

**Iowa State University Faculty Senate
Executive Board Meeting Minutes
December 2, 2003**

Present:

Girton J., President; Agarwal S., President-Elect; Provost Allen B., Provost Office; Baldwin C., Vet Med Caucus Chair; Fiore A.M., FCS Caucus Chair; Ford C., Judiciary and Appeals; Heising C.; Engineering Caucus Chair; Mave J., Design Caucus Chair; Phye G., Education Caucus Chair; Palermo G., Academic Affairs; Vrchota D., Governance Chair; Woodman B., RPA Chair; Zanish-Belcher T., Secretary

Absent: Mennecke B., Business Caucus Chair; Owen M., Agriculture Caucus Chair; Premkumar, P., FDAR Chair; Robinson B., LAS Caucus Chair; Wortman M., Past-President

I. Call to Order – 3:10 p.m.

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.

II. Introductions – 3:10 p.m.

III. Consent Agenda – 3:15 p.m.

A. Agenda

B. Minutes, Executive Board, Oct. 28, 2003

Woodman moved, Ford seconded and the consent agenda was approved.

IV. Announcements and Remarks – 3:20 p.m.

A. President

Girton noted the Board should keep an eye on the Dec. legislature revenue setting conference. The Budget and advisory committee has been meeting, but are waiting on the Dec. estimates, as there will possibly be more budget cuts.

Girton also noted it was the last day of review of Vice President for Student Affairs, Tom Hill. One issue raised has been the role of Student Affairs with graduate students. Girton will bring a report to the Executive Board.

There will be 10 memorial resolutions at the FS meeting next week.

B. President-Elect

Agarwal reported that the Spring Conference planning is continuing.

C. Provost

Several announcements:

The Arrival of Children Policy has been tabled by the Board of Regents due to the cost, but it is still on the agenda. The Provost has met with Girton, Kane (P & S Council), Beck (Chair, University Committee on Women). There will be some kind of communication out to the campus community

indicating the status—we will try and do it without an official policy, with some examples. Also gather better data on the costs.

December 8-9 are the dates for the state receiving estimates for making the state budget.

The Governor is asking for expectations for serious cuts, in order to support tax increase, or moving funding from elsewhere.

The Provost Office is continuing to look at reorganization, both in the office and also larger university reorganization issues. Recommendations will be made to President by mid-Dec.

Ford asked about prioritization or setting criteria—principles and fairness

The Provost responded that some of the issues would be a focus on science and technology, numbers of students, and the size of programs. He also noted the task force looking at small enrollments. These issues will all be discussed with the RPA.

V. Request for a presentation by the ISU foundation– 3:30 p.m.

Dan Saftig, the new Director of the ISU Foundation will speak at either the Jan 13 or the Feb 10 meeting. This will fall under a Special Order and Girton will add it to the agenda.

**VI. By-law changes for Senate committee reorganization. – 3:40 p.m.
Interim report from Governance Council**

Vrchota reported from the Governance Council. One suggestion was to merge the Handbook Committee with the Structure and Documents Committee (which has been recommended for 4 members). The Past President will still chair.

The FDAR Council will be doing a self-study. The proposed Committee on Recognition and Development --4 members +--tabled due to the fact that the chair is brand new, former chair Tom Chacko is out of the country. Would like to wait till Tom comes back and tells what the committee should be doing. Girton questioned whether these members could be considered for the Distinguished and University Professor Committees?

The Committee On Facilities and Physical Resources—not proposed to be smaller, but the Council think it could be modified. Will wait until the FDAR self-study is completed.

Finally, there was discussion over past presidents being honorary members of the FS until they leave the university (to be available for councils and committees), attend meetings and comment. They would not be voting members of the FS, and there are 8-10 past presidents.

It was noted the most recent 2002 by-laws need to be added to the website. Woodman suggested creating the position of a public relations officer who would manage the website, possibly a Greenlee student?

VII. Policy on department reorganization – 3:50 p.m.

This policy has been reviewed and discussed with the Administrative Committee. The Executive Board looked over the 11/10/03 Draft version. The Basic outline remains the same, although some wording has changed.

There are 3 Main Steps:

#1 Discussion and commitment to plan

- Formal planning will be officially started by the administration
- Determine which groups are involved, time frame
- Notification, assistance from the Faculty Senate

Comments:

Fiore: Should the title read Reorganization or Elimination?

Baldwin noted she thought elimination would be perceived as negative.

Woodman suggested possibly having a policy for elimination? Palermo noted reorganization is a more inclusive word. The Board decided there should be footnote referring elimination to the University Policy, as there are processes already in place.

#2 Planning, need to consider the costs of implementation, and resources available

- Plan as a whole should be considered and discussed
- It must be clear when the final decision is made (final vote)

Vrchota asked who would be involved with the planning as she thought this portion was rather vague. Girton responded he had done this on purpose, but it could include both faculty and administration. Vrchota suggested providing resources, Girton mentioned the FS is already mentioned in the document as a resource. The Provost noted the administrator will oversee, and it is their responsibility to involve the faculty. Feedback loops maybe should be indicated while there is analysis of resources.

The Board discussed the current situation in the College of Engineering, involving the creation of an ad hoc committee to consider combining Industrial Science with Mechanical Engineering. It was felt that the communication methods were lacking. The Provost will be checking the Dean on this entire process, and will get back to the FS.

The Board then discussed the Approval/Review process—how Faculty/Administrators are involved and the faculty vote. There needs to be specific information about the proposal—initial votes should not make it a final decision. The Provost can then send it back, reject, or submit plan to FS—seek information, clarification, discuss. FS can review and advise.

The group agreed the planning process should include an ad hoc task force including administration and faculty, and that who is doing the planning needs to be clarified.

Feedback on the proposal should come back to the committee before a final version is submitted for a vote.

Phye asked about setting timeframes and whether there would be obstructionist tactics. Girton responded that when the decision is made, a timeframe will be developed—to prevent rushing the processing.

The Provost brought up 3 concerns of the Deans: (1)Timing; (2)Flexibility—the Deans thought there needed to be continual feedback, as opposed to a linear process; and (3)Where do the prerogatives of management overlap with shared governance?

Vrchota suggested adding consultation with faculty to the various sections—Girton feels it is a shared activity. How should this be expressed? Palermo suggested an introductory paragraph that sets the

foundation for reorganization activity. It is the ultimate challenge to the university community, best principles of shared governance, with positive interactions with faculty. He also suggested adding a line which assures and requires timely and substantive input from faculty and administration. Palermo recommended placing this with each part of the flow chart with principles. Girton still feels that a narrative should be included. Agarwal noted that an explanation of academic and implementation plans are helpful, and feels the description should be retained. Girton will revise based on the group's discussion—guiding principles will be stated at the very beginning and focused on the first page, with narrative to follow.

Would like to have at the FS next week—the Provost suggested presenting the concept, and then work with the Provost Office to further tweak. There are still issues between management and governance and the setting of a designated group (faculty and administration) to handle.

Woodman moved, Heising seconded and the Board approved the continued revising of a draft for discussion at the Jan. meeting.

VIII. Proposal for a discussion on the implementation of the P&T policy– 4:15 p.m.

This policy will be presented at the December Faculty Senate meeting, to be discussed, and then voted on at the January meeting. Palermo suggested making the resolution bold, and then taking the resolution and the 3 components be put first in the document.

IX. Council items – 4:40 p.m.

X. Senate Agenda, for December 9, 2003

The Board approved the Senate agenda for December 9th.

XI. Adjournment

The Executive Board adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

**NEXT MEETING
January 6, 2003 3:10 -5:00
107 Lab of Mechanics**