

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING minutes
March 2, 2010
3:00-5:00 p.m.
107 Lab of Mechanics**

Attendance

Van der Valk, A; Ford, C; Freeman, S; Martin, M; Hendrich, S; Selby, M; Loy, D; Palermo, G; Anderson, P; Porter, M; Walter, S; Osweiler, G; VanDerZanden, AM; Wallace, R; Owen, M; Carlson, S; Holger, D; Hoffman, E; Tanaka, P (OUC); Murtaugh, T (ISU Daily); Meernik, J. (ACE Fellow)

I Call to Order

Van der Valk called the meeting to order at 3:04.

II Consent Agenda

A Agenda, Executive Board Meeting, March 2, 2010

B Minutes, Executive Board Meeting, February 2, 2010

Noted that secretary had misspelled Pete Reilly's surname. Owen made a motion to accept the consent agenda as amended. Walter seconded. Motion carried.

III Announcements and Remarks

A President

No comments.

B President-Elect

Owen noted that VEISHEA chairs wanted to make a brief presentation to the Senate to brief the Senate on plans and to encourage participation. Noted that for the spring conference, the second event had been cancelled, so no 4/1 event; the 4/30 event will still be held, featuring Provost Sullivan from the University of Minnesota speaking on the topic of the academy in times of budget difficulties.

C Provost

Hoffman thanked the Governance Council and others for their recent work on crafting proposed Handbook edits. Noted that Handbook Section 10.8 will need to be reconciled with an amended Section 3.4.

D Council/Caucus Chairs

VanDerZanden noted that the FDAR Council will submit their NTE % report to the EB soon.

IV Old Business

A Withdraw previous version of Section 3.4 and Memorandum of Understanding – Governance Council (Porter)

Porter noted that the Gov Council decided to withdraw the previously submitted MOU and Section 3.4, and a newly edited Section 3.4 will come forth as a motion to the Senate from the EB. Van der Valk wondered how best to accomplish the withdrawal? Porter noted that the

MOU is going away entirely, with relevant parts incorporated directly into the revised Handbook language. Freeman made a motion to withdraw as Porter described. Owen seconded; motion carried. Owen made a motion to afford VEISHEA chairs the opportunity to present to the Senate under a special order; Freeman seconded, motion carried. Van der Valk noted that there are four open Council chair position to be filled: FDAR, J+A (a one-year appointment to replace Freeman), Academic Affairs, and Governance Council. Palermo to continue as chair of RPA, unless he steps down to assume chairmanship of J+A (e.g.), in which case a special election would be needed to replace him on RPA. Van der Valk agreed to make a ballot for elections.

V New Business

C Engineering Sales Minor – Hendrich

(Items dealt with out of order) Hendrich noted that within Engineering, this minor attracted 70% faculty approval. Assumed that 30% opposed were opposed to any initiative such as this because of budget constraints. Freeman noted that the minor seemed dependent on a single faculty member. Walter asked why this minor would not reside in the Business College? Hendrich noted that the faculty member responsible teaches in both Engineering and Business. Holger offered that it was not appropriate for the EB to second-guess the recommendations of Councils. Palermo disagreed, noting that a function of the EB is to review substantive decisions made by councils. Holger countered that in this case, ample review had occurred by now. Hoffman asked whether this was perceived as a “poaching” issue—what with an Engineering faculty member teaching a marketing course. Hendrich noted that this was not an issue at Academic Affairs. Wallace noted that the FSCC had received a letter of support for the minor from the Business College. Walter made a motion to place the item on the Senate agenda. Owen seconded, motion carried.

A Proposed replacement for FH Section 3.4 Nonrenewal or Termination of Appointment – Governance Council (Porter)

B Discussion of Pros and Cons document for Section 3.4

Porter noted that there were many concerns expressed to him about the fact that the MOU was not proposed as part of the Handbook. Discussion ensued about content of the advisory document (“pros and cons”) that was crafted to explain the Handbook changes. Suggested that we pull out the sentence referring to the U of I’s definition for “financial exigency”. Owen made a motion to remove from the prelude of the advisory document the sentence that begins “The AAUP defines...” as well as the sentence “Additional discussion...”. Freeman seconded; motion carried.

Further suggestions for this document: to replace the term “ untenured” with the phrase “continuous adjunct appointment”, in the first paragraph. In second paragraph, down five lines, replace “in found” with “found in” (typo). At the top of page two, Rewrite to say, “The appointment of a tenured or a continuous adjunct faculty member can be terminated...”. At this point in the editing discussion, Carlson wondered aloud whether the document was ready for the Senate. Van der Valk countered that the issues under discussion were essentially typographical and not substantive. Porter noted that as new business, there would be time for debate. Ford suggested that the document could be cleaned up for the Senate meeting in one week. A further suggestion made to change the word “can” to “may” in the first paragraph.

Selby noted that the issue of whether money follows a position-terminated faculty member was still unresolved. Hoffman said that a promise of 75% support (money following a faculty member) would be acceptable in an MOU that had temporary force, but that such a condition would not be appropriate as a permanent fixture within the Handbook. Hoffman also noted that the phrase “make every effort” was problematic because it was an impossible standard; Tanaka concurred. He suggested we accept the term “good faith effort” because it was more useful and realistic. Hendrich said we should confront the salary issue (where it comes from when relocation is contemplated). She moved to accept the change to “good faith effort” from “every effort”, as Tanaka and Hoffman suggested. Owen seconded; motion carried.

Discussion continued about whether to make mention of where salary comes from in the event of a relocation. Palermo suggested adding a phrase to the sentence “...effort will be made by the University to find a suitable placement ***including compensation commensurate...***”. Owen made a motion to add this phrase; Walter seconded, motion carried. Agreed all around that while this statement avoids mentioning any percentages, it does suggest that salary support is a part of what it would mean to make a “good faith effort”.

Hendrich noted that the MOU contained language concerning appeals process for a relocation dispute; she made a motion to add a proviso regarding an appeal process to Section 3.4.2.2, at the end. Owen seconded, motion carried. Hoffman again expressed thanks for the efforts all had made.

VI Approval of Senate Agenda for March 9, 2010

Van der Valk asked whether there was support to send the document to the Senate as new business. Owen made a motion to do so, Loy seconded. Much discussion followed. Ultimately, motion carried. At 4:58 Wallace made a motion to extend 10 minutes. Freeman seconded, motion carried. Hendrich suggested that EB propose a committee of the whole discussion at the Senate meeting, for the purpose of discussing Section 3.4. No motion was recorded, but the EB seemed to agree to this. Selby made a motion that the “pros and cons” document not be forwarded to the Senate. Wallace seconded, motion carried.

VII Good of the Order

Nothing offered. But hey, it was late.

VIII Adjourn

In the mad rush of itchy feet, no motion to adjourn recorded. Meeting ended at 5:11.

NEXT MEETING – TUESDAY, MARCH 30, 2010

Minutes assiduously recorded, painstakingly typed and respectfully submitted by Michael David Martin, duly elected Recording Secretary of the Iowa State University Faculty Senate, upon this twenty-eighth day of March in the year MMX *Anno Domini*.