

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING Minutes
January 6, 2004**

Present: Allen, B., Provost; Baldwin C., Vet Med Caucus Chair; Carlson, S.; Provost Office; Fiore, A.M., FCS Caucus Chair; Ford, C. , Judiciary and Appeals Chair; Girton, J., President; Mennecke, B., Business Caucus Chair; Owen, M., Agriculture Caucus Chair; Palermo, G., Academic Affairs Chair; Phye, G., Education Caucus Chair; Robinson, B., LAS Caucus Chair; Vrchota, D., Governance Chair; Wortman, M., Past President; Zanish-Belcher, T., Secretary

Absent: Agarwal, S., President Elect; Heising, C., Engineering Caucus Chair; Maves, J., Design Caucus Chair; Premkumar, P., FDAR Chair; Woodman, B., RPA Chair

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

Owen moved, Baldwin seconded, and the consent agenda was approved.

Announcements and Remarks

Girton started the meeting with a discussion concerning the new policy on 3% charge on purchases, proposed by the Vice President for Business and Finance to raise money for an updated Environmental Health and Safety Building. There was no input from the faculty. This new charge comes into direct conflict with the current indirect charge agreement already completed with the federal government. The implementation has been postponed. Girton would like the Senate to discuss. The Provost believes Iowa State's ongoing problem of physically disposing of hazardous waste is the source of the entire problem. Girton noted the concern of the faculty—can the university unilaterally increase this amount? Ford asked why it couldn't be financed by the current overhead.

Phye noted the difficulty in adding additional fees to grants—the cumulative effect can be damaging and result in smaller percentages being available for the actual work of the grant. What do we get for those indirect costs? He also noted the impact on Departments as well. Palermo asked what the President planned to do? The Provost said the President will be working on this as the problem still exists.

Owen noted EPA involvement and that this is a real problem for the university. Phye believes there are other solutions for this problem, not necessarily the most effective or creative. Two problems: options were not presented till the last minute, no input—the second is whether this is correct or not.

There was a question as to why this issue wasn't brought up at the most recent Leadership Breakfast?

A. President-Elect

Agarwal was not present.

C. Provost

The Provost went back to earlier issue and how it relates to wider issues in the way the university handles creates their budgets. Budgeting is not done by expenditures. How can we provide environment for better budget decisions, motivate faculty to assist, and have a better understanding of academic and nonacademic budgets?

Recommendations:

As an example, the Provost discussed how the problem in Madden's Office could have been handled. A Utilities Board (which would be discussed with RPA) could be created to look at these types of issues. Madden does have a problem, and now it will be harder to solve. This should have been discussed prior and we need to focus on major issues.

Ford asked about lead-time on problem, would there have been enough time for discussion? The Provost said yes, he thought so, as it had already been discussed in Madden's office.

The latest budget news: FY05 is beginning, and the RPA has already met with the Provost 4-5 times. Cuts could be 0-8%, probably 3%. Salaries and benefits for faculty/P & S will not be funded. Timing is important and states coming out of budget problems faster will be able to pick off our faculty.

Policy on department reorganization

Girton then led a discussion of a proposed revision to the previous draft. Ford asked whether a FS committee would be appointed. Girton said yes and the report would be presented to the EB. Ford asked about background information being provided and a potential lack of preparation for FS meetings, Girton noted the committee would have longer than 2 months to prepare and discuss. The 2 months starts when Provost presents it at a meeting, and the vote will happen at the next one. One meeting to consider and one meeting to vote, and a special meeting could also be called.

The EB approved.

Strategic Planning Process

The Provost updated the Board on the proposed strategic planning committee structure (2006-2010). The Provost sent out a memo setting out the premise for strategic planning, the process, and potential members (based on analysis of past committee). The Provost was tempted to go to small committee who would access other individuals and groups. Due to shared governance, the Provost decided to have a larger group with smaller subcommittees.

The process is driven by the President, who wants loops of feedback from the university community. In the beginning, the committee will focus on key questions and issues, go to different folks, focus on vision, mission, values, key priorities—draw from the community. The committee will sort out strategies, objectives, and goals. The Committee will go to existing university committees and proceed in a systematic manner.

There will also be a coordinating small group that will share with the larger group. The Provost is also looking for someone to facilitate and listen, but doesn't see drafting as the main responsibility. He wants the large group to think about bigger issues, passing information to constituencies, and sees a teamwork approach.

The University's NCA accreditation will be going on at same time. He would like to tie them together and reduce the workload. The new NCA standards are mission driven and should easily tie to the planning process. The NCA accreditation targets, "this is what you say you are," do the processes reflect that and is there an understanding of this? This will be cost effective, and the institution should learn from the process.

Wortman commented the land-grant concept needs to be defined in terms of the 21st century. What should a modern land-grant institution be? The institution has not dealt with this issue yet.

Outcomes: The last 2 plans have been very useful documents according to the Provost, but did not necessarily provide guidance for making difficult decisions. How do you keep people engaged? The memo will be placed on the Provost's website, so folks understand the process.

Comments from the EB:

Robinson thinks the budget will make this a difficult process, and feels there should be a place for arguing about any possible pruning. The Provost responded by noting after the vision is set, pruning will take place in context of the developed goals. This committee will not be looking at programs, but will set directions. He recognizes that not everyone will feel comfortable.

Wortman noted the last plan was beautifully written, but didn't have much substance.

Ford asked about the facilitation group, and was interested in makeup of the committee—will they all have equal input, and play an advisory role? The Provost replied that there would be no votes taken; the committee will serve a consultative role. He also sees the importance of external views.

Websites will make a difference in communicating the work of the committee to the campus community at large.

Fiore questioned the comment about budget following the plan. The Provost responded: Basic allocations should follow top priorities. Fiore questioned the impact of this on grant funding? The Provost responded that there will need to be some changes from the top—the President will have to set parameters, tone.

Palermo suggested academic college representatives not be administrative appointments. The Provost agreed, and noted there is a representative from Dean's Council and Department Chairs group. Girton asked that the EB consider and send comments by Thursday at 5, especially in membership selection process.

By-law changes for Senate committee reorganization.

Vrchota reported for Governance: they will be meeting next Monday, and the by-laws will be completed, and will be available for the Feb. EB meeting, and then to FS, ready for voting by April.

Proposal for a discussion on the implementation of the P&T policy

This proposal was presented at the last Senate meeting, and it will be brought to the next meeting. Each department should have a firm understanding of the policy and that it is time for a review of how the policy is working. The departments should have governance documents, and if they don't have one, they need one.

Robinson would like to offer an alternative requesting college offices to examine the P & T documents in their departments, and if insufficient, DEOs should be required to update it and submit.

Girton disagrees, should the P & T guidelines be guided by the Deans? It should come from the faculty. It's time for the faculty to look at whether the guidelines are being followed or not.

Robinson still disagrees, how should he propose to the FS? It can be presented as an alternative at the discussion. He will make a substitute motion. If the existing motion is defeated, he will offer it.

Palermo noted the Provost did challenge the Deans to modify the documents, for review and this process is to see how much the document is being "lived" by the faculty. Divisive departments may have a problem. This should be considered follow up.

Robinson pointed out when percentages in the position responsibility statement are different; the P & T document is not specific in this regard. Should it be reflected in the P & T document? Received a response from an asst. professor who was worried release from teaching time would require more publication, or other work. Girton noted this does express his point—this person SHOULD have more.

Girton see this is really a review of where we are with the P & T document.

I. Council items – 4:40 p.m.

Palermo reported on the academic standards subcommittees. They will explore the College of Business and Design's new policies (as opposed to Engineering) regarding temporary enrollment. There are now 83 students looking for new college homes and new courses, what should we do? Suggested this policy be looked at and a catalog language change be considered. Last year the language was changed to dismissed from the College, as opposed to dismissed from the University.

Vrchota noted there will need to be new Council Chairs elected for Judiciary and Appeals, Resource and Policy Allocation, and Governance.

Senate Agenda, for January 13, 2004

Wortman moved, and Owen seconded. The agenda was approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

NEXT MEETING
January 27, 2004 3:10 -5:00
107 Lab of Mechanics