

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING MINUTES
November 1, 2005**

Present: Agarwal, S. (Past President); Baldwin, C. (President); Owen, M. (Ag Caucus); Bradbury, S. (Design Caucus); Crase, S. (FDAR); Fiore, A.M. (Human Sciences Caucus); Heising, C. (Engineering Caucus); Mennecke, B. (Business Caucus); Palermo, G. (President-Elect); Phye, G. (Human Sciences Caucus); Robinson, W. (Judiciary and Appeals); Roskey, C. (Academic Affairs); Vrchota, D. (Governance); Wallace, R. (LAS Caucus);

Absent: Girton, J. (RPA); Thacker, E. (Vet Med Caucus); Zanish-Belcher (Secretary).

Provost Office: B. Allen and S. Carlson

Guest: Jim Davis, CIO; F. Maistrovich (ISU Daily)

Consent Agenda

Agenda order changed – old business A switched with B

- Minutes accepted and consent agenda accepted.

President's comments

- President Geoffroy supports S05-3 : Name change for Foreign Languages and Literatures to World Languages and Cultures. Provost Allen will move this to the Board of Regents.
- President Geoffroy has reviewed S04-16: Distinguished Professor and University Professor Policy. The Provost's office has concerns about the proposed changes. We have been requested to work together on revisions. Baldwin will discuss with Provost Allen.
- Higher learning commission (information on the web) accreditation information for self study available. The Senate has made changes on the document regarding faculty governance. The older version is on the web at <http://www.iastate.edu/~accreditation/2-mission/123.htm>
- Letter received from VEISHA co-chairs was discussed. They would like to meet with Faculty Senate representatives. Owen volunteered. Owen reported on the last VEISHEA Advisory Committee, as he is a member of the committee. He asked if the committee could make a short presentation to the Faculty Senate. The EB thought this could be arranged. Owen will speak with the committee chairs.

- Resolution from Jim Hutter – proposing that a statement on the transcript indicating that ISU makes accommodations for those students with disabilities was received. Baldwin suggested we pass this on to Academic Affairs council. Roskey indicated she will also share with Legal Counsel.

President-elect comments

- Palermo announced title of the Faculty Spring Conference – The Shifting Landscape and described briefly the points of emphasis, format, dates and venue. This will be posted on the Faculty Senate website. The Provost asked about potential speakers. Lee Schulman of the Carnegie Institution and Catherine Christiansen of the Sloan Foundation were mentioned. Palermo will speak with the Provost about this in more detail.

Council Reports

- Judiciary and Appeals - finishing one case and anticipating another. Also working on language for procedures and timing of appeals. Hope to have this done by December
- Academic Affairs – discussed certificates; minors and requirements for these minors, particularly in Business. They want the catalog to match that which is actually offered.
- Governance Council - reviewing all documents – looking at by-laws; they have requested that councils review the information and submit comments to them. A group within the Governance Council will review the comments.
- FDAR – the council has completed work on changes to the PRS document. These include formalizing (with dates and signatures) the PRS and a process to follow when the faculty member and the chair cannot come to agreement on a change in PRS.
- RPA – Girton not in attendance as he is receiving a Regent’s Faculty Excellence Award this evening. Allen commented on topics including reallocation, mandatory costs, differential tuition; new budget model. He also discussed the inclusion of new committee responsibility for the RPA council
- Old business
 - Formation of the New Information Technology Committee – Jim Davis – CIO – handout 3 – Denise indicated that this was the third time a proposal was brought forward to the Exec Board .
 - Suggests the wisdom of having a faculty committee for IT

- Davis comments – IT supports academic enterprise – research, technology in the classroom and learning – suggests that this committee is essential – serves as a sounding board, new ideas, - role of committee more advisory – careful to set expectations that could not be met – very supportive of the committee.
- Anthony Townsend indicated that the committee is appropriate given the singular point of contact – supportive of the idea – would help shape the IT unit and provide the faculty input
- Palermo – felt that the charge was reasonable – why was paragraph C dropped – Denise – provided rationale – conflict in committee term for the new committee – wants to make sure that this is consistent with the by laws – committee term typically 2 yrs – Palermo suggests that the omission of Extension/professional practice implies that IT will not support that network – Davis – suggests that committee should address – Owen – expressed some concern- Davis indicated that Extension was not under central IT . Agarwal suggested eliminating text (“in areas of teaching, research, and service”) within the charge so that it would read: represent faculty interests regarding IT; coordinate information
- Motion to make the change – delete in “areas... service” – was made, seconded and passed
- In rationale –in 4th line – delete “for research, teaching, and service activities” and insert “in the pursuit of their endeavors” Motion made, seconded and passed
- Motion made to approve the new standing committee as modified – seconded and passed. This will be put on the agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting next week for discussion.
- Part-time Appointments for Tenure-eligible and Tenured Faculty (handout 4)
 - Carlson took this to various groups and allowed them to review the proposal and significant changes resulted. This is proposed as a mechanism of balancing careers and life outside the academy. ISU gaining national recognition for policies affecting “life management”; extension of the tenure clock for arrival of children, spousal hires, quality of life considerations. This is currently being done on an ad hoc basis – some variation occurs from unit to unit. This policy supports one of the new priorities to attract the best new faculty. A policy like this would greatly enhance recruiting. MIT, U of MI and Berkley are all working on a similar policy; many other institutions are also moving forward. We are still lagging behind in hiring women and people of color. This may relate to family issues in that men who are married with children have the best chance of tenure whereas women with children have the worst time. Singles about equal without regard to sex. Changes made to the policy:
 - part-time hiring was critiqued – departments must have funds to support full time faculty

- changed number of years you could remain as a part time faculty
 - changed review schedule –more clear and more similar to full time faculty
 - criteria for tenure would be the same for all faculty (full or part time)
 - for tenure-eligible faculty – could go part-time for family issues not professional opportunities
 - any part time decision would occur in 2 year increments
 - for tenured faculty – allowing a broader range of opportunities to go on part-time assignment
 - department chair is a key component of the process
- overall represents a major change in how faculty are considered – allows consistency across the university
- Palermo in favor of moving forward. Clarification on page 6 – preliminary review of probationary term – draft document suggests 3rd and 6th year review, if working part-time. How can a part-time faculty amass enough materials to be fairly considered? What is the rationale for the 3 yr review? Carlson responded that the calendar enters into the decision. It would not be fair to carry this along further without feedback to the faculty member as well as the person reviewing the person. Palermo expressed some concern that people may not understand and confuse the amount of materials amassed over the part-time appointment. Townsend questioned whether or not the policy tended to create 2 classes of people – part-time people may have greater expectations over the same period of time; disciplines that are dependent on funded research may have greater problems with a part-time appointment. Baldwin cautions that considerable care must be employed with this policy; part time that “slack” and part time that are pushed to produce more.
- Palermo questioned what the Fac Sen Exec charge is for this draft policy. Baldwin indicated this was a joint task force by the senate and provost office. Therefore, if approved, it will be placed on the agenda for the Senate meeting for discussion. Motion to accept and forward for discussion and approval was made, seconded, and passed.
- New business
 - Charge for Task Force on Governance Documents: Baldwin agreed to appoint a task force, chaired by Max Porter.
 - No representative from Vet Med at this time.
 - Palermo – indicated some concern for terminology – appropriate to review documents of governance within the university – concerns about the use of “inconsistencies” – rather suggest review documents for similarities and make recommendations to

departments/colleges – brief statement to indicate this is undertaken for faculty governance and provide a stated objective to review and recommend – not stated in the current goals statement – wants the goal to be review the documents with regard to faculty governance to all extents – Vrchota indicated that this was implicit within the current wording –

- Suggested we need to include language in the goal statement that is consistent with faculty governance considerations within all documents. Also documents need to be in concert with the Faculty Handbook.
- Baldwin suggested that this document be returned to the task force for further work. There was a consensus to send it back
- PRS mediation guidelines (document 6): for discussion
 - Suggested language change to the current policy are listed sections I and II.
 - III describes suggested procedure.
 - Looked at things already in place in departments. Procedure allows for discussion with both parties. When a disagreement occurs, we can refer to the PRS mediation guidelines (either party)
 - Requires that each department elect a departmental representative to a panel and when a problem develops, 2 others are appointed One is chosen by the chair and one by the faculty member. This allows each party to present their position to the departmental panel and the panel provides direction to resolve the issue. If no resolution occurs within the time period, it is forwarded to the dean of the college. This proposal provides a standard process for departments. Expedience of process was also discussed. This will be put on the next EB agenda for action.

Motion to approve the agenda for the Senate meeting, amended to include Formation of the New Information Technology (IT) Committee, made, seconded, and passed.

Adjourned at 5:01 PM