

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
DRAFT MINUTES EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING
February 1, 2011
3:00-5:00 p.m.
107 Lab of Mechanics**

Members Present: Agarwal, S.; Anderson, D.; Bratsch-Prince, D.; Dark, V.; Freeman, S.; Holger, D.; Katz, A.; Owen, M. (Chair); Palermo, G.; Selby, M.; Smiley-Oyen, A.; Stevenson, G.; Torrie, M.; VanDerZanden, A.M. (for D. Loy); van der Valk, A.; Wallace, R.

I. Call to Order

President Owen called the meeting to order at 3:03 pm.

II. Consent Agenda – 3:02 p.m.

A. Agenda, Executive Board Meeting, February 1, 2011

B. Minutes, Executive Board Meeting, January 11, 2011

Written minutes were distributed.

van der Valk motion, Anderson second to approve the consent agenda. Motion passed.

III. Announcements and Remarks.

A. President

Owen commented on the heavy email traffic regarding the Unacceptable Performance of Duties policy. The traffic shows that people are paying attention. We should set up a blog for future discussions.

B. President-Elect

President-Elect Freeman had no additional comments.

C. Provost

1. Effort Report Policy

Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince distributed an FAQ about the Effort Report Policy, which came about as result of an internal audit and NSF's request to better document grant-related work. There has been input from many sources. The policy adds to the work load of chairs and administrators, but there is no choice. Those who are B-base and paid off grants in the summer are most affected.

A. Smiley-Oyen and M. Selby noted that this is unrealistic. It assumes a 40 hour work week with nothing else done. Bratsch-Prince agreed but stated that 100% means effort means ALL effort to NSF.

Associate Provost Holger noted that the accounting is easier at other institutions where, for example, 50% during the academic year means that 50% year around.

Bratsch-Prince noted that implementing will take time. The need is to change the idea of 9 months plus 2 months summer to 11 months total.

Owen noted that there had been discussion on the document for months, but no changes in the document had been made as a result of the discussion. Chairs are under the impression that this is still a draft and they have not presented it to their faculty. If it is the final policy, it needs to be on the Faculty Senate Consent Agenda.

Holger stated that chairs have been told the policy is final. Selby stated that many do not know that it is final.

M. Torrie suggested that the Question and Answer sheet needs to appear with the policy on the Provost page.

G. Palermo suggested that it be put under the provost comments in the agenda because if it is simply put on the consent agenda, then there is there implied action by the senate.

After discussion it was decided to include the policy in the in the FS packet and highlight that provost will discuss it.

2. VP for Outreach

Holger noted that on campus interviews for five VP of Outreach candidates have been scheduled and will be posted next week.; there are two people each of the next two weeks and then one the beginning of the following week. The forum for each will be live webcast but will not be posted until all five have been interviewed.

D. Council/Caucus Chairs

There were no reports.

IV. Old Business .

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

There was much animated discussion concerning the points made in the email traffic and the description of the relationship between the UPD policy and the Post-Tenure Review (PTR) policy. It was noted that the policies are different but remain interlinked for many faculty. Much of the discussion was supportive, but there was also the question of whether the policy was needed.

Owen distributed a revised version of the UPD policy including revisions based on comments from Engineering and Business was distributed. As in all conduct cases, as soon as a complaint is accepted, the faculty member is informed, provided with a copy of the complaint, and given the opportunity to file a rebuttal. The faculty member also can ask for one of the three members of the committee to be removed with no questions asked. Finally, any completed PTRs are part of the written record.

D. Anderson noted that these changes were all considered friendly; they are not substantive changes.

Past-President van der Valk stated that he still will not support the policy because it does not have a definition of unacceptable performance as required by AAUP. He believes the policy must have peer review within the department and he will be presenting an alternative motion.

Owen noted that his motion would not be allowed if it contains the department peer review, which was already voted down.

There was discussion of what could be brought forward on the FS floor. Parliamentarian Porter noted that anyone who voted on the prevailing side may ask for reconsideration of the department peer review.

There was much discussion of whether the policy as written was or was not meant to lead to termination and whether it could be used by chairs to get at faculty with whom they disagree. Among other topics the discussion addressed the question of whether the policy is designed for unacceptable performance per se or unwillingness to remedy the unacceptable performance and whether the policy should be under FH Section 3 (Appointment Policies and Procedures) rather than Section 7 (Faculty Conduct).

It was moved and seconded to bring the revised policy to the FS floor. The voice vote was not unanimous, but the motion carried.

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

Freeman noted that the policy had been introduced at the Senate, but that no comments had been received.

V. New Business – 4:00 p.m.

A. FH Revision of 5.2.1.3 Early Tenure [S10-12]

Freeman presented the policy, which the Promotion and Tenure Committee thought would not be controversial. The Administration supports the change. Basically, it gets rid of the need to show "extraordinary" performance.

B. Proposed University Outcomes Assessment Committee [S10-13]

The proposal is from S. Hendrich. It is a reinstatement of a previous committee rather than proposal of a new committee. Because of Hendrich's absence due to illness, discussion was postponed until the next meeting.

VI. Approval of Senate Agenda for January 18, 2011

Changes to the draft agenda including clarification of the numbering for the Unacceptable Performance of Duty policy to 7.2.2.5.1, removal of the proposed outcomes assessment from New Business on the Senate agenda, and adding that the provost will discuss the effort report policy.

VII. Good of the Order – 4:18 p.m.

Porter noted that the DOT website shows all roads in and out of Ames are closed because of the blizzard.

VIII. EXECUTIVE SESSION: Honorary Degrees

The meeting was moved into Executive session at 4:26 and out at 4:56.

VIII. Motion to adjourn was made and seconded. Meeting adjourned at 4:58.

NEXT MEETING – TUESDAY, March 1, 2011

Respectfully submitted,
Veronica Dark, Faculty Senate Secretary, 25 February 2011