

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING MINUTES

May 8, 2007  
3:05-5:00 p.m.  
107 Lab of Mechanics

Present: Crase, S. (President); Ford, C. (President-Elect); Grudens-Schuck, N. (Secretary); Olsen, M. (Eng. Caucus); Mennecke, B. (Business Caucus); Owen, M. (Ag. Caucus); Palermo, G. (Past President and RPA); Paschke, T. (Design Caucus); Porter, M. (Governance); Thompson, J. (Vet. Med. Caucus); VanDerZanden, A. M. (FD&R).

Absent: Freeman, S. (Judiciary & Appeals); Hendrich, S. (Academic Affairs); Wallace, R. (LAS Caucus); Anderson, D. (Human Sci. Caucus)

Provost Office: Carlson, S. (Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement and Diversity); Holger, D. (Associate Provost for Academic Programs)

- I. Called to Order – 3:05 p.m.
- II. Consent Agenda – 3:06 p.m.
  - A. Agenda, Executive Board Meeting, May 8, 2007
  - B. Minutes, Executive Board Meeting, April 17, 2007

Motion to approve amendments and corrections to the May 8 agenda, by Past President Palermo. Seconded by Senator Thompson.

Motion passed.

Motion to approve corrections to the minutes by Senator Paschke and seconded by Senator VanDerZanden.

Motion passed.

- III. Announcements and Remarks – 3:05 p.m.
  - A. President – Crase

Hardcopy report was provided which included BOR attendance report, as well as a copy of her talk to the Regents.

- 1. Friday, April 27: President's Council (once a month, 1 hour): Quarterly Financial Report; 2005-2010 Strategic Plan Progress Report; College of Agriculture report.

2. Monday, April 30-May 1: Board of Regents meeting, Iowa City.
  - a. Monday evening: Council of Provosts met – included the three provosts, associate provosts, FS presidents. Topics included approval of new programs at the three universities and discussion and approval of all but one paragraph of a proposal to revise the regents rules to adopt a new Section 6.09 relating to academic freedom which mirrors the language in the 1940's AAUP statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure (BOR later did not approve any part; will wait for the whole document).
  - b. Tuesday, May 1: President Geoffroy has written a letter to faculty detailing some of the spending increases and the good news related to faculty salaries. FS presidents each spoke on budget policy. Meeting ended at 7:40 p.m. Agenda items are posted on the Board of Regents home page.
3. Wednesday, May 2: Attended first meeting of University Budget Advisory Committee. Organizing meeting. Bi-weekly and weekly meetings will be held. Clark, Claudia, and Sedahlia represent the FS.
4. Wednesday, May 2: First meeting with the Provost – transition meeting with Gregory. Agenda items included discussion about Provost's role in third-year probationary period (she is working via deans and chairs to make it have more meaning for new faculty and be a fair and thorough assessment, with clear feedback to faculty member) and the Non-Tenure Eligible Research policy (much discussion; thoughts about what to do over the summer).
5. Thursday, May 3: First meeting with P&S Council. They are extremely interested in the NTER policy. I will be meeting with their leadership soon to discuss their interests/concerns. They had met with the Provost prior to their May 3 meeting to discuss NTER, as well.
6. Friday, May 4: First meeting with the Chairs' Cabinet. I presented where we are with the NTER policy, but they were more interested in pursuing what was going to happen with the NTE faculty (lecturer) coming up for review for senior lecture (see item 7 below).
7. Monday, May 7: Meeting with associate provosts Carlson and Holger, Clark, and Gregory (bridge meeting). Discussion of community college admissions partnership programs (we will discuss NIACC and a generic plan in May 15 EB); interactions between graduate council and FS; non-tenure eligible faculty and advancement (feedback and plans – FDAR will take up this issue in coming year); and brief discussions about processes for materials getting in the *Faculty Handbook*.

Notable was continued discussion of the Provost's attention to the quality and consistency of the third year review. Senator Paschke asked about the consistency of holding an oral interview for the candidate with the 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Review Committee as well as the chair across campus. It was noted that interviews with chairs were common but less was known about visits with committee members. Senators Mennecke and Owen asked about the impact on faculty advancement and the colleges if increased attention was provided by the Provost. Some colleges do not currently involve the deans in the third year review. There has been some concern that the Provost's attention would be toward candidates as individuals, and less toward process, and this has stimulated discussion among deans and others. Associate Provost Carlson noted that there was no intent to supplant the role of the colleges but to “coach for excellence” among the players to increase the likelihood of smoother and more transparent tenure decision making processes. Senator Owen and Past President Palermo suggested that attention be paid to this issue in J&A Council, and perhaps within Governance Council, regarding third year review specification in the *Faculty Handbook*. This was considered to be an issue of crucial importance to the faculty, hence to the Faculty Senate.

B. President-Elect – Ford

Committee on Committees (Com-Com) is his province, and he welcomed the Council Chairs, which routinely attend, and also plan the spring conference. He asked for early thoughts on the theme and keynote speakers, which he hopes to settle in fall 2007.

C. Provost – Hoffman

No report.

D. Council/Caucus Chair Reports

Ag Caucus - Owen. Meetings have been set up for following year. Senator VanDerZanden requested that she be updated on the NTEF discussions as the new chair. Crase and possibly Palermo will meet with VanDerZanden to update her and bridge to the new year. s

No other reports.

IV. Old Business – 3:47 p.m.

A. Non-Tenure-Eligible Research Faculty – Governance and FDAR

President Crase asked if there were follow-ups or additional discussion to this previously introduced item. She also noted that there were prior discussions of the need to collect different types of data, and so forth that had not yet been acted upon. She wondered if open forums or other venues might assist faculty and staff to understand the issues and to generate discussion and input. Senator Porter echoed the need to stimulate discussions in various groups so that the issues would be thoroughly vetted. Senator Olsen spoke for the Engineering Caucus, where there was support but also concerns. There may be implications for what a department looks like in the

future, and there is ongoing discussion on how proposed changes might affect the colleges and universities. If it was "purely supplemental," there would be likely easy passage; but if the proposed policy is projected to lessen, over time, the proportion of tenure-track faculty at the university, passage is less likely. Senator Owen noted that the documents and discussions were clearly in favor of protecting the overall faculty numbers. Past President Palermo noted that the limit was 20% of FTE faculty- who had any part of their title, "Research Professor," and the overall university limit would be 10%: about 130 slots overall. He agreed with Senator Porter that a strategy for ways to stimulate and manage discussions of the proposal would be appropriate. Bullet points might be provided to the Council Chairs, which might be provided by the Governance Council and the EB might make use of a feedback link on the Faculty Senate website. Associate Provost Holger said there was also a need for information on the impact on faculty numbers at institutions that have pursued a similar policy. Senator Olsen noted that there were several ways that faculty lines could be affected and that it was not straightforward. President-Elect Ford spoke to the need to make the concept workable for faculty senators. President Crase noted that she would not encourage voting at the first meeting FS in fall (even though it would be legal) because the summer was a potential barrier to understanding of the issues. It would also be important to monitor the hiring of the Ames Lab director, because the policy would greatly affect this unit, as per Interim Director Goleman.

V. New Business – 3:50 p.m.

A. LAS Approval Process for US Diversity and International Perspectives – Academic Affairs – Hendrich

Past President Palermo reported on the report received by the FS Executive Board, which he compiled; that report did not change the substance of the current policies regarding monitoring and evaluation of International Perspectives and US Diversity courses. Highlights were provided in the document by Palermo to assist in addressing a recent potential conflict of new procedures in LAS for review of such courses with the extant policy. Palermo described the conflict as follows: LAS has consistently voiced displeasure with the burden of the high number of course approvals at the LAS curriculum committee. Associate Provost Holger affirmed the fact that LAS courses formed the core of offerings for these area requirements, "by an order of magnitude" more than other colleges. To manage the situation within the college, LAS revised their process for review. Their goal was to improve workability of the review process and to lessen the overall load of the LAS Curriculum Committee. The recent solution put forth by LAS was to devolve review and decision making regarding courses that would satisfy the area requirements to the departments that offered and/or originated the courses. Although the LAS group had sent a report to the FSCC, that report was not sent to the FS Executive Board.

However, decision making at the level of the department is different from decision making at the level of a Curriculum Committee. It was not, at this time, considered optimal, and was perhaps not legitimate, to change to review at the department level because the review would be shortchanged of the wider view brought to bear on decision making by a group of college-wide representatives. Regarding legitimacy of alternative processes (substituting review by CC with another process for review), there was room in the policy for innovation, but it was not seen at this time that departmental-level review would satisfy either the letter or the spirit of the policy.

Senator Olsen spoke to the power of the new budget model to encourage pan-university review. Associate Provost Holger noted that we did not want our deliberations and problem-solving among colleges, administration, and Faculty Senate to present a problem to students regarding course offerings.

Discussion will continue on this issue. However, LAS Caucus Chair Wallace and AA Council chair Hendrich were not in attendance, and there is a new curriculum chair in LAS and at the Faculty Senate level, so it was not considered to be fruitful for the EB to make a statement or decision regarding action on this item today.

B. Plant Physiology, degree name change request—Academic Affairs – Hendrich

Not presented.

C. Final Report of the Task Force on Review of Governance Documents – Porter - 4:28

Senator Porter highlighted a table from the report which provided a summary of policies that were identified as incomplete or missing at the level of departmental governance documents. Recommendations included communications to departments to underscore that "corrective action was urgently needed" regarding updates of governance documents, in line with university, college, and other policies, procedures, and regulations. In some cases, noted Holger and Porter, "best practices" were being carried out but were not specified in governance documents. This helped—that people were doing the right thing—but it was not sufficient with regard to grievance processes.

Past President Palermo and Senator Mennecke thanked Senator Porter and the Task Force for the report, but disagreed with recommendation #3. Palermo noted that the lower document could be more detailed and restrictive. Porter agreed. He noted, however, that there needed to be a statement that where there was no policy lower, or a policy with different strictures, the lower document (i.e., departmental) could not undo or be in direct contrast with university or other "higher" policy. Mennecke said that the recommendation, as written, was confusing. Senator Owen noted that the word "supersede" was especially confounding. Associate Provost Holger noted that the problem to be solved was to stop departmental documents from being "wrong" and was not intended to limit the right of departments to be either more specific with regard to procedures, or more restrictive with respect to the policy itself. There were additional discussion about formatting, language, and provision and archiving of matrices of the individual departmental documents. Members should send comments and corrections to Senator Porter. *See report* for other recommendations. The report was received but no action was taken on approval at this time.

VI. Executive Session – 4:45 p.m.

Motion to enter into executive session for reasons of setting strategies for discussions with administration by Senator Owen, and seconded by Senator Thompson.

Motion passed.

A. Summer Retreat with President and Provost – May 31, 12 noon -4:00 p.m.

VII. Good of the Order – 4:58

VIII. Adjourned—5:00 p.m.

Mike Owen made a motioned to adjourn. Motion passed.

Minutes by Nancy Grudens-Schuck, Faculty Senate Secretary

Appendix: Documents provided for/at meeting:

Draft Versions

1. 2005 Retreat Minutes with follow-up 2006.doc
2. 2006 Retreat Agenda V3.pdf
3. EB - Agenda May 8 2007.doc
4. EB - Minutes April 17 2007.doc
5. EB - Minutes Retreat June 20, 2006.doc
6. Final Report 4\_15\_07REV.doc
7. Plant Biology a 1.pdf
8. USDiv-IP Course Approval.doc
9. President's Update to Executive Board, May 8, 2007, Sedahlia Crase, President

NEXT MEETING  
May 15, 2007  
Executive Session