

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
DRAFT MINUTES EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING
January 11, 2011
3:00-5:00 p.m.
107 Lab of Mechanics**

Members Present: Anderson, D.; Bratsch-Prince, D.; Dark, V.; Freeman, S.; Hendrich, S.; Hoffman, E.; Holger, D.; Katz, A.; Loy, D.; Owen, M. (Chair); Palermo, G.; Selby, M.; Smiley-Oyen, A.; Stalder, K.; Torrie, M.; van der Valk, A.; Wallace, R.

I. Call to Order

President Owen called the meeting to order at 3:02 pm.

II. Consent Agenda – 3:02 p.m.

- A. Agenda, Executive Board Meeting, January 11, 2011
- B. Minutes, Executive Board Meeting, November 30, 2010

Stevenson motioned and Loy seconded to accept the consent agenda. Motion passed.

III. Announcements and Remarks

A. President

Owen thanked the caucus chairs who provided info from caucuses on the Unacceptable Performance document.

In response to an announcement that faculty are invited to a focus group lunch at the Union drive market on Jan. 25, there was discussion of the need for a faculty lounge/club meeting area, a point made on and off for years.

Owen reminded people that nominations for President-elect are still needed.

B. President-Elect

The Committee on Committee is looking for a Senator to be the liaison to the Transportation Advisory Committee.

C. Provost

Provost Hoffman discussed the budget situation, which is filled with uncertainty.

D. Council/Caucus Chairs

Katz reported that Design is meeting on Friday to discuss the Unacceptable Performance policy.

Selby noted that Engineering has had mixed reaction to the policy, but many are favorable.

Wallace noted mixed reactions in LAS.

Loy noted that CALS is generally supportive.

Torrie noted that Human Sciences is generally supportive.

Owen noted that concerns about vagueness have been taken into account in the revision.

There were no Council Reports.

IV. Old Business

A. FH Section 7.2.2.5 - Unacceptable Performance of Duty [S10-8]

Anderson presented the revised document. The new introduction is less vague and emphasizes the point that a lot goes on prior to the procedures described.

There was much discussion and some word-smithing.

van der Valk noted that this is a way to remove tenure and that the process should be more like the process in place to grant tenure; this is administrative and not a peer process.

Freeman stated that it is incorrect to describe this either as an administrative process or a process to remove tenure; it is a part of the conduct policy, which is based on peer review.

There was discussion of what the criteria are for "unacceptable" and whether criteria should be explicitly defined within each department. Points included the fact that criteria for tenure are pretty vague.

There was much discussion about the preferred role of faculty peers versus administrators in determining unacceptability.

Suggestions were also made about showing the FS where in the conduct policy this policy fits.

van der Valk stated that he cannot support the current policy and offered an alternative in writing.

Discussion of the alternative included discussion of the role of the PRS in determining unacceptable and on the requirement in the alternative policy for governance documents to specify acceptable/unacceptable. It was also noted that the alternative initiates a dismissal proceeding while the current document describes a procedure to determine if initiation of dismissal is warranted. Concerns about confidentiality were also raised.

Palermo called the question of whether the current document should be forwarded to the senate. The motion passed.

Selby moved, Loy second that a rationale should be added and that it go forward to the Caucus chairs as soon as available to allow caucus discussion. Motion passed. Freeman noted that van der Valk's motion goes forward as a substitute motion.

B. Revision of FH section 5.3.5 Post-Tenure Review Policy [S10-9]

Freeman noted that a straw poll at the last meeting was to have three categories and that the policy has been revised several times since then. A major change in that in the current version (version 10) is that there is no administrative input into the decision itself. The department chair, the dean, and the provost only have input into the salary increase. Also, the PTR outcome is only at the department level; PRT is a faculty peer review designed to help the faculty member.

Hoffman noted that the salary increase for the top category must clearly be described as a recommendation rather than a mandate and that the wording should indicate that some may and some may not get a salary increase. Freeman noted that the policy only specifies that if there is an increase, it is a set amount not a negotiated amount.

There was discussion and clarification of what circumstances might be defined as "unacceptable performance" in 5.3.5.2. It is the failure to have an improvement plan in place within a year, not the failure to have completed the plan. This wording will be clarified.

There was discussion of whether PTR and unacceptable performance are linked in the proposed PTR policy. They should not be, but some felt that they were linked at least implicitly.

Owen asked whether the policy should be on the FS agenda or whether more EB discussion is warranted given concerns that many faculty have expressed.

Porter noted that if this is put on the FS agenda it would be new business, so no action would be taken.

There was more minor word-smithing. A motion to add the policy to the FS agenda, with the word-smithed changes, was made and seconded. Motion carried.

Motion by Wallace to extend the meeting 5 minutes. Torrie second. Motion carried.

V. New Business

A. Department Name Change: Department of Plant Pathology and Microbiology

Stalder noted that there was some resistance to the proposal originally, but not now.

Wallace asked if there was any concern with age of letters. Owen replied that he thought it was okay.

Hoffman noted that the CALS dean assured here that there was much faculty discussion and support.

Katz motioned and Smiley-Oyen seconded to put it on the FS agenda as new business.
Motion carried.

VI. Approval of Senate Agenda for January 18, 2011

Katz motioned and Stevenson seconded to approve the FS agenda as modified (i.e., addition of IV.B. and V.A above to the New Business of the FS). Motion carried.

VII. Good of the Order

There was none.

VIII. Motion to adjourn by van der Valk, second by Katz. Meeting adjourned at 5:05 pm.

NEXT MEETING – TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2011

Respectfully submitted,
Veronica Dark, Faculty Senate Secretary, 31 January 2011