

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING MINUTES  
January 10, 2006**

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

Absent: Baldwin, C. (President); Fiore, A.M. (Human Sciences Caucus); Owen, M. (Ag Caucus)

Provost Office: S. Carlson

Guests: C. Espinoza (Human Resources); K. Kruempel (Curriculum Committee); K. Overberg (Legal Services); T. Polito; P. Tanaka (Legal Services)

**I. Call to Order – 3:10 p.m.**

Vice President Palermo called the meeting to order at 3:11.

**II. Consent Agenda – 3:10 p.m.**

- A. Agenda, Executive Board Meeting, January 10, 2006**
- B. Minutes, Executive Board Meeting, November 29, 2005**

A change was made to the agenda (VI. C.) based on discussions between Vrchota and Girton. RPA Council will present the constitutional changes.

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

**III. New Business with Special Attendees – 3:15 p.m.**

- A. Harassment Policy – Sanjeev Agarwal and Kathryn Overberg**

Agarwal introduced the revised harassment policy. The purpose of the proposed revisions was to streamline dual policies and to serve as a single point of reference.

Agarwal introduced guest speakers Overberg, Tanaka, and Espinoza. He then noted that we had two different policies for sexual harassment as well as racial and ethnic harassment. These have now been combined into one policy in the handbook. The policy includes a description and mechanism for handling complaints (under the wider rubric of discrimination).

Espinoza revised the language, and Agarwal checked the policy on behalf of the Faculty Senate. Overall, the revisions do not change the policy. It does delete a few sentences due to repetition, legal codes, and streamlining.

There are some new items based on previous cases, but these additions do not change the nature of the policy.

Agarwal did ask how will we handle future proposals of this nature and how they should be reviewed for the Handbook?

Carlson noted these are university policies, as opposed to simply applying to faculty.

Espinoza gave the background for merging the two policies. The goal was clarity and consistency so there would no longer be confusion.

Carlson recommended accepting Agarwal's recommendations and would like to take these to the President. This would change the handbook and there would be a link to this in the policy library.

General harassment will remain in handbook.

Race, sex, etc. have been merged together.

Girton suggested putting this together as a handbook change to be presented to the Faculty Senate.

Townsend thinks it is very important that the Faculty Senate support this policy change, and it is also important to participate in a discussion about it.

Agarwal noted a specific change based on experiences with previous cases. Supervisors who receive complaints now need to notify the Office of Equal Opportunity (EO).

Overberg stated this is to provide accountability and guidance as needed. This will also enable the university to keep track of the issues.

Townsend suggested adding some language in regards to records documentation, and how it will be kept, especially in relationship to permanent files.

Overberg responded that an informal complaint does not result in discipline and the reporting is only an effort at facilitation.

Townsend feels that once it comes to EO office it becomes formal.

Robinson asked if identification would be required in this reporting structure?

Palermo questioned the documents the Executive Board had received and asked for clarification. Agarwal described the document with different colored fonts as his which raises specific questions.

Robinson asked why ethnicity was left out of the language? Overberg noted that this was odd, but ethnicity is covered by the policy.

Vrchota asked why list the acts of potential discrimination? What if it isn't complete? Agarwal noted that the language does cover all eventualities. Vrchota also noted additional inconsistencies, and feels the language should note examples (but not limited to).

Girton asked what the Executive Board should do with this today? Palermo responded that the Executive Board will review it, and should ask questions of the experts currently in the room.

Carlson noted the President's desire to have a single policy. Espinoza noted that the Faculty Senate needs to accept the merged policy. Other pieces of the discussion have to do with wordsmithing, and how it connects to Faculty Handbook. There are currently two cases pending, and the policy must be moved forward.

They will incorporate Agarwal's recommendations.

Girton noted this should come from the Handbook Committee. It will be presented to the Faculty Senate for the February meeting.

Townsend feels the combined policy is a mistake for a number of reasons. The special character of sexual harassment is lost and creates more confusion. There should be separate specific policies for each item. He also feels the policy lessens the possibility for the freedom of speech, which is integral to the academic community. Finally, he noted that the policy states that consensual relationships may still be harassment. He feels we should be very clear here, especially in regards to supervisory relationships.

If the Executive Board has any further comments, they should send them in writing to Sanjeev by the next meeting. These will be shared with other Executive Board members.

Palermo responded to Townsend's question, currently we are discussing editorial clarity, but we may need to look at other issues.

Tanaka noted that academic freedom is listed first and is still a priority. Everything still must go through the Faculty conduct policy

Palermo asked that the President wait till the Executive Board concludes its preliminary review.

### **C. AA Council - New Policy for Academic Standards – Tom Polito**

T. Polito described the background for the development of the policy as a response to a perceived inequity in college standards. The implementation of this policy could result in more students on probation, but it is important to have a common set of standards. It is very important for interventions to occur when students are in trouble.

Palermo asked (in regards to p. 8) about the estimated costs. Is it as equitable as our current system?

Polito responded yes. The impact on the university and student numbers could be immense. The standards must be implemented, but we need to prepare to be committed to help the students through them.

Roskey stated this policy is completely supported by the Academic Affairs Council.

Phye asked about the privacy issue in terms of deciding on an intervention. Polito acknowledged that this is an issue, but we are limited as to what we can do.

Palermo suggested that since this a comprehensive and sweeping revision, maybe the presentation should line up the revisions side by side? Will this be included in the current catalog cycle? How would it work with collegiate advisors? He feels there will be a number of questions from the Faculty Senate and implications for the colleges (and their enrollments).

Polito noted this policy was endorsed by the academic standards committees of the colleges.

The changes in the catalog have been anticipated. Polito would be willing to discuss with the college caucuses and any representatives.

Roskey did note that approval should be contingent on funding of the intervention process.

Vrchota asked if we should include that in our recommendations?

Townsend asked if we take this forward, commitment from the Provost for the funding? Carlson agreed, we could at least ask.

Robinson moved, Townsend seconded, to accept the report and bring this to the Faculty Senate. The Executive Board approved and the policy will be placed under New Business in the agenda.

#### **IV. Announcements and Remarks – 3:45 p.m.**

##### **A. President**

Baldwin is at a meeting on Disaster Preparedness sponsored by American Humane Society. She sent the following items in advance:

There has been a response to Professor Jim Hutter regarding questions he raised regarding disabilities

Denise Vrchota has been appointed to a Strategic Plan: University Life Survey Task Force formed by the Office of the Provost as our Faculty Senate representative.

Sedahlia Crase has been appointed as the Faculty Senate representative to Ombuds Search Committee.

**B. President-Elect**

There were no items for report.

**C. Provost**

There were no items for report.

**D. Committee/Council Reports**

The reports were distributed as follows:

Governance: Reviewing the Faculty Senate by-laws

Judiciary and Appeals: Reviewing the timing of appeals

Academic Affairs: Still working on a minor policy. Met with Kay Palan from Business and they are not interested in changing their minor policy. The minor offered for non business majors is their set of core courses that all business majors take.

Faculty Development and Administrative Relations: Two items have come their way; one has to do with tuition reduction/waiver for faculty spouses/children and the other is related to purchasing cards and the way the purchasing department interacts with faculty and deadlines related to the cards.

Resource Policies and Allocations Council:

Budget: Prepared and presented to the provost the list of priority items for funding in the 2006-2007 budget

Currently analyzing this year's budget to determine how well the administration is able to meet its goals proposed last year when the budget was being formulated.

Budget model: Currently discussing the proposed structure and function of the new proposed budget model

Committees: Currently preparing specific items/tasks for the committees under the RPA, in light of the changed committee structure.

**V. Old Business – 4:00**

**A. J&A Council – Amendments to Faculty Handbook regarding appeals**

Robinson gave additional background in regards to added text and noted how the two appeals processes are dissimilar.

Girton moved, Bradbury seconded and the Executive Board approved the amendments going before the Faculty Senate.

**B. Governance Council – Proposed Changes to Senate Constitution**

Vrchota described the revisions, and stated she feels the language needs to balance between instruction and promotion and tenure responsibilities.

Vrchota will revise language so that it is all consistent. She will also add the wording, “These include, but are not limited to...”

Agarwal feels the language should be more specific.

Palermo asked about changing the word “educational” to “academic.” The Executive Board agreed to this change.

Girton moved, Bradbury seconded, and the revised changes will be forwarded to the Senate.

**VI. Remaining New Business – 4:30**

**A. FDAR Council – PRS Mediation Guidelines – Sedahlia Crase**

The Executive Board agreed to extend the meeting by 15 minutes.

Crise presented the reorganized guidelines for the EB to consider and discuss, and provided an overview of the changes made.

Girton questioned having a committee within the department handling an inter-department disagreement over a position responsibility statement (prs). Shouldn't it go to the Dean? Could an internal committee be binding on a department chair, as opposed to a dean?

Carlson and Crise noted they wanted to try and solve it within the department, and then it would be forwarded on.

Girton believes this adds another level of complexity. He has concerns.

Townsend noted that the department chair works for the dean and feels that peer review is better.

Girton feels the language is very arcane and the Executive Board agreed. Crise will revise by tomorrow, so that it can be added to the next Faculty Senate meeting. Girton moved, Phye seconded, and the Executive Board approved the guidelines to the Faculty Senate.

**B. AA Council - Certificate Criteria - Carol Roskey**

Ken Kruempel presented the guidelines for an undergraduate certificate. Other universities, including the University of Iowa and University of Northern Iowa have such a policy.

Girton asked how the certificate compares to a minor. Kruempel responded that a minor has less credits. A certificate represents a body of work.

Girton asked if a student who already possesses their baccalaureate degree could return for a certificate? Yes, this is accurate.

Palermo asked why this was not going to the Board of Regents? Do certificates appear on the transcript? Yes. Do they appear on the diplomas? No. A certificate will be provided by the Registrar's office.

Roskey stated that the Academic Affairs Council has approved these criteria.

Robinson recommended revisions for some contradictory language.

Girton moved, Wallace seconded, and the Executive Board approve the criteria being presented to the Faculty Senate.

**C. Change in Bylaws regarding RPA Council – Jack Girton**

The Executive Board received the proposed changes and they will be discussed at the next Executive Board meeting.

**VII. Approval of Faculty Senate Agenda for January 17, 2006**

Palermo read through the revised agenda. Robinson moved, Crase seconded and the Executive Board approved the agenda.

**VIII. Adjourn—5:00 p.m.**

The Executive Board adjourned at 5:17.