IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING MINUTES
September 6, 2005

Present: Baldwin, C. (President); Bradbury, S. (Design Caucus); Crase, S. (FDAR); Fiore, A.M. (Human Sciences Caucus); Girton, J. (RPA); Heising, C. (Engineering Caucus); Mennecke, B. (Business Caucus); Owen, M. (Ag Caucus); Palermo, G. (President-Elect); Phye, G. (Human Sciences Caucus); Robinson, W. (Judiciary and Appeals); Roskey, C. (Academic Affairs); Thacker, E. (Vet Med Caucus); Vrchota, D. (Governance); Wallace, R. (LAS Caucus); Zanish-Belcher (Secretary)

Absent: Agarwal, S. (Past President)

Provost Office: S. Carlson and D. Holger

Guest: F. Maistrovich (ISU Daily)

I.   Call to Order – 3:10 p.m.

The meeting was called to order at 3:13 p.m.

II.   Consent Agenda – 3:10 p.m.
A.   Agenda, Executive Board Meeting, September 6, 2005
B.   Minutes, Executive Board Meeting, August 9, 2005

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

IV.   Announcements and Remarks – 3:15 p.m.
A.   President

The Intelligent Design issue has been passed along to the general faculty as they can hold open forums by departments.

B.   President-Elect

Palermo met with the Caucus Chairs to discuss the Spring Conference and Committee on Committees. March 31/April 1, April 7/8 are possibilities for the spring conference. The group is brainstorming ideas at this point.

There will also be a group meeting in the Provost Office to continue the previous discussion related to the status of University Committees.

C.   Provost

There were no reports from the Provost Office, although VP Holger will discuss streamlining suggestions later.

D.   Committee/Council Reports

Academic Affairs:

Roskey had the following announcements:

- The Vice Chair for Academic Affairs will be Sundararajan
- MFA in Creative Writing and Environment was approved
- Undergraduate minor in digital media in the Design College was conditionally approved
- Previously approved post-audit reviews for programs were forwarded on to the Provost
- Upcoming issues:
    - Curriculum Committee-criteria for certificates
    - Process for new programs/majors

Governance

Vrchota announced the following:

Every 5th year, the Governance Council must review all the governance documents, including the strategic plan, constitution, and by-laws. These documents must be approved by the Faculty Senate and sent to the Regents.

Vrchota reminded the Council Chairs to send their agenda and a set of minutes to both Tanya and Sherri. These will also be posted to the website. It is also recommended that the Caucus Chairs send out agendas to all faculty in their departments.

Max Porter is waiting on nominations for the College document review committee.

There is a proposal for a new standing committee, the Information Technology Committee, which will operate on an ad hoc basis. This will be on the agenda for the next Executive Board meeting.

RPA:

Girton reported the following:
- Looking for a vice-chair
- Established a schedule of meetings, twice a month
- Will be examining budget matters

FDAR:

Crase announced that the Council has not met yet. She also noted the Dept. of Animal Science will again be coming forth with an adjunct professor proposal.

J & A:

There was no report.

VI.   New Business – 3:20
A.   Streamlining Council/Committee Items – Dave Holger

Holger asked if, due to recent Board of Regents changes and the Senate's committee/caucus structure of the Senate, does there need to be a new arrangement due to post-audit changes and permission to plan new programs proposal procedures? Does there also need to be revised procedures to emphasize the different between standing committees, the Executive Board, the Faculty Senate, and the Councils? The Board would like to streamline level of discussion on campus, especially in regards to "permission to plan."

Palermo responded. While he appreciates the idea of streamlining, he also noted that Faculty Senate has legislative authority in regards to academic programs and standards. He feels the oversight by the various committees, councils, and Executive Board strengthens and clarifies these proposals.

Holger is not attempting to circumvent legislative authority, but what if a standing committee has authority? He feels these committees should be able to present their recommendations straight to the Senate (as opposed to the proposal spend 3 years going through the process).

Vrchota noted however, that sending policies through these layers allows for a certain amount of inclusiveness and input. If we do not have this, how do we maintain this? The Senate by-laws should also include job description for the committee, councils.

Holger also sees a separateness between policy v implementation.

Vrchota also noted the potential organizational problem of committees not reporting to Councils.

Palermo also noted that members of committees may not be faculty senate members. Committee members are not permitted to present to the FS, if they are not Senators.

Baldwin would like to continue this discussion, and asked the Executive Board where it should be discussed? Palermo asked if it should be part of Governance's review? Or, maybe this should be opened up to the Senate and see how they respond.

Holger also recommended asking standing Committee chairs what they think.

Crase was concerned as to how this will impact program planning. The point is to bring the concept of the program in first, before the planning occurs (BOR).

Palermo again noted that committee members are not elected members and may not have all the information they need to make a decision.

Crase and Phye raised questions in regards what the procedures are for programming proposals?

Roskey noted that this is also an issue for Academic Affairs. Should there be a full proposal before sending an abstract to BOR?

Holger: The BOR feel that they want to see pre-proposals (so not as much work is expended) with a waiting period of one year (must be examined by COGs and other institutions). Are we comfortable with this?

The Academic Affairs Council will continue to look at this issue.

> C.   **Use of Social Security Numbers -** http://policy.iastate.edu/drafts/

This draft policy is available online, and Baldwin would like the faculty to look and make comments. After approval by the P & S Council (which has already occurred) and the Faculty Senate, it will be forwarded on to President Geoffroy.

V.   Old Business – 3:40
> **A.   US Diversity & International Requirement – [S04-24]**

This requirement was introduced to the Senate at its last meeting and will be voted on at the upcoming meeting.

Roskey reported that the Academic Affairs Council feels that one year is not long enough to approve these courses.

Crase and Palermo responded that it is supposed to be a revolving/periodic review. Course reviews should not take that long. This policy removes this from direct Faculty Senate oversight. College curriculum committees will make these decisions and will simply inform the Senate Curriculum Committee and the Provost Office. The Senate Curriculum Committee will establish the criteria and maintain the overall list.

Wallace noted that LAS holds the majority of courses, and that the original schedule was frightening in regards to the retroactive review of previously approved courses (not necessarily the new course review).

Roskey recommended that LAS look at the latest version.

> **B.   Distinguished Professor and University Professor Policy – [S04-16]**

This revised policy proposal originated out of the Governance Council and was tabled at the April Faculty Senate meeting.

The University Professor Committee was to work on the policy during the summer for the Sept. meeting, but has not. Vrchota informed Tim Keller (Chair) that the Senate will consider the policy as it stands and it can be revised on the floor.

C.   Department of Animal Science Appointment of Adjunct Instructors

Deferred until the next meeting.

D.   FLL Name Change to World Languages and Cultural Studies – [S05-3]

The EB approved that this proposal be forwarded to the Faculty Senate. Bratsch-Prince has prepared an updated proposal including the rationale for the reason for the name changes and more description of the process followed. The Executive Board noted that there were no departmental votes included.

E. Formation of Committee for Vice Provost for Research:

While this committee was previously approved, it was never actually officially formed (even though it has met).

Palermo feels that this committee should go to Governance to be vetted and placed in the Council structure. He is somewhat concerned over the name changes from an advisory group v. standing committee. How do we frame it so it becomes permanent?

Vrchota: When the proposal for this committee came out of Governance, it was recommended that the committee report to all Councils. She would like discussion on why it is reporting to RPA.

Girton feels it is a resource for faculty issue.

Fiore asked if the Research in the title refers to funded research only, or in the broader sense?

Girton responded that the title represents research in the broad sense, particularly in regards to policy and infrastructure of university.

Governance will examine the reporting structure and also examine the charge.

Palermo asked how we can ensure that the chair always serves on CURIA? Girton currently serves, this was a requirement set by Bloedel. CURIA membership is set by the VP for Research.

Robinson moved, Wallace seconded that this committee be created and the motion was approved.

F.   RPA Membership

RPA Membership needs to be reviewed. S02-30 was approved as part of the Senate's consent agenda at its April 29, 2003 meeting which changed the membership of the council and added a committee on University Planning and Budget. The Executive Board discussed whether it

should have been included on the consent agenda. What are the guidelines for the consent agenda?

Baldwin will take to Parliamentarian and will also look for other documentation related to the changes in RPA and the formation of this Committee.

Baldwin asked the Executive Board to approve the agenda for the upcoming Faculty Senate meeting.

Mennecke moved, Crase seconded and the Senate agenda was approved.

VI.   Adjourn—5:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.