

Iowa State University
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING
Tuesday, February 19, 2002
3:10-5:00 p.m.
107 Lab of Mechanics

Call to Order:

The meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Board was called to order at 3:11 p.m. in 107 Lab of Mechanics by Christie Pope, President.

Attendance:

Present: John Cunnally (DES Caucus Chair), Janice Dana (FCS Caucus Chair), Michael Duffy (AGR Caucus Chair), Dorothy Fowles (J&A Council Chair), Anthony Hendrickson (Academic Affairs Council Chair), 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), and Max Wortman (ISU Faculty Senate President-Elect).

Substitute: Claudia Baldwin for Brad Thacker (VET Caucus Chair).

Absent: Sanjeev Agarwal (BUS Caucus Chair), Carolyn Heising (ENG Caucus Chair), David Hopper (ISU Faculty Senate Past-President), Gary Phye (EDU Caucus Chair), and William Woodman (RPA Chair).

Guests: Professor Jerry Colver; T. J. Schneider and Andy Tofilon, students.

I. Approval of the minutes and agenda. Motion to approve the 2/5/02 minutes and today's agenda was passed.

II. Announcements

A. Faculty Senate President Christie Pope

1. **VEISHA Grant:** The Faculty Senate is giving VEISHA \$200.
2. **Nontenure-Track Transition Committee:** The committee, headed by David Hopper, also includes the following: Carolyn Heising, Claudia Baldwin, Sanjeev Agarwal, Jim Hutter, and Gary Phye.
3. **ERIP Questions:** A senator with questions about ERIP wonders if there shouldn't be a Brown Bag lunch to discuss these, and Mark Power has agreed to do it if there are enough persons with questions to warrant it. Pope asked the Board if it should organize a Brown Bag or have Power speak to that person. The Board decided on the latter course of action.

4. **Contacting Legislators:** Pope said President Geoffroy asked her to get in touch with all the faculty about contacting legislators; however, if e-mail lists cannot be used to accomplish this, then phone trees will take a lot of time. Although there is no code saying e-mail lists cannot be used and Tanaka has said it would not be illegal, word about it would reach the Republican legislators, who would run with it.

5. **Update about Faculty Representation on Board of Regents.** Pope reported that she attended a subcommittee meeting with Barbara Finch, Danny Carroll, and Jane Greiman. Finch and Carroll favor faculty representation on the Board of Regents; Greiman opposes. The lobbyist for the Board of Regents was there opposing it, in addition to the lobbyist for ISU and the one for UI, both of whom are against it. Pope said President Geoffroy told her he does not think the proposal will go anywhere. Steinke told Pope that the lobbyists are monitoring this, but then called her back right away to say that since the Board of Regents is opposing it, the lobbyists are too.

According to Pope, the meeting today gave members an opportunity to ask questions of her and others. She also said that the committee will bluecard the Democrats and Republicans on the Education Committee to find out how they will vote. If it looks as though it won't come out of committee, said Pope, they will drop it because it would be hard to revive it if it dies in committee.

When Pope told the committee that there is no opportunity for faculty senate presidents to address issues at board meetings, Greiman picked up on this and so did others. Pope told the committee that last summer she attended at a Board of Regents meeting at which members talked about how faculty do not work very hard, yet none of the board members in attendance had ever taught except for one doctor who did some teaching at a medical college. Pope informed the committee that she wanted to tell the Board of Regents that she does not know of any other occupation where the employees work for two months out of the year with no pay because that is only time we can get our research done. Owen Newlin, however, would not recognize Pope because she was not on the agenda, so she asked Interim President Seagrave if he would make the comment or let her make it. Seagrave told Pope the Board members would likely see university professors as public school teachers who should go out and get summer jobs in that case. This is just one illustration, said Pope, of why she wants a faculty member on the board to be part of the conversation. She noted that she sees this happening with the student member of the Board of Regents, Lisa Ahrens, who is quick to speak up and say, "It doesn't affect students that way," thereby changing the course of the debate on an issue.

Pope said she thinks there will be some backroom maneuvering. Finch is

organized, and told the Board of Regents lobbyists to go back to the Board and put in writing how they intend to give faculty a greater voice. Pope said the meeting of the subcommittee was an interesting experience for herself and Tom Emerson, who accompanied her, but warned that it is likely to be a two- to three-year campaign.

Max Porter remarked that Finch is concerned that if you put faculty on the Board of Regents, then you need Merit and P&S representation. Porter said he told Finch that shared governance demands that faculty be on it -- but not necessarily Merit and P&S. If she sends Finch a confirmation memo, Pope said she will be sure to include this point. Hutter expressed delight to hear Finch make that point and said he has talked with Greiman about the need for faculty senate presidents to have a place at the table, including the right to be recognized if you raise your hand.

Pope said it is a concern of the Regents that if you do have a faculty member on the Board, the person might be in conflict with the President. Fowles pointed out that if the student representative on the Board of Regents can disagree with the President, shouldn't faculty able to express dissent as well? If this comes up, Porter said he would accept nonvoting status. He noted that it is deplorable for faculty to have a shared governance role with no representation and for students, who have no shared governance role, to have representation. Pope reminded Executive Board members that they will have a chance to say this at the luncheon the Faculty Senate Executive Board is hosting for the Board of Regents in March and noted that facebooks for the Board of Regents have been distributed at today's meeting. To Porter's question about whether Faculty Senate Executive Board members would get a chance to say anything at the meeting, Pope responded that Provost Richmond gave the Faculty Senate President a chance to speak briefly at a similar gathering not long ago.

B. Faculty Senate President-Elect Max Wortman

Wortman announced that the two dates for the Board retreat during the summer are June 18 and June 26, noting that June 18 would be the day before the Board of Regents meeting at ISU. Faculty Senate Executive Board members agreed that June 18 would be preferable to June 26. As a follow-up to Porter's comment that next year there will be an almost complete turnover in membership on the Executive Board, Wortman requested that council chairs consider who might run for office as Chair of the Governance Council and the FDAR Council. He noted that Bill Woodman has agreed to run as Chair of RPA.

III. Reports - none

IV. Old Business

A. Proposed Changes to Governance Documents (Porter)

1. Proposed Language for Nomination of Members for Distinguished Professor and University Professor Nominating Pools

“A pool of 32 faculty names (16 for the Distinguished Professor pool and 16 for the University Professor pool) will be forward through the faculty senate president to the provost.

“The pool will be selected by the Committee on Committees.

“If a committee member has a conflict of interest with any nominee, the member will recuse him- or herself from discussion and voting for that nominee.”

Last spring the Faculty Senate passed language for procedures to be used in nominating members for the Distinguished Professor and University Professor nominating pools. The council took the attitude that since the Faculty Senate has passed this items, we wouldn't monkey with them. Pope noted that when Morrow brought forward names, it was felt that the committee should work closely with the Honors Committee of each college to coordinate matters. Porter said he thinks that language of the proposal covers that concern and clarified that the pool of 32 faculty names is the group from which the committee is formed. These items, said Porter, will be added to those the Faculty Senate has already passed, which is why a section number for this has not been provided. Once passed, these will forwarded to the Provost. Hutter said he hopes the language will be improved a bit, and Pope suggested that to move things along the wordsmithing could be sent on to the committee.

Pope asked Porter if the Governance Council wants to move to put this on the agenda for the next faculty senate meeting, and Porter noted that two were passed at the last meeting: Senate historian and the nontenure-track transitions committee.

2. Proposed Language to be added to Article II, Section 4, D, Powers and Duties of the Faculty Senate President (By-laws, pp.2-3)

“4. With the advice and consent of the Executive Board, the senate president will schedule additional senate meetings to discuss special topics and may cancel senate meetings due to lack of business.

“5. With the advice and consent of members of the

Administrative Board, the senate president will cancel senate meetings in time fashion due to inclement weather or other exigency.”

3. Proposed Language to be added to Article VI, Section 1, B, Procedures in Common to Standing Committees (By-Laws, p. 13)

“d. Agreeing to be a member of a committee carries with it the responsibility to actively participate and attend meetings. It is therefore incumbent when agreeing to be part of a committee, to participate in those on-going efforts to complete the charges of that committee. Individuals not fulfilling their committee or chair responsibilities may be asked to relinquish their positions.”

Pointing out that the final sentence does not say who will do the asking, Hutter recommended that the language be changed to read that the asking will be done by the Faculty Senate President and that the Executive Board will advise and consent.

4. Proposed By-law changes dealing with committee/council terms:

a. Article VI, Section 1, Subsection B.3.:

“Term of office: The chair of each committee will be appointed for a term of two years. One half of all chairs will be appointed each year. After serving as a member for one year, chairs would be appointed to a two-year term as chair, thus resulting in a term on the committee of three years. The term of any committee member will be for three years, one third being appointed each year. All voting members are limited to a maximum of six consecutive years on any one committee.”

b. Article VI, Section 1, Subsection A.3.:

“Term of office: The chair of each council will be elected for a term of two years. Approximately one half of the chairs will be elected in alternate years. After serving as a member for one year, chairs would be elected to a two-year term as chair, thus resulting in a term on the council of three years. The term of any council member will be for three years, one third of the members will assume office each year. All voting

members are limited to a maximum of six consecutive years on any one council.”

In discussing proposed changes to terms of office, Hutter said there is no right or wrong length of term but only what works best. Wortman said he is not sold on the three-year term but did say it is giving the Committee on Committees great difficulty. Porter stated that he would take up the matter with the Council at its meeting tomorrow and then made a motion.

Motion was made by Porter to adopt all five items.

Fowles amended the motion for term of service on council to read two years for regular members on councils.

Fowles pointed out that to be on a council commits you to a great deal of time and that serving on a committee is not contingent on being a Senator. Hutter, stating that he thought the motion was for both committees and councils, said the Governance Council could spell out in the procedures document how resignations and replacements, etc., are handled rather than putting such matters in the by-laws. He also stated that a two-year term in both cases could be the norm.

Motion for a two-year term for council members was passed.

Motion by Hutter to reduce the three-year term for committee members to a two-year term was passed.

Pope asked if the Executive Board was ready to take up whole packet of five; and if so, did it want to endorse or simply receive and forward? Board members said “endorse” in unison, and Porter asked that any suggestions for wordsmithing be sent to him by tomorrow. Pope noted that the motion includes giving the governance committee the opportunity to further word smith.

Duffy, who said he knows the difference between endorse and forward versus forward, asked why the Board could not just forward and let the debate take shape on the floor of the Senate. Duffy said he was not offering this as a motion but did note that for six years he has heard debates done twice when the Board votes to forward and endorse: first, by the Board and, second, by the Senate. Pope said she regarded the comment as a motion. Taking up the issue raised by Duffy, Hendrickson asked the Executive Board about its perception of the difference between forward, on the one hand, and endorse and forward, on the other. According to Porter, if the Senate hears something has been endorsed, it assumes the Executive Board has debated it whereas if a matter is simply forwarded, it sends a subtle message that the Executive Board does not

feel strongly about it.

A third possibility, said Hutter, is to send something to the floor with the recommendation that it not be approved. Pope pointed out that sometimes the Executive Board states that something should be received and forwarded because it thinks the Faculty Senate should decide the matter. That, said Duffy, addresses the issue about what our role is as an Executive Board: is it to debate, fine-tune, or to say this is an issue important enough to go to the Faculty Senate? Hutter maintained that it is the role of the Executive Board to amend, change, etc., stating that it is the funnel and the filter, and in so doing has three ways to weigh in on a matter. If so, said Duffy, then that is why we waste a lot of time in this group hearing debate here and then again on the floor of the Faculty Senate. Noting that the Board may do too much of this in terms of fine-tuning things, Duffy said he did not want to belabor the point.

According to Hutter, the faculty senate with 87 persons in it is hardly the forum for wordsmithing and extensive debate, adding that before things go to the Senate, they need to be put in good shape. Nevertheless, said Duffy, a lot of wordsmithing is done on the Senate floor. In fact, he added, when he looks at a lot of the debate and the discussion, he does not believe it was a very productive use of his time.

Motion was made to receive and forward the five governance items to the Faculty Senate for its consideration.

Hutter, who immediately moved to amend the motion to say that the Executive Board endorses, rather than receives and forwards, was told by Pope that his amendment was out of order and that the Board would now vote on the motion.

Motion to receive and forward the five governance items to the Faculty Senate for its consideration failed to pass. Pope said she assumes that means the Executive Board will endorse and forward.

Fowles, who asked what the change stipulates about the minimum number of senators, wondered how the amendment was worded to handle a situation in which two departments are combined so that the total is four instead of three, which is the case in the College of Design. Pope replied that the number of senators would still be one for each department plus two.

B. Academic Affairs (Hendrickson)

Tony Hendrickson, Chair, said there was not much business this time but there would be some at the next meeting. In going through the minutes, he said he

realized that on 1/22 the Executive Board passed the Teaching Task Force, which means that it needs to be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.

C. MGT-American Report and Response to Budget Crisis Task Force (Wortman)

Noting that Report #1 was done at the last meeting of the Executive Board, Max Wortman said it will go on the consent agenda for the next Faculty Senate meeting. The Board of Regents sent recommendations, said Wortman, and theirs were much like ours. Wortman passed around Report #2, which went out just as the news about the additional \$2.6 million cut was announced. Wortman said that the Task Force wants cuts in faculty and the library taken off the table, just as President Coleman has done at the University of Iowa for the library and LAS faculty. According to Wortman, members of the Task Force believe themselves to be the point people for any discussion of this matter and therefore wish to present the following resolution to the Executive Board to send on to the Senate:

Whereas it appears that there will be further cuts to the ISU budget in the 2002 fiscal year, be it resolved that two areas be removed from the table so that there are no further budget cuts in: (1) faculty (both permanent and temporary); and (2) library.

Hutter recommended that the resolution be amended to say “faculty positions” rather than “faculty” so that vacant positions, etc. can be included; he also suggested that the resolution specify “library acquisitions”. Hendrickson sought clarification about what is meant by “faculty” in the statement and said that adding “total” would make the statement clearer. Hutter said that “faculty positions” would take care of the matter.

In a department where there is nothing else to cut except staff, Duffy asked if this resolution means that should there be a vacant staff position, would a secretary be laid off instead of a faculty member? According to Wortman, the concern of the Task Force and the Faculty Senate President is to increase faculty lines and not sustain additional cuts. Duffy acknowledged that he is sympathetic to the faculty, but pointed out that in some departments the cuts will require an increase in the productivity of the faculty who remain. In some areas, noted Duffy, the cuts have been as high as 25%. Hendrickson said someone in his department turned in his resignation, and that if the department cannot fill the line by next fall he could be forced to get rid of the one secretary in the department. According to Duffy, in the College of Agriculture the Experimental Station has been cut 20% and the Service Extension 25% so that there is nothing really left to cut. Another 2% cut, said Duffy, and people are going to be fired. Instead of across-the-board cuts, said Pope, there will be selective cuts. Duffy said he agrees with that, but if he is given a certain percentage then it means people must be let go.

Pointing out that the language of the resolution does not say the total number of

faculty positions in any department, Hutter emphasized that it just means we cannot go below the number of faculty that the university has now. He asked, however, if the Board would be voting on the entire document or just the resolution. Palermo, referring to the resolution, spoke in favor of the motion as amended. Despite the fact that differential cuts are supposed to be taken, said Palermo, this resolution asserts an important principle. Palermo noted that the President's e-mail message today did not refer to lines that are open -- only that faculty cannot be cut who are teaching courses this spring or summer. Palermo therefore agreed that the resolution should refer to the total number of faculty and said he believes it is a positive motion despite the risks.

Motion to amend the resolution was passed, and the resolution now reads as follows: Whereas it appears that there will be further cuts to the ISU budget in the 2002 fiscal year, be it resolved that two areas be removed from the table so that there are no further budget cuts in: (1) the total number of faculty positions; and (2) library acquisitions.

Hutter noted two grammatical changes that he will suggest to Wortman, who reported that the Task Force has met again and that it believes the 35 to 40 pages of the MGT-America Report are garbage. He pointed out that the only thing the Task Force gleaned from it is the concern on page 23 about revenue generation. A diagram about internal reallocations mentioned in the report has been requested by the Task Force. Pope thanked Wortman for his work on the Task Force, and the discussion of the matter concluded with Hutter suggesting that the Task Force ask for a copy of the report of the response to the MGT-America study that the administration will give to the Board of Regents.

D. Dead Week (Tofilon)

Andy Tofilon introduced T. J. Schneider, who presented the "Proposal for a University Policy on Dead Week" dated January 22, 2002. Schneider, who pointed out that increased stress felt by students during Dead Week prompted this proposal, emphasized the three items in boldface.

In the discussion that followed, Fowles and Palermo in the College of Design made it clear that major projects can only be turned in during Dead Week. Waiting until the week of finals to have them submitted imposes a hardship on students, who should be studying for their exams, and on faculty, who need to be grading the exams rather than the major projects at that point. Schneider suggested that maybe an exception would have to be made for the College of Design. Porter sought clarification that the proposal also rules out club meetings during Dead Week and was assured that it does. Other Board members registered objections to subpoints under the second major point of the proposal, and Pope said she will have the students send this to Hendrickson for review.

V. New Business - Regent Faculty Excellence Awards (Colver).

Motion to go into closed executive session was passed.

Summary of the work of the Recognition and Development Committee was made by Jerry Colver.

Motion to go out of closed executive session was passed.

Colver has served as Interim Chair of the committee while Thomas Chacko is on leave. Other committee members for 2001-2002 include: Lynn Jones, Samuel DeMarie, Donna Merkley, Brian Gleeson, Mark Love, Barry Falk, Ron Myers, Jerry Colver, Prem Premkumar, and Susan Carlson. The committee, it should be noted, is not filled by the Committee on Committees but is formed by having the Chair of the Professional Development Committee in each of the colleges serve on this committee. The chair is appointed by the Faculty Senate President.

Motion to adjourn the meeting of the Executive Board at 5:07 p.m. was passed.

Constance Post,
Faculty Senate Secretary