

**Iowa State University**  
**FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING**  
**Tuesday, April 2, 2002**  
**3:10-5:05 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), 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), Max Porter (Governance Council Chair) Connie Post (Faculty Senate Secretary), Brad Thacker (VET Caucus Chair), Bill Woodman (RPA Chair), and Max Wortman (Faculty Senate President-Elect).

**Absent:** Carolyn Heising (ENG Caucus; Provost Rollin Richmond)

**Guest:** Lee Fletcher, Chair of the RPA Planning and Budget Committee

**Call to Order:**

The meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Board on Tuesday, April 2, was called to order at 3:10 p.m. by President Christie Pope.

**I. Approval of the Minutes and Agendas:**

The minutes of the Faculty Senate Executive Board meeting on March 12, the agenda for the Faculty Senate Executive Board meeting today, April 2, and the agenda for the Faculty Senate Meeting for April 9 were approved. Max Porter stated that he may have something to add to the agenda, and this also was approved.

**II. Announcements**

**A. Faculty Senate President**

- 1. Chairman of the Board of Regents to speak to Faculty Senate:** Owen Newlin, Chairman of the Board of Regents, has accepted an invitation to speak to the ISU Faculty Senate on May 7. There is a custom that the President of the Faculty Senate extends an invitation to the Chairman of the Board of Regents to speak, and this is the date he chose. The Procedures Committee is working on procedures for the offices, noting those things which are mandatory and those which are optional. For example, it is customary for the Faculty Senate President to take the Chair of the Board of Regents out to dinner with the President-Elect and Past Presidents of the Faculty Senate, yet when the Faculty Senate Executive Board has lunch with the Board of Regents the President of the university is invited.
- 2. Communication between the Faculty Senate and the ISU Central**

**Administration.** Initially things passed by the Faculty Senate seemed to fall through the cracks, and it was unclear whether the administration had accepted them. President Geoffroy has informed Pope that he will let her know within two weeks if something is approved. Concerning the ombuds position, Geoffroy told Pope that the ombuds packet was omitted from the materials distributed for discussion at the President's Cabinet meeting last month. Pope reported that she has heard nothing about the Faculty Senate resolution concerning protected categories.

3. **Academic Calendar.** The issue of the academic calendar, which was raised by Jim Hutter, is under consideration by the Office of the Provost. Instead of focusing on the resolution, Provost Richmond said he first would like some time to look into the matter. He announced that the matter has been given to Alicia Carriquiry from whom a report will be forthcoming. Pope added that she has invited Alicia Carriquiry to attend the Faculty Senate meeting at which the issue of the calendar will be discussed.
4. **Dead Week.** Pope reminded members of the Executive Board that the GSB leadership addressed the group about Dead Week and that she had assured them that something would get through the Faculty Senate before Dead Week this time. Pope mentioned that the Academic Affairs proposal about this was introduced at the last Faculty Senate meeting and will be on the agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting on April 9. According to the GSB, the Academic Affairs Council has not been cooperative, and Pope asked Tony Hendrickson to comment on that.

Hendrickson stated that the Academic Affairs Council has had three meetings at which Dead Week has been discussed. Two meetings ago the Council was going to have GSB members speak, but they did not show up (they were conducting elections at the time). Hendrickson reported that the Council believes the GSB proposal is attempting to be more specific than is practical. It is not that the Council disagrees with the idea of making Dead Week what it is supposed to be, said Hendrickson, who reiterated that the policy about Dead Week appears on pages 44 and 45 in the current Iowa State University bulletin. In the bulletin, however, it does appear to be a little vague, perhaps of necessity because there are so many different disciplines represented in the various colleges. Hendrickson said his Council has helped the GSB wordsmith its proposal so that it says what the GSB wishes it to say. The problem is that every time someone offers a solution, another person raises yet another question. As a result, the Council has reached an impasse. Hendrickson said it is not as though the Council has not made a concerted effort, contrary to the GSB's assertion that the Council hasn't tried hard enough or spent enough time on it. If you look at their proposal, Hendrickson noted, there is nothing wrong with it, although he noted that Part C makes major assignments due

#### 4/2/02 Faculty Senate Executive Board Minutes

Friday before Dead Week yet allows a project worth a large percentage of the grade to be due during Dead Week. What the Council wants to do, said Hendrickson, is to reaffirm what the current policy is. If people would follow the spirit of what is in this policy -- even the letter, although it's not all that specific -- it would help. The Council, though, does not want to pass bad policy.

Porter wondered if it would help to pick out the things we do agree with, and reaffirm those. Hendrickson said he would not have a problem with that, but that he is skeptical about making the current policy more specific because it would make it difficult for everyone to adhere to it. Pointing out that the university has a policy but that GSB apparently wants a rule, Woodman reported that when he passed the resolution around in his department at a recent meeting, his colleagues perceived it as an intrusion. According to Wortman, the GSB's position appears to be non-negotiable. Four meetings back, said Wortman, the GSB representatives did not seem to hear faculty comments, and three meetings back they did not as well. In his opinion, the faculty will be perceived as non-responsive unless they adopt what the GSB asks. A major issue with the GSB is that it does not want faculty end-loading the work by making everything due during Dead Week. Reading from pages 44 and 45 in the current ISU Bulletin, Hendrickson said the Council believes the statement there is acceptable because it gives pretty good guidance for academic work during Dead Week. Pope concluded the discussion by announcing that the matter will be debated by the Senate on April 9.

5. **Faculty Senate Representation on the ISU Foundation.** Pope reported that the ISU Foundation has agreed to accept Hopper as the one and only nomination for the faculty representative on the Foundation. She recalled that originally the Foundation wanted three names. Tom Mitchell, however, was willing to accept just one, primarily because he found Hopper so acceptable.
6. **ISUComm.** Pope said she was surprised at the March 26 meeting of the Executive Board to hear that Faculty Handbook copy has been brought forward, even though the Faculty Senate had not passed any policy but only principles. Pope, who reminded Board members that nothing can be put into the Faculty Handbook about a program unless it has been passed by the Faculty Senate, said she explained this to Michael Mendelson. The original plan for ISUComm was to take three years: one to develop the proposal, including the principles; another for the models; and the third for the policy. Pope said she suggested to Mendelson in January 2002 that he might bring policy proposals earlier, but he said he did not want to do that.

The actual proposal for ISUComm will not come until next year, said Pope. Ken Kruempel called her, and he thinks the principles should go

into the catalog now. Pope disagrees. She stated that she then got a note from the LAS Curriculum Committee, which is very upset that something would be put in the catalog at this time. Dean Rabideau, who wanted to speak with Pope about it this morning, April 2, said ISUComm is an unfunded mandate that will cost a million dollars. Pope stressed that although the Faculty Senate may have passed the principles, it does not mean that it will pass the policy. A concern about cost was also noted by Wortman, who said he believes the figure of a million is accurate.

Hutter said that as much as he has long favored a greater interest in writing, this proposal is much more than that, given its emphasis on other forms of communication. At a cost of a million with possible overruns, ISUComm poses a problem. The first problem, said Hutter, is one that has been mentioned to ISUComm, specifically, the tremendous amount of time and resources from faculty that the program requires. Hutter noted that at one point Mendelson had drafted something regarding principles, including language that the administration would recognize this effort, but that this was taken out by the administration. Therefore, even if we want to pursue this, said Hutter, it must be recognized as a major undertaking. Pope added that ISUComm will require a great deal of debate. Palermo acknowledged that the question about money is one that ISUComm has not yet fully considered, although the Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education has submitted an enhancement proposal to the President's Task Force. Figures were requested about other matters as well, said Palermo. Emphasizing the importance of not putting the cart before the horse on this matter, Pope said that first you pass the policy and then you fund it -- not the other way around.

**B. Associate Provost**

**Dead Week Proposal.** Susan Carlson said that Provost Richmond asked her to comment on the Dead Week proposal. He is worried about the message this sends to students and wants the Faculty Senate to figure out a way to make it look as though the administration and the faculty are being responsive to their request. Wortman said a good-faith effort was made at the last Faculty Senate meeting and that the Faculty Senate in its wisdom did not wish to extend.

**C. Council Chairs**

- 1. Max Porter, Governance Council Chair,** said that Dean Ulrichson and his committee should be thanked for their work. Porter also stated his hope that the resolution can go on the consent agenda for the next Faculty Senate meeting.

*Resolution to be placed on the consent agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting of April 9 to receive the report of the Faculty Handbook Com-*

*mittee is approved.*

Porter, who raised a question about the procedures document, said the GSD committee will soon have its work completed and may put it on the web to let people comment by reviewing it there. Porter said that if Denise Vrchota has the procedures document ready by Tuesday, April 9, it could be quickly placed on the web before the Faculty Senate meeting that night. Porter sought the advice of the Executive Board on the process for approving the document: should it be accompanied by a statement that it will be revised by the Faculty Senate, or should the statement be a bit softer than that by saying that someone can make a change in the document that night? According to Porter, some believe the document needs to be approved only by the Executive Board while others say the Board should not have the final say on the document.

Pope stated that this procedures document looks at current practice but that experiences may change. Hutter, recalling that it was Porter's idea to have this document, said that a lot depends on what goes in it. Some of it perhaps should go into the by-laws, said Hutter, who noted that the document was supposed to be pretty informal. For example, it was not assumed that the material by Brad Thacker on elections would go to the full senate, although the first time it certainly should. Pope, who said it could be put on the web and people invited to make suggestions, wondered if Porter's committee wants it to be placed on the consent agenda.

Right now, said Porter, the committee believes that this document will take a long time, so members have come up with a different title for it: Working Guidelines. The plan would be to accept the report of the GSD committee at the May meeting, and that the report would be these working guidelines. That way the report is not cast in concrete and makes it possible to continue to revise it. Pope asked Porter if he wants to talk about it as a report or put it on the consent agenda. He said it would be wise for Vrchota to give some concise comments about the document. When Pope observed that May is really a full meeting, Porter said it would help to announce this at the April meeting. He urged that it be mentioned in the cover letter for the April meeting and said that Vrchota will speak about it at the meeting in May.

If these are working guidelines, asked Palermo, then when do they become real guidelines? This will happen when the Senate approves them, said Porter.

2. **Dorothy Fowles, J&A Chair**, reported that the pace has picked up. Noting that the Provost has made his decisions, Fowles said it is going to be a very long month.

**D. Caucus Reports: Mike Duffy, AG Council Chair**, announced that AG has a re-

## 4/2/02 Faculty Senate Executive Board Minutes

organization plan underway by which it is looking at merging several departments in a way that will involve LAS. If a department in two colleges chooses not to have a senator, where does the at-large senator go? asked Duffy. If it is big enough to have two colleges, said Hutter, it should not be allowed to do that. Porter said the rules allow the person to declare which college the person is in. Fowles asked if the faculty member does not have to declare which college the person is voting in. Hutter said this is logical but that it is not written down anywhere. According to Duffy, the caucus in which the person was elected is generally the one the person attends. Woodman, whose department straddles two colleges, said that Sociology once had someone elected from one college who chose to vote in the other. Pope assigned the problem to Thacker.

### **VI. Conversations on Structures and Budgets**

President Pope said she wants a long, deep discussion about structures and budgets and that there are several issues that should be examined. Bloedel, she noted, was willing for the Faculty Senate to have a committee to decide on research grants out of his office. Faculty Senate structures in terms of budgets are a bit vague, said Pope. Another issue on the horizon is that during the summer the President is going to make a budget committee a permanent part of his administration, which means that the Faculty Senate needs to decide how it wants to articulate with that body. These are important issues, said Pope, who invited Lee Fletcher to lead the discussion today about some of the issues.

Hopper asked for more specific information about the proposed budget committee. Pope stated that the President, who says he is still thinking about it, commented that it may look like the President's Task Force with wide representation among its 21 members. The proposed budget committee may be much smaller, although the President is still mulling this over. Pope said this bodes well for the Faculty Senate because as long as things remain fluid the Senate has an opportunity to influence matters. The President, said Palermo, is broadly inclusive in whatever he does, which means that the Faculty Senate will have a voice but that it will not be the voice. Palermo noted that the President has said that the search committee for a new provost will be broadly based and that the President likes a broadly participatory breakfast with faculty as well as P&S and Merit staff in attendance together with members of the administration.

Pope said the President considers the Senate a stakeholder, which is still problematic from the Senate's point of view. Palermo noted that the only leverage the President granted faculty on the Task Force was to have a representative from each college. Fowles, however, pointed out that representatives from the colleges were not faculty members in every case. Woodman said he and Pope represented LAS on the committee, but Palermo said Woodman and Pope were representing the Faculty Senate. According to Thacker, those representing the colleges on the President's Task Force were not selected by the colleges themselves. As far as this matter is concerned, asked Hendrickson, what is shared governance? Do all stakeholders share in it? Woodman said he does not believe President Geoffroy sees the Task Force this year as anything more than an emergency measure and therefore it cannot be viewed as setting precedent. The Task Force

#### 4/2/02 Faculty Senate Executive Board Minutes

has one more meeting, said Woodman, and after that its work is finished. Pope explained that Lee Fletcher will first present his ideas and then the members of the Executive Board can respond to them. Should the Board reach consensus, said Pope, perhaps we will make a resolution.

**Remarks by Fletcher:** Fletcher said he attended a meeting today at which the President was asked if he thought it would be useful to have a faculty group to which he could turn when he had decisions to make; the President said, no. It therefore would be a mistake to assume the Task Force has set a precedent for what will happen in the future. Although at some level there is a need for confidentiality with some information, the Task Force has operated in a completely confidential way that has discouraged broader discussion and participation as well as the flow of information. Fletcher said he hopes that can be avoided when setting up a budget committee.

Fletcher also enjoined members of the Executive Board in their capacity as leaders of the Faculty Senate to reach consensus about what would work best because he believes these decisions are going to be made in a relatively short period of time. With too many voices, you will not have much of an impact on what happens, he noted, admitting that, yes, there are many stakeholders. From a shared governance viewpoint, however, faculty do have a particular role, and it is beyond the role of students and even staff. Fletcher attributes this role to the faculty's long-term commitment as a body, its broad institutional experience in knowing what is done at other institutions, and its disciplinary expertise that can be developed and brought to bear on the decision issues faced by the university. Shared governance therefore places the faculty in a special role as compared to the other groups.

According to Fletcher, there is a continuum of questions for which the Task Force is only an opening. One of these is the matter of long-standing structural and organizational issues in the planning and budget area in the Senate itself, which has not done a good job of linking the committee, the council, and the Senate by way of reactions and requests. Fletcher said that he was going to be so bold as to put a proposal on the table, specifically, to make the Faculty Senate Committee on Planning and Budget the group the President appoints. This committee should bear a special burden to create a flow of information to the council and the Faculty Senate that would circulate among the three groups.

To illustrate his point, Fletcher used the analogy of the Senate as a team. The Task Force came along and the game moved to another court, but the Faculty Senate team stayed on the same court. To put it bluntly, said Fletcher, The Senate needs to either put its team back on the floor or cancel the units and realize that you as a senate and senators are going to assume this role yourselves. Wortman commented on another task force, namely the one on MGT-America and another that is responding to the 03 budget. The question for Wortman is this: we have the council, the committee, the task force appointed by the President, and ourselves. He wondered if perhaps the Task Force on 03 could be gotten rid of.

In talking about a budget committee, Fletcher said he wants to remind members of the

#### 4/2/02 Faculty Senate Executive Board Minutes

Executive Board that it took a lot of work to get planning and budget linked together. As far as Fletcher is concerned, planning should lead the budget because the real questions are the priorities and the direction -- not whether \$500,000 will be spent here or there. Planning and budget must be seen on a continuum, and whatever the Senate does it should keep that close connection, said Fletcher.

Hopper asked Fletcher if there were other matters besides confidentiality that did not work so well for the current task force on planning and budget. Fletcher responded that he did not mention confidentiality in order to criticize. He then went on to say that three things are needed for an effective group: (1) people on a task force who are keenly interested in examining the issues; (2) a group that is truly representative; and (3) members who are willing to make a multiple-year commitment. The Task Force was difficult because everyone was learning on the job, so to speak, said Fletcher.

**Discussion:** Noting Fletcher's comment about other committees that deal with planning and budget issues, Palermo mentioned that the Faculty Senate's University Welfare and Benefits Committee helps to make policy for approximately 30% of our salaries. FDAR also has a Committee on Women and Minorities as well as a Committee on Welfare & Benefits, said Palermo, who sought clarification about Fletcher's point that the budget committee formed by the President will have faculty from the colleges on it. Fletcher said there will be nine members on it. Woodman offered a small correction, pointing out that the University Benefits Committee is not a task force but an on-going committee. He added that the way the Council works here is the same for other councils: the council chair is elected by the Faculty Senate and members on it are elected by the caucuses. The Planning and Budget Committee is in the process of being put together, said Woodman, unlike FDAR which has had standing committees under it for a decade. In trying to incorporate the core of the former committee, the assumption has been that its mere existence would guarantee entrance into the corridors of power. Power, though, has found a way around it. A model comprised of every stakeholder on campus, which is what worked at Maryland, is what the President plans to use, said Woodman, who voiced his concern that this is problematic. Woodman noted that Geoffroy's egalitarian instincts are the polar opposite of the faculty's previous experience.

Dorothy Fowles said there is a bigger issue at stake here, pointing out that there are two structures already in place: (1) the Benefits Committee with faculty on it that the Senate does not appoint, and (2) all of the Faculty Senate committees with faculty on them that the Senate appoints. Until those two systems are meshed into one, said Fowles, there will never be shared governance at ISU. Pope said that she had a meeting this fall with Faculty Senate representatives that serve on committees other than those set up by the Senate. Fowles responded that there are faculty on committees who are appointed by the administration -- not by the Faculty Senate.

By reconstituting the Planning and Budget Committee, said Palermo, the Faculty Senate has created a new council. One member would represent the Faculty Senate on any university committee for planning and budget, which is what Fletcher is doing now. Palermo recalled that last summer when Faculty Senate Executive Board members asked



#### 4/2/02 Faculty Senate Executive Board Minutes

Geoffroy to make use of Faculty Senate committees, the President said to send him the Senate's nominees and the administration would see how they perform. Pope acknowledged that this is what Geoffroy said, noting that he likes to take in as much data as possible and then reach a decision quickly.

Faculty set policy and administer it, said Hutter. For this reason, he does not see staff on an equal level because they are not involved in all these things. This view may be elitist, Hutter admitted, but the President after all is also a faculty member. Hutter recalled that he was on the budget committee when it was set up by President Parks, who liked to report to the Board of Regents that he had run things by the faculty. What really happened is that the committee would get the budget with practically no time to evaluate it. Occasionally, though, the committee was asked a question. When Jischke had the problem over McDonald's in the Hub, said Hutter, he asked faculty why he should listen to them, given that they were just another piece of the pie. Someone said later that if he had consulted the faculty first, he might have avoided the flap over McDonald's. The Faculty Senate also wanted to know why this committee was deciding promotion and raises, yet the committee was not linked at all to the Faculty Senate. Hutter, who said he hopes President Geoffroy will not have his committee operating separately from the Faculty Senate committees, affirmed his position that faculty should be the governing body of this university.

Hopper said he understands that many deans are quite upset with the structure of the current task force because they are the ones ultimately held responsible for how funds are spent in their colleges; they also oversee strategic planning for their colleges. For these reasons, some deans are upset that the task force provides principal input about how the budget will be disbursed. The DEO council, said Hopper, has a similar complaint. The question for the Faculty Senate is how does it get its voice at the table? Hopper said he particularly wants to hear from those who have served on the task force. Pope responded that the plans came from the deans, they in turn got theirs from the DEOs, and the task force then made decisions about what was put before it. According to Pope, members of the task force did not get to do the planning. What they did get to do, said Palermo, was set parameters. As a member serving on the task force, Palermo noted that it was difficult to deal with those who responded in obfuscatory terms. The principles were solid: Policy, framework, values, and then operations. It was not a shell game at all, insisted Palermo.

Hendrickson asked how such a committee works at other universities, and wondered why it is his perception that it works better at other places. The University of Iowa, for example, does not have the same heartburn about shared governance. Acknowledging that it may sound elitist, Hendrickson said this is after all a meritocracy. He stated that he participated in one when he earned a Ph.D. from an institution that was accredited, that he got a job here based on it, and that he had kept that job by his performance. This is what differentiates the faculty from the other stakeholders, said Hendrickson. People are smart, and students are smart, but they don't teach my courses.

Pope noted that the budget committee at the University of Iowa is chaired by the Presi-

#### 4/2/02 Faculty Senate Executive Board Minutes

dent of the Faculty Senate, not by the Provost. The administration is seen by the faculty as very supportive with everyone working together. Fowles added that the whole constitution at the University of Iowa is different, given that it rests heavily on shared governance and has done so in a meaningful way for years.

Wortman asked why it has been recommended that the Planning and Budget Committee ought to be part of the President's Task Force instead of the RPA Council. After all, said Wortman, people on that council are senators, they have been elected by their constituencies, so in a sense it is more representative. Pope agreed but pointed out that it might not have as many economists. Fletcher said Wortman's question was a fair one, but that he should ask himself if he is in a position to deliver council chairs that will provide the continuity of effort in this area in order to have an impact.

Hutter said that the Faculty Senate has a structure for how it sets up councils, which is not the same as for a budget advisory committee. Specifically, every committee and council at a minimum has a member from each college. With more members appointed to committees, stated Hutter, there will be even greater representation. According to Sanjeev Agarwal, the job of management in an organization is to plan, implement, and control; however, many times in organizing activities management tends to use rules that are simple to implement rather than looking at why it is done that way. Here, said Agarwal, Geoffroy uses one person from each college, which is very simple, and gives a semblance of representation. So why does the Senate have a problem with this? Clearly it is because the Senate has a different understanding of representation, one in which different groups of faculty have different stakes and different roles and that is why the Executive Board is recommending representation from different groups of faculty: the Faculty Senate, department chairs, and maybe experts in a particular field (economists). So if the Board seriously believes that these groups are different, with different roles and different stakes, then it should have representation from these different groups, Agarwal noted, adding that such representation would change the fundamental structure of an organization. Thacker concurred with Agarwal about the importance of melding the representation issue with the expertise issue.

Employing Fletcher's original metaphor, Porter told the Board to decide which court it is going to play on and to get its team back on it. Noting that Pope had mentioned a research committee. Porter said such a committee would have been helpful in determining indirect cost percentage. Where to place a research committee, however, is difficult. Porter urged caution, pointing out that several years ago committee restructuring was done in an effort to bring order out of the chaos of hundreds of committees. Administrative echelons, however, are starting to appoint committees again, said Porter, so the same problem may soon reappear. He stated that if there are going to be three or four budget committees, shared governance of the sort that the University of Iowa enjoys needs to prevail but pointed out that there is an opportunity to work with the new administration on this.

Another issue noted by Fletcher was that the task force was chaired by the Provost, which Fletcher said he thinks was a mistake because it put the task force too much into the ad-

#### 4/2/02 Faculty Senate Executive Board Minutes

ministrative channel whereby the Provost viewed it as carrying out his program. In short, he did not distinguish any difference between his role as the chair of the task force and his role as provost; moreover, said Fletcher, he expected the task force to fall into line with his job as Provost. The task force was almost told that things were the Provost's decision and therefore that members on it should only consider what the provost recommended. The task force was a case study in group think, said Woodman, in part because everyone was so honored to be on it. The problem is not that the Provost wanted it to be that way, but that that is the way it turned out to be. Woodman said he likes the University of Iowa model and urged the Executive Board to make a proposal soon because the President is going to act quickly.

Hutter offered a cautionary note, pointing out that faculty do not want to spend a lot of time on administrative matters when they are not rewarded for it. To some extent, said Hutter, Jischke was right: there is a pyramid. Hutter noted that there ought to be some group out of the loop that has a chance to weigh in on things without being part of the administration itself. This means that the role of the committee must be determined carefully; what role, asked Hutter, does Geoffroy want it to have? Pope, who said that Hutter's point was a good one, noted that the Faculty Senate has been fighting for more participation. Unlike last year when the budget committee was made up of the deans, this year faculty members are a part of it, so progress has been made. Although Geoffroy accepts all recommendations, Pope wondered if the appointment of faculty to such committees ends up co-opting them.

Porter reviewed possible models, including the President's Maryland model and the University of Iowa model. With a shared role, said Porter, the President would not chair this committee, yet key top administrators might be working on it with the faculty. Woodman, who said he and Fletcher have discussed this issue, outlined who might be the core members of a Planning and Budget Committee: Mark Chidister from the Office of the President, someone from the Office of the Provost but not the Provost, a representative from the business office but not necessarily Madden, a P&S person, a Merit person, etc. Hutter commented that the central issue is whether administrators are ex-officio or get to drive this. When Jischke was President, said Woodman, Murkejea would drop the budget in the center of table and give the faculty an hour to weigh in on it. To avoid the pitfalls of the past, Woodman suggested that the committee sit in two forms with one working for the Faculty Senate and another composed of a larger committee with voting members from the identified groups. Woodman said he is opposed in principle to people sitting on committees and not voting.

Pope said she likes Woodman's idea of Faculty Senate members of this committee getting together outside of this committee and voting as a bloc. Duffy asked Woodman where RPA fits in all this, and Woodman said he sees the Planning and Budget Committee under RPA serving as the core of this committee plus representation from the deans, a Merit person, and a P&S. He also recommended that the President of the Faculty Senate speak to President Geoffroy about the composition of this committee. If he rejects it, said Woodman, then the Executive Board can prepare a resolution to bring forward to the Senate.

## 4/2/02 Faculty Senate Executive Board Minutes

To Palermo's question about the role of this group, Woodman said there would be two charges: (1) to carry out the business of planning and budget for RPA, the Faculty Senate vetting group that would go on to the Senate; and (2) to make planning and budget recommendations to the administration with this larger membership. Agarwal, considering how a marketing person would take this to President Geoffroy, said he imagines that the President's goal would be to have faculty representation and expert opinion and that he would probably feel that he can get that by selecting people from different colleges on his own. Why, asked Agarwal, would the President take people from the Senate who are put in a group not necessarily based on their expertise but by some process whereby people end up on different committees? Woodman replied that for this committee the faculty are selected for their expertise. If you can convince Geoffroy of that, said Agarwal, then you don't have to go through the process. Woodman said that a different view will be taken of this committee by people on campus. If so, said Sanjeev, it indicates that the Faculty Senate is in a competitive environment with other entities on campus.

Pope said her next meeting with President Geoffroy is April 16, the week after the Faculty Senate meets on April 9. According to Woodman, there is no reason why the four senators, including himself, who serve on the President's Task Force could not make that recommendation to him. Hutter said he would encourage the four to try to see the President in the next day or two and ask him what he wants. If, for example, he wants the committee as part of his decision-making process, this committee is probably not going to do that. What Woodman is suggesting, said Hutter, is not that different from what we have now, so be sure to ask him what he sees as the function of this committee. Hutter said he would not want to pitch a committee until he has a better idea of what the President wants. Fletcher asked Hutter if he wants to influence what the President is looking for, and Hutter said the President first needs an opportunity to declare what he wants. Woodman said the President does not have a firm model in mind.

Duffy sought clarification about Woodman's two-step plan, and Woodman said that when the group meets as a committee of the Faculty Senate it would deliberate on matters regarding the faculty. When meeting in the larger aggregate, however, the committee would deliberate on wider matters. Palermo said that waiting until April 16th is too long, that the Faculty Senate Executive Board needs to find out informally from the President what he is seeking because the Senate has several concerns: (1) assuring a Faculty Senate voice, period, no matter what else happens; (2) understanding that the voice of the faculty is greater than just one of a group of stakeholders; (3) leading in this effort by dint of its knowledge and on-going expertise. Fowles said that Geoffroy is the President of the faculty and that elected representatives of the faculty would therefore be advising him at a higher level. It seems ingrained in the administration that the Faculty Senate is an adversary, said Agarwal, who said the Senate needs to change that perception.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Constance Post,