

**Iowa State University**  
**FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING**  
**Tuesday, March 12, 2002**  
**3:10-4:50 p.m.**  
**107 Lab of Mechanics**

[Approved minutes]

**Attendance:**

**Present:** Sanjeev Agarwal (BUS Caucus Chair), Susan Carlson (Associate Provost), John Cunnally (DES Caucus Chair), Janice Dana (FCS Caucus Chair), Mike Duffy (AG Caucus Chair), Dorothy Fowles (J&A Council Chair), Carolyn Heising (ENG Caucus Chair), Anthony Hendrickson (Academic Affairs Council Chair), David Hopper (Faculty Senate Past-President), Jim Hutter (LAS Caucus Chair), Gregory Palermo (FDAR Council Chair), Christie Pope (Faculty Senate President), Connie Post (Faculty Senate Secretary), Brad Thacker (VET Caucus Chair), and Max Wortman (Faculty Senate President-Elect).

**Call to Order:**

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

**I. Approval of the minutes for February 26, 2002 and agenda for today's meeting.** [See page 5.]

**II. Announcements**

**A. Faculty Senate President**

- 1. Adopting the Title of Chair:** At a meeting of the DEO Cabinet, the Provost said he wants to change the titles of DEO and Head to Chair.
- 2. Dropping ERIP:** President Geoffroy says there is no way to continue ERIP because of legal difficulties. Provost Richmond will not be here today, but Susan Carlson, Associate Provost, will discuss changes in the Phased Retirement Policy. ISU has found this policy, paid for at the unit level, to be difficult and expensive because departments cannot afford to replace persons on phased retirement for five years. The administration wants to limit phased retirement to two years.
- 3. Changing the name of the Honors Building:** Robert and Patricia Jester, owners of an insurance services company, have sent a letter to President Geoffroy about removing the name of Jischke from the Honors Building.

In the letter the Jesters state that they strongly support this move, noting that they were first major contributors for the construction of the building. At the time they made their gift of \$60,000, they said no one mentioned to them the name that would be given this building. The Jesters conclude their letter by urging President Geoffroy and the Board of Regents to rescind the name. Bill Kunnerth placed an article about rescinding the name in the Purdue paper. The article included an interview of David Fisher, a member of the Board of Regents, who said what the Faculty Senate did was a serious mistake. When Pope asked President Geoffroy whether this might be a good reason to have a faculty regent, he said he did not think it would have mattered.

4. **Need for Names:** Thirty-five to forty names are needed for a pool from which the Provost can select members to be on faculty review boards and sanction committees by July 1st. Pope asked that the names be sent to her by e-mail.
5. **ISU Foundation Gifts Acceptance Committee:** Tom Mitchell has written Pope that the ISU Foundation is going to have a Gifts Acceptance Committee, which will meet quarterly. The high-powered committee will include the President of the Foundation, the Vice President of Development, the Vice President of Finance, the Governor of the Board of the Foundation, and someone from the Faculty Senate. Pope requested members of the Executive Board to give her three names to forward to Tom Mitchell, rather than sending this request to the Committee on Committees.

James Hutter said that if the Foundation wants a faculty senator, the Senate will send one; the Foundation, however, should not do the choosing. Pope stated that the Foundation will say it is a private corporation and will do whatever it pleases. Hopper noted that in October Geoffroy appointed a committee to review funds transferred to the university from the ISU Foundation. The committee, on which Hopper serves, is not reviewing the Foundation—only the 35 to \$40 million transferred from it to ISU. How the transfers are processed, how donors' wishes are honored, etc., will be the focus of the committee's work. Geoffroy especially wants scholarship funds looked into. The committee, said Hopper, is small: Jim Espinson (Chemistry), Jill Bystydzienski (Women's Studies) Johnny Pickett (Assistant Vice President for Business and Finance), and Cheryl Ripke (Head of Internal Audit). The committee is reviewing Foundation accounts and is doing it by way of the Foundation's computer system. Hopper noted that the committee has come up with a significant number of recommendations and that it is charged to report directly to President Geoffroy. Therefore, a report will not be come directly to the Faculty Senate, but Hopper said that Geoffroy will probably make the report public.

Pope asked Hopper if he would be willing to be the representative from the Faculty Senate to the Foundation, which meets quarterly. The

term, said Pope, would be for a year. Hopper agreed to serve, and Pope said she would get back to him later after negotiating with the Foundation about the matter.

- 6. Lunch with the Board of Regents:** The Faculty Senate Executive Board is hosting a lunch for the Board of Regents at noon on Thursday, March 14, in the Campanile Room. Dan Power, UNI Faculty Senate President, and Amitavi Bhattacharjee, U of I Faculty Senate President, will be there. Barbara Finch wants to come, too, although she is not sure she can make it. Pope said she received a letter from Greg Nichols, Executive Director of the Board of Regents, who wants to know what kind of questions will be asked in this forum. According to Pope, she listed a number of things that might come up, e.g., a faculty regent and budget cuts, so the Board of Regents will know what the Faculty Senate has been discussing in the past few months. Pope commented that she, like Hopper, will give a welcome speech and that Owen Newlin will likely give a response.
- 7. Update on Faculty Regent:** Pope reported that Finch was surprised that all Democratic members of the committee, led apparently by Greiman, oppose a faculty regent. There was a strong opportunity here, said Pope, since a Republican took it up and had already put a bill in the hopper. Finch and Greiman are talking about improving the relationship between the senates of the three universities and the Board of Regents, and Finch is determined to bring this back next year. Finch, said Pope, is thinking about a bill with a three-year term, with one year for each of the three universities. Greiman is concerned that faculties are sometimes at odds with their presidents and therefore believes this is not a good idea. U of I, concerned about things such as the statute that says there have to be five members of one party and four of the other, worries that the faculty representative would have to declare party membership. Pope stated that the move to have a faculty regent is undercut by not having the University of Iowa on board and by the Board of Regents saying it is happy with things as they are. Presidents of the three universities and their lobbyists cannot come out in favor of the proposal. According to Pope, Greiman and Finch want to find way for Faculty Senate presidents to give more speeches to the Board of Regents. Right now as Faculty Senate President, Pope cannot send things directly to the Board of Regents but only through President Geoffroy. Hutter asked if Pope was aware that in a conflict situation, you can do things differently. Pope replied, yes.
- 8. Protected Categories for Budget Cuts.** Pope reported that in her meeting with the President this month, she asked about a resolution regarding protected categories such as faculty and the library. The President refused to commit himself, saying he wants to maintain flexibility. Pope noted that President Geoffroy's secretary forgot to put the ombuds proposal in the packet for the President's Cabinet this month, which means that the proposal will be postponed until the April meeting

of the cabinet. When Pope asked if he thought the ombuds proposal would be put in place this year, he said, yes.

- 9. Family Leave Policy.** At her meeting with the President, Pope also discussed the Family Leave Policy. Although President Geoffroy wants a unified policy, he would like the Senate to pull out of its response to the FLP the part about extending the tenure clock and send it to him as a separate thing. Pope reminded the President that there are other aspects of the policy passed by the Senate, such as broadening its scope, etc. Geoffroy said we could pull out those other aspects that pertain just to faculty and submit those as well, making them an addendum to the FLP. Pope asked members of the Executive Board about making these aspects of the Family Leave Policy as two separate items and placing them on the consent agenda.
- 10. Task Force on Budget and Strategic Planning.** Pope noted that the President's Task Force on Budget and Strategic Planning has been confidential and that there are three senators on it. Geoffroy wants to institute a permanent presidential committee to deal with budget matters, and representatives from the Faculty Senate would be on it. Pope said the Senate needs to figure out a way to interface its committees and structures with whatever permanent committee Geoffroy decides to put in place. She noted that the Senate has an RPA as well as a committee of the RPA that deals just with that kind of thing and that has people on it with expertise in economics and related matters. Lee Fletcher, who heads that up, has put forward a suggestion. Pope said the Faculty Senate Executive Board might even want to give the President suggestions about how he might devise a presidential budget committee, etc. Hutter recalled that the committee of the RPA Council is the original President's Budget Advisory Committee, which was initiated by Parks and ignored by Eaton and Jischke. Pope noted that RPA has been unhappy with the President's Task Force because it is confidential.

[Return to I.]

- I. Approval of the minutes for February 26, 2002, and Agenda for March 12, 2002.**  
The minutes and the agenda were approved. Hopper asked about his motion, and Pope said it is E. under new business. A motion to approve the agenda as amended was passed.
- II. Announcements (continued)**

  - B. Associate Provost Susan Carlson.**

**Phased Retirement.** Associate Provost Carlson explained that this issue has come up because ISU is losing ERIP and therefore phased retirement may become more popular. Carlson noted that during the debate about the ERIP option, no one was enthusiastic about the phased retirement policy. The Faculty Handbook

allows phased retirement for up to five years, but Carlson noted that the administration is not sure it is a good idea. Chairs, for example, worry that faculty members on phased retirement become nothing more than instructors. Some, she noted, teach only one semester but tie up a line for five years. Right now about 50 faculty are on some kind of phased retirement, lasting one to five years. Carlson reported that according to Brenda Behling, seven faculty members are electing to begin it this year and three have signed up for next year. The average is about eight a year.

Pope asked for comments, and the response was mixed. Dorothy Fowles said some faculty use phased retirement very well, and some abuse it. According to Fowles, most of the faculty she knows here and at U of I who take phased retirement use it well. Besides, she added, the numbers are not so great that it looks as though you ought to drop it. Given that it may be the difference between a faculty member's retiring or not retiring, Fowles said she strongly urges the administration to continue to support it.

Carlson said that five years may be too long and suggested that phased retirement be limited to one or two years. According to Carolyn Heising, phased retirement has worked very well in her department; in fact, one person on phased retirement brought in a big grant. Janice Dana asked that persons who take phased retirement declare well enough in advance of a new academic year whether they intend to remain on it for the time period originally elected. Carlson stated that people do declare their intention when they sign up for phased retirement. Most people on phased retirement, said Pope, completely retire after one or two years.

Wortman inquired about the time frame of the present plan, and Carlson said it had been approved indefinitely. Phrased retirement is a two-edged sword for a department, said Hendrickson. If a person is productive and valuable, you do not want to let that person go; therefore, you want phased retirement as an enticement. To someone you think has the potential to abuse phased retirement, you may want to deny it. For those faculty members who are not fully functioning, departments like to encourage them to go on it. Duffy wondered how that is better, and Hendrickson explained that the department is only saddled with those persons for half the year. To Fowles' question about whether the revised policy will no longer permit faculty on phased retirement to teach only one semester per year, Carlson said, not exactly: A faculty member could teach just one semester per year but remain active in some way during the other. According to Duffy, a department may be better off having faculty on phased retirement rather than full employment. Connie Post wondered how it might affect faculty morale if phased retirement is sharply reduced the same year that faculty are notified that ERIP will not be continued. Pope noted that she asked Ardith Maney, Chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Welfare and Benefits, about this, and Maney said she felt comfortable about letting the matter come before the Executive Board today.

### **III. Reports**

#### **A. Council or Committee Chairs: FS Committee on Senate Elections. Brad**

Thacker, Chair, said that council and secretary elections as well as orientation for new faculty senate members will be held at the Faculty Senate meeting on March 26, so that this will not have to be done at the April meeting. Instead the April meeting will be used to get council heads to make their committee selections.

Wortman asked if all of the senators have been elected. For the most part, yes, said Thacker, although there was a contested election in Vet Med. Thacker also noted that the computer center can run only one election at a time, and that GSB has been doing one. Wortman expressed his concern that committee assignments be made in a timely manner so that the Senate will not have cases in which committees are operating only half a year. Thacker said this is a council matter, and Pope suggested that perhaps Wortman and Thacker could get together to work the matter out. Fowles asked if new senators are aware that orientation will be held in March, noting that her college has one election that remains to be held. Thacker stated that a letter will be sent to senators whose races are not contested.

- B. Caucus Chairs: AG.** Mike Duffy, Chair, said a letter has gone out about eliminating double journal acquisitions. According to Duffy, several departments, including Ag and Sociology, made their decisions on which journals to cut without knowing that double journal acquisitions would be dropped. Had they known these would be cut, the decision might have been made differently. Pope said Olivia Madison should be contacted about this.
- C. Nontenure-Track Policy Transition Committee.** David Hopper, Chair, said the committee met today and that it has established a policy for these positions. The serious issues that remain to be resolved concern adjunct appointments, particularly non-P&S adjunct appointments. Noting that the issue of titles has been brought to the committee, Hopper said that the title of “temporary position” will be eliminated. Pope said she may exercise her authority as Faculty Senate President to establish a task force on titles. Hopper pointed out that Senior Lecturer/Clinician may not carry academic recognition, so that assistant, associate, and full clinical professor, etc., may be needed. The committee meets again on March 26, said Hopper, who acknowledged the help of Susan Carlson and Faye Whitaker in working with the transition committee. All caucus chairs are on the committee plus several others, Hopper noted.

**IV. Special Orders: Approval of the Senate Agenda for March 26.** Pope discussed the following items for the Faculty Senate Agenda on 3/26:

- Family Leave will be placed under consent items since it is material the Faculty Senate has already voted on.
- Elections of the Faculty Senate Secretary and Council Chairs will appear under Special Orders.
- Additional governance documents from Porter will appear under Old Business.
- Hopper’s motion on the naming of buildings and streets, introduced at the 3/5 Faculty Senate meeting, will be considered under Old Business.
- Reading Week will be considered under New Business.

**ISUComm:** Hutter said Michael Mendelson told him he wants to make a presentation to the Faculty Senate about ISUComm. Pope said she considered it, but that there is not enough time at the next meeting. Hopper said he spoke with Mendelson today, suggesting to him that it would be best to address the Faculty Senate about ISUComm at the first or second meeting in the fall. According to Hopper, Mendelson liked the idea. Greg Palermo reported that the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee just this day approved language to go into the new general catalog that would essentially approve ISUComm for the undergraduate curriculum in terms of general education. This committee of the Faculty Senate reviews catalog copy, said Palermo, so the copy will probably come forward this spring. Pope said, no, the matter will be put on hold until next year. Palermo said the language approved by his committee will go into the front of the catalog, even if it is not approved by the Senate until the fall.

Hendrickson said that when the Academic Affairs Council met last week, he brought this up, hoping that the council could move the process along. Kruempel reacted, saying the report had just been received by the Curriculum Committee and that he was uncertain about how fast it would pass. Palermo stated that ISUComm presented its material to the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee today, which approved it. Hendrickson said that in most cases approval is perfunctory, but noted that in this instance the committee has not done anything yet and will not until it hears from the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee. Pope said it sounds as though there will be wonderful catalog copy, and Hopper reminded the Executive Board that it has already passed the principles. Plans for implementation, however, have not yet been approved, Pope noted.

What happens, asked Hendrickson, if approval of the implementation is ready to go to the floor of the Faculty Senate, but Mendelson says it is not yet ready to be voted on? In that case, said Pope, the matter will be held until the Faculty Senate votes on the particulars. Otherwise, copy cannot be put in a handbook. Pope, who said she thinks the planners of ISUComm do not want to come forward until next year about this, stressed that so far only the principles have been approved -- not the policy itself. This, said Pope, stands in contrast to the nontenure-track policy, on the one hand, for which the Senate did not approve principles because it was a policy; and student evaluations, on the other, for which the Senate did approve principles.

Palermo reminded Executive Board members that ISUComm principles were approved last year and that the catalog copy does more than simply repeat the five principles by stating two items: that the duration be two years and that communication across the curriculum be made department specific. These two matters are policy items embedded in the catalog copy, said Palermo, who noted that the committee has separated out the logistical plan of operation from the policy framework. Hutter asked if catalog copy for ISUComm will be approved at some future meeting. Palermo replied that the catalog copy is simply a policy statement, pointing out that ISUComm does not have courses and that it does not have a director.

When Pope said the Executive Board had not yet not voted on the Senate agenda for 3/26, Hutter stated that he had another item for it. First, though, he wanted to know at

what point in the Senate's agenda is it appropriate for senators to arise and make motions. According to Pope, it depends on whether the matter is old business or new or "other." Hutter said perhaps it should be called something other than "other," suggesting that it might be something under special orders. To his question about how the Mize motion got introduced, Pope responded that it was done through the Executive Board. When motions are not handled this way, Pope said that Porter believes you open the floodgates. Pope then asked if Executive Board members were ready to vote on the agenda. Before voting, Duffy asked whether the motion to rescind will have a number, and Pope said, yes.

*Motion to approve the agenda for the 3/26 Faculty Senate Meeting was approved.*

- V. **Old Business: Reading Week.** Hendrickson, Academic Affairs Chair, said the committee has heard a proposal from GSB, and that the proposal has several suggestions that are being wordsmithed. The GSB wanted to put them on the agenda for last week's Faculty Senate meeting and is frustrated that faculty take a while to do things. Hendrickson said he anticipates that at the next meeting of Academic Affairs Council on Thursday there will be more discussion of Reading Week and possibly a resolution to put forward. Pope said she would like to leave the item on the agenda and has said so in an e-mail to the students making the proposal. According to Wortman, GSB is having an election today, and the GSB President wanted to have this taken care of by the Faculty Senate Executive Board at its meeting this afternoon. Wortman said he reminded the GSB President that the policy is already in the catalog, which means that the Provost should say that ISU will follow the policies regarding dead week already in the catalog. Hendrickson said it is important for Executive Board members to know that proposals regarding Reading Week range from having no classes at all from two days to the entire week. During this time there would be no major exams and no finals. GSB also wants some language about not introducing brand new assignments that week. Pope said the Faculty Senate would look better if we have the resolution. Hutter wondered why the proposal is for Reading Week instead of Dead Week, and Pope replied that it is because students wanted it that way. Hendrickson said the proposal was to change Dead Week to Reading Week by devoting the whole week to reading. Hendrickson noted, however, that the proposal begs question about what is done the rest of the semester.

VI. **New Business**

- A. **Curriculum Committee Reports for the Regents** (Kruempel and Hendrickson). Reports from the Curriculum Committee Chair were received and placed on the consent agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting on March 26.
- B. **More proposed governance document changes.** Pope noted that Max Porter was planning to bring forward more changes but was not able to attend today's meeting. If these changes are not put on the agenda for the next Faculty Senate meeting, said Pope, then there would be time for ISUComm with Mendelson's 12-minute Power-Point presentation. Hutter asked if the governance matters are ready to be voted on. Pope said, yes, adding that Porter had more that he wanted to bring up. Since it does not take any time to introduce them, asked Hutter, then



why not let him do that? Hendrickson agreed, and Pope said she would convey this to Porter. She also sought input from the Board about Mendelson's 12-minute presentation about ISUComm, noting that some say it should wait because we will have many new senators later. Thacker reminded Executive Board members that orientation will be held on March 26 and that new senators will be encouraged to stick around that night. Hutter recommended that the matter be put under Special Orders, and Pope suggested it be placed under elections.

- C. Orientation for New Faculty Senators.** Pope stated that the matter of orientation had just been discussed.
- D. Presidential Award for Outstanding Achievement in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.** Noting that there already are a number of teaching awards, Palermo asked whether a council should look at this first. Although it is somewhat different from the other recognitions, Palermo wondered if it were different enough not to have it seen by one of the councils. Pope said it sounds like a good idea for FDAR, and Palermo said that he would get it to the council. According to Pope, the president of the university would give this award.
- E. Motion by Hopper on the Naming of Buildings and Streets:** Pope stated that Hopper and Hutter want to say something about the motion. Hopper said that what the Faculty Senate said about naming the Honors Building needs to be addressed. The first bullet of his motion is taken off the web page and reads as follows:
- *Generally, nominations may be submitted at any time and the committee will act on the nominations as expeditiously as possible. However, nominations for current or former employees of the university will normally not be reviewed by the committee until at least five years have elapsed since the termination of their university employment (whether by death, retirement, or resignation) in order to ensure their sustained recognition and thus, the strength of the nominations. Exceptions to this time period may be made in extraordinary cases. If any, such exceptions will require convincing justifications.*

According to Hopper, the Faculty Senate is asking the President to reaffirm the language under the first bullet, and to add #2, which asks that reasons when an exception is granted be made known to the community:

*In all cases where an exception to this time period is deemed justified, the committee shall inform the university community of its reason for making the exception, and broadly solicit input from the university community concerning its support for the exception.*

Palermo objected to the language in #2, noting that the word, *making*, assumes the decision has been made rather than one that is being proposed. Pope said this change would require a second motion since a motion has already been accepted.

Hutter, however, said the Executive Board can send motions to the floor. Palermo sought to amend the original motion by replacing *making* with *proposing*. Pope said there is one motion on the floor, so that one should be done first. Palermo said his amendment was a friendly amendment and had been accepted, but Pope said, no, the original motion was seconded so must be submitted to the Senate for the amendment. Hutter noted that the Mize motion was amended many times. Pope pointed out, however, that those amendments were made by the Executive Board before the motion went to the Faculty Senate. If the maker of the original motion accepts the change as a friendly amendment, asked Hopper, can't it be accepted? Pope said, no, because it has already been presented to the Faculty Senate. Palermo said the Executive Board could review a motion, perfect it, and then bring it to the Senate by offering it as a substitute motion. What the Executive Board cannot do, said Palermo, is act for the whole body of the Faculty Senate by altering the motion it has already passed.

Hutter wondered if the Board should not put "teeth" into #2, and Pope asked who the ruling authority would be in this case. According to Hopper, whatever the Faculty Senate might say would be a recommendation to the President for his committee. The material in the bullet under #1, said Hopper, is in the office procedure guide. The intent is clear. If you're going to do this, let the community know it. Agarwal suggested for clarification regarding community, whether it is faculty, students, etc. Hendrickson, noting that someone can only be nominated five years after death, retirement, or resignation, asked about firing. ISU fired a Nobel Prize winner, he said, and according to this motion the university could not name a building after such a person. Hopper stated that the reference is only to current employees.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Constance Post,  
Faculty Senate Secretary