

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING minutes**

**March 31, 2009**

**3:00-5:00 p.m.**

**107 Lab of Mechanics**

**Present: Torrie, M; Ford, C; Crase, S; Freeman, S; Martin, M; Hendrich, S; Selby, M; Owen, M; Sapp, T (for Palermo); Anderso, P; Walter, S; Osweiler, G; VanDerZanden, AM; Wallace, R; van der Zalk, A; Carlson, S; Holger, D; Hoffman, E.**

**Absent: Porter, M.**

**Guests: Jack Girton, Heimir Geirsson, Pete Reilly**

**I. Call to Order**

At 3:06pm.

**II. Consent Agenda**

**A. Agenda, Executive Board Meeting, March 31, 2009**

**B. Minutes, Executive Board Meeting, March 3, 2009**

Motion to approve agenda by Owen, second by Crase. Motion carried.

**III. Announcements and Remarks**

**A. President**

Ford asked whether the Senate should take another look at the research policy that the president signed off on after making revisions, revisions that were termed “non-substantive” by Jack Girton. Questions were raised by several EB members about how something could be “non-substantive” if it was important enough to be an impediment to the president’s signature. Ford proposed that Walter compare the two versions and advise the EB whether the changes seem “non-substantive”. Ford proposed that the EB make this determination on behalf of the full Senate, following Walter’s review and advisement.

In a stroke of perfect timing, Jack Girton himself then entered the room. He eventually allayed all fears by noting that 1) some changes amounted to re-arranging/incorporating existing policies; 2) some changes were clarification of terms without changing intent or meaning; 3) the president himself had sought only two changes, and one was non-substantive but the other was substantive, and he backed off the latter. Ford asked for a show of hands on the question of whether the matter needed further review; the EB was unanimously satisfied that no further review was necessary.

**B. President-Elect**

Van der Valk asked that the 4/21/09 Senate meeting be devoted largely to discussion of budget issues. Ford asked the EB whether this seemed like a good idea. Anderson asked about tradeoffs—are there other urgent discussions that would be displaced?

Freeman wondered whether such a session might prove non-constructive by becoming a complaint forum; Crase said that even if it did, it was important for the Senate to provide for such a forum. Van der Valk wondered whether a separate forum should be arranged. Ford then asked for a show of hands on these options, and the consensus emerged for a half-hour discussion during the 4/21 Senate meeting. The forum will include explanations by Provost Hoffman with time for questions from faculty.

### **C. Provost**

No comments (Hoffman had not yet arrived)

### **D. Council/Caucus Chairs**

Anderson noted that the Design College Liaison Council led a discussion on budget implication for the college on 3/27/09. Torrie noted that the Human Sciences caucus had an opportunity to interview dean candidate Pam White.

## **IV. Old Business**

### **A. Faculty Grievance Procedures**

Nothing new about anything old.

## **V. New Business**

### **A. Bylaw Changes for Electronic Voting**

Noted that bylaws do not account for electronic voting, so a change is proposed. Walter proposed that the word "electronic" could be added to the balloting options available. A discussion ensued that ranged widely over the efficacy of various balloting methods, as well as sorting out rules regarding when a particular balloting method could be "demanded" (as opposed to requested) by a senator. Ford indicated that further EB business needed to be attended to. Martin moved, and Wallace seconded that the discussion be postponed to the next EB meeting. Three voted nay on the motion, but the motion carried.

### **B. Report of the NTE Research% (sic) Task Force**

*[Noted that the agenda needed to be corrected to replace "research%" with "teaching%"]* Ford suggested that the report be accepted. Freeman countered that there was no need for the Senate to accept the report, as the report was a done deal; he advised that the Senate consider recommendations based on the report's findings. Van der Valk moved to delete the report from new business because the EB needed more time to review it; Wallace seconded, motion carried. Ford noted that he will mention at the next Senate meeting that the report is complete and available for review on the Senate website.

### **C. Export Controls Policy**

Girton noted that the policy needs to be revised because the federal government has changed its rules regarding exports in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks. He noted that internal exemptions to federal rules were essential to ISU research and academics. Freeman moved and Owen seconded that the policy be introduced at the next Senate meeting; motion carried.

#### **D. Faculty Handbook: Admission Requirements**

Hendrich noted that Academic Affairs Council proposes that ISU replace its admissions criteria with a link to the Board of Regents' admissions policies. Freeman moved and Wallace seconded that the proposal be introduced at the next Senate meeting; motion carried.

#### **VI. Approval of Senate Agenda for April 7, 2009**

Agenda approved by voice vote (no motion)

#### **VII. Good of the Order**

Nothing offered.

#### **VIII. EXECUTIVE SESSION**

##### **A. Regent Faculty Awards**

##### **B. University Professor**

##### **C. Honorary Degrees**

At 5:17, Wallace moved and Owen seconded that the EB move out of executive session.

#### **IX. Adjourn**

Owen moved and Wallace seconded for adjournment. Motion carried.

#### **NEXT MEETING – April 14, 2009**

Minutes assiduously recorded, painstakingly typed and respectfully (although belatedly) submitted by Michael David Martin, duly elected Recording Secretary of the Iowa State University Faculty Senate, upon this twelfth day of April in the year two thousand and nine *Anno Domini*.