

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING Minutes
October 13, 2009
3:00-5:00 p.m.
107 Lab of Mechanics**

Present: Ford, C; Osweiler, G; Owen, VanDerZanden, AM; Walter, S; Torrie, M; Freeman, S; van der Valk, A; Selby, M; Loy, D; Anderson, P; Carlson, S; Hoffman, B, Palermo, G; Martin, M; Porter, M.

I Call to Order

Van der valk called the meeting to order at 3:04pm, and suggested that the meeting focus on options for dealing with a 10% budget reduction.

II Consent Agenda

A Agenda, Executive Board Meeting, October 13, 2009

B Minutes, Executive Board Meeting, September 1, 2009

Presumed to have been approved (secretary's notes failed to record this)

III Announcements and Remarks

A President

(1) Faculty Senate blog (blog.facsen.iastate.edu)

(2) Post-tenure Review Task Force

(3) Strategic Plan and October FS Meeting

B President-Elect

C Provost

D Council/Caucus Chairs

(Note: rather than sequence comments A-B-C-D in the usual fashion, it was agreed that the comments and discussion for part III of this meeting would merge into one free-ranging discussion)

Van der Valk noted that the blog is up and running, with three topics featured: NTE Faculty Task Force report, the Post-tenure Review Task Force, and the budget. No table of contents yet exists; IT has been contacted to remedy this but no response as yet. Noted further that because he teaches Tuesday nights, discussion must stop today by 4:45 in order to leave time for structuring the upcoming Senate meeting. Noted that the Governor has decreed a 10% across-the-board cut for state expenditures, the Regents have decreed a hiring and building freeze. Noted that the 10% reversion was permanent. Noted that ISU has lost 22% of state appropriations in the last 2 months, and that presently ISU depends on tuition for about 50% and state appropriations for about 50% of its operating costs. Noted that tough decisions loom: cut programs? Or, could there be "bridge funding" of some \$25M from some source to allow time for planning...no sense of where such money could come from. Noted that the cut may exceed 10%, since some money has already been allocated.

The Provost arrived at this point and noted that she can say as much as the President did yesterday (10/12/09); Regents to meet tomorrow (10/14/09). Noted that the building and hiring freezes would be lifted if the President can devise a plan for the 10% reversion. Regents may ask ISU to cut contributions to TIAA/CREF from 10% to 8%, and may ask for a "leave without pay" (furlough) proposal, but we can't call it a "furlough". May be a tuition surcharge, higher tuition next year, which would be controversial for Regents and with some student groups. All this is speculative; President will report following his meeting with Regents. Noted that 10% of state funds=4.81% of the general fund. The effect of the cut will differ across colleges, based on amounts of reserve funds. Central administration can absorb some of the cut, but limited. Noted that while these mid-year cuts by the state would be across the board, cuts devised by the legislature next year will be politically wrought and thus differential.

A question was posed about whether all ISU faculty and P&S staff are invested in TIAA/CREF; the answer was yes, except for employees working less than half-time or paid by federal funds. \$10M can be saved through the TIAA/CREF reduction along with the furlough. The furlough will likely be differential, with higher-salaried employees taking longer amounts of time off without pay. A question posed about the use of carry-over money held by some units; such take-back would "send the wrong message" to units, and in any case most of that money is committed already.

Noted that undergraduate tuition now provides about 55% of the budget, and that sponsored funding was at record levels, \$500M; we are a different university now, increasingly non-state-funded. A question was posed regarding the disconnect between an increased dependency on undergrad tuition while human resources devoted to undergrad education is dwindling (less faculty, increasing student:faculty ratios, etc.); the answer is that our challenge is to maintain enrollment when national demographic trends work against this.

Noted that in our favor, economic doldrums tend to keep kids in-state; also tends to steer kids from private colleges to less-expensive alternatives such as state universities. Freeman noted that if state contributes proportionately less to ISU's budget, then perhaps the Board of Regents should have proportionally less influence over ISU. Van der Valk noted that a \$100 tuition surcharge would likely be proposed for the spring semester. Van der Valk asked how the 10% cuts would be passed on to colleges—wondering whether any could be absorbed by central administration. Hoffman replied that percentages were as yet unknown, but that colleges would be cut about 4-5% probably. Palermo offered that the ISU budget issues were not perceived as a "crisis" by taxpayers; the assumption would broadly be that we were "fat" and could well afford budget reductions.

Hoffman noted that we could cut a college—but which? All serve a great many students. But units within colleges are a different story. Some lack enrollment and/or external funding. Van der Valk noted that thus far the cuts have been "invisible"; the pain is only felt internally; perhaps better if it could somehow be revealed how the cuts are affecting ISU. Cancelling classes as part of furloughs, for example. Palermo noted that we could

withdraw from the Big 12 and join the MVAC, or that we could eliminate the College of Design (*a “thought experiment” only, notes the recording secretary*) and take advantage of reciprocity with adjoining states that have design programs such as Wisconsin. Or we could just raise tuition 20% and see what happens. Ford suggested that we could employ more NTE faculty, at a presumed cost savings. Van der Valk objected most strenuously, preferring an assessment of “inefficient” programs—in particular, programs with high faculty salaries and low numbers of students. Hoffman noted that with this round of cuts, colleges with more resources would be taking bigger hits.

Van der Valk wondered how across-the-board furloughs could be equitable. Palermo noted that we are essentially a “humanistic” enterprise, and that assessments of comparative performance among units or colleges could not be based solely on economic measures. We need to consider what is of value about what we do. Hoffman noted that early retirement will be pushed—perhaps offer further incentives, such as lowering the minimum age or lowering the minimum number of years of service for eligibility. One problem however is that making early retirement more attractive now will make recent early retirees (who got a less-sweet deal) feel cheated.

Van der Valk suggested facetiously that we could close FPM, and out-source physical plant/maintenance to private enterprise. Hoffman said FPM is actually quite efficient. Hoffman went on to say that three things are imminent.

Conflict of Interest/Commitment

Provost Hoffman noted that current policies on conflict of interest and commitment were being reviewed and probably a new policy would be developed. This was due to increased scrutiny by federal agencies and local problems with conflict of commitment.

1. Better effort reporting: an audit crackdown on accounting for hours and days devoted to contract work on grants; time accounting must be diligently conducted henceforth.
2. Conflict of Commitment policy: we must be diligent about acknowledging (for example) pay from other sources, and be able to reconcile various commitments so no conflict or overlap exists.
3. Work for Associations: for staff, we must make sure that those who do the work are the ones getting paid; sometimes a problem of (for example) ISU staff doing work that is outside of their domain.

IV Old Business

Agreed that NTE report will be kept on the agenda.

V New Business

None

VI Approval of Senate Agenda for October 20, 2009

Van der Valk proposed that the bulk of the upcoming Senate meeting be devoted to a budget discussion, possibly as a “committee of the whole”. Porter suggested that the Senate meeting’s budget discussion be closed to the press, to allow for candor; the general sense among EB members was that this was not advisable. Owen then moved to make the budget the primary discussion item for the Senate meeting; Anderson seconded, motion carried.

VII Good of the Order

Van der Valk proposed a structure for the Senate’s budget discussion, with comments from Hoffman, Palermo (on behalf of RPA), and himself.

VIII Adjourn

Van der Valk moved to adjourn; Ford seconded, motion carried at 5:07pm.

NEXT MEETING – TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 2009

Minutes assiduously recorded and painstakingly typed by Michael David Martin (with an invaluable assist from Past President Clark Ford, who pinch-hits as note-taker for the first 40 minutes because MDM teaches a class that lasts until 3:30), duly elected recording secretary for the Iowa State University Faculty Senate. On this ninth day of November Two Thousand Nine *anno domini*.