

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
DRAFT MINUTES EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING**

March 1, 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.; Katz, A.; Loy, D.; Owen, M. (Chair); Selby, M.; Smiley-Oyen, A.; Stalder, K.; Stevenson, G.; Torrie, M.; van der Valk, A.; Wallace, R.

I. Call to Order

President Owen called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm.

II. Consent Agenda

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

B. Minutes, Executive Board Meeting, February 1, 2011

Motion and second to approve the consent agenda. Motion passed.

III. Announcements and Remarks

A. President Owen

1. EB Pictures are scheduled for April 19, 3:00 p.m.

2. Questions have been raised about NTER faculty (non-tenure eligible research faculty) and effort reporting because NTER faculty cannot work on new grants while being paid on old. Provost Hoffman indicated that the deans would like to be able to pay some small portion of the NTER faculty member's salary from the general fund until he or she is able to build up an incentive fund to allow that could support grant writing. President Owen indicated that he will send a memo asking the Governance Council to consider the request.

B. President-Elect Freeman noted that he has not received any topics for next year's retreat.

C. Provost Hoffman

1. Thanks to all who participated in the VP for Extension marathon. All open forum videos will be available tomorrow. The search committee is meeting on Friday. Send comments to Penni Bryant.

2. Dean Oliver is interim dean of LAS. A large number of people have been nominated for the search committee. David Holger, co-chair of the search committee, will begin contacting people this week about serving on the committee.

3. No useful information is available about the budget.

4. The legislature set a cap of 3.5% of faculty going on FPDA. We have never been more than 1.5%

5. Governor Branstrad's appointments to the Board of Regents have been announced but not yet confirmed.

D. Council/Caucus Chairs

1. Senator Katz reported that the College of Design reorganization is moving forward.
2. Academic Affairs Council Chair Hendrich reported that Lib 160 is going into the next catalog as 1 credit.
3. There was a general discussion of the fact that legislators and other nonacademics do not seem to have an accurate perception of what faculty do, other than teach "just a few hours", nor of the value of time spent on research. Among the ideas expressed were:
 - faculty should better explain to students what they do and why
 - perhaps an issue of Visions should be devoted to the theme
 - the lack of appreciation on the part of the public could contribute to low faculty morale

IV. Old Business

A. FH Section 7.2.2.5.1 - Unacceptable Performance of Duty (UPD) [S10-8]

President-Elect Freeman presented a motion to amend UPD based on discussion of the Administrative Committee. The second paragraph will state that the written record will include one post-tenure review (PTR) that has been completed during the time period considered.

After discussion, the motion passed. The rationale will be updated to note the change.

The discussion points that follow include some made before and some after the motion was passed.

Senator Vander Valk asked whether the PTR can be sent outside the department. A restriction on this is in some governance documents.

Senator Katz noted that the question about the relationship between PTR and UPD will come up.

President Owen, who noted that he has remained silent on this issue, decided that it was time to make known his opinion and that he will present his view as part of his comments on the senate floor. He noted that in its Feb 18 newsletter, AAUP stated that all academic personnel decisions should rest on performance variables, so he sees no conflict between UPD and AAUP. UPD and PTR have been linked in the minds of many senators and they should not be linked. UPD came from J&A council, which has the best understanding of conduct policy. President Owen distributed a slide that makes the point visually that the policies are independent; there is a relationship, but they are not linked. PTR remains formative. Also:

- The specificity in UPD is similar to the specificity about tenure.
- AAUP states that administrators meet with faculty if there is a problem.
- There are checks at all levels that prevent a chair from sending forward as UPD a case that does not have merit. A complaint must be based on the written record, not opinion.

There was much emotional discussion concerning whether the written record is simply what the chairs says.

Senator Smiley-Oyen noted that the addition of required peer review in the form of PTR addresses two major concerns in the written comments from the LAS Caucus.

There was discussion of whether PTR should be discussed prior to UPD. There was general agreement that it should.

It was agreed that visual depictions of what happens in PTR and what happens if the case for UPD goes into a conduct proceeding should be developed and presented.

B. Revision of FH section 5.3.5 Post-Tenure Review Policy [S10-10]

President-Elect Freeman noted that there has not been a chance to discuss PTR on the senate floor. The only clear complaint is the issue that a below expectations outcome can be given if the faculty member is below in only one area. The rationale for this is that the only way an improvement plan is mandated is when the person has a below expectations outcome. Improvement is the goal of a "below expectations" outcome. Freeman noted that PTR cannot lead to the possibility of UPD in and of itself. It leads to the possibility of UPD only if the faculty member refuses to come up with a plan to improve. If there is an improvement plan in place, the PTR is satisfied even if there is not actual improvement.

Discussion points included:

- the pros and the cons of the salary bump.
- the positive aspect that getting regular reviews might motivate some associate professors to go up for full.
- whether below expectations in service should really be allowed as a basis for a below expectations PTR.

A motion was made and seconded to add "in areas deemed below expectations" to bullet 3 in 5.3.5.2 to make it clear that the plan should address the below expectations area.

Motion passed without dissent.

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

President-Elect Freeman explained the proposal which removes the expectation of needing an extremely strong record for "early" tenure. He believes that when it gets to the floor there will be support.

D. Proposed University Outcomes Assessment Committee

Senator Hendrich introduced a proposal to establish a university level outcomes assessment committee that will report to Academic Affairs Council. There was a one time a university committee, but it was not part of the senate. This group would evaluate the University wide outcomes including DIP. Creation of the Committee requires action by Senate. If passed, then the proposal would be send to Governance to develop a proposal changing the FS bylaws.

There was discussion of the need for a university level committee when colleges already have committees and whether people might vote against it simply because there are too many committees. Senator Hendrich responded that there are university level outcomes independent of college outcomes. Consideration of these

will only occur if there is a university level committee. An example was ISU Comm. This committee would assess whether it is working out.

V. New Business

A. Name Change: Women and Gender Studies – [S10-13]

President Owen introduced the name change, noting that action on name changes ends with FS approval.

B. FH Section 3.3.2.1 Non-Tenure Eligible Faculty [S10-14]

Senator Stalder noted that this is wording to put into the handbook the changes already approved by the Faculty Senate.

It was moved and seconded to move the wording changes to the FS Consent Agenda along with a rationale statement. After short discussion, the motion passed without dissent.

As part of the discussion, the request was made that the institutionally generated NTE percentages be made available to colleges and departments either through posting on the web or through electronic distribution.

C. FH Section 10.8.1 Academic Program Approval [S10-15]

Senator Hendrich noted that there is different language regarding approval of academic programs in different places. The Academic Affairs Council decided to reconcile the differences by making two modifications to what is on Provost's website. One modification adds a dean to the process. Deans already can defund and kill a program. The second modification is that there must be a documented vote of the related program. A minority report also is allowed.

There was discussion of the need to clarify other parts of the existing FH Section 10.8. Consensus was that the proposal should go onto the Senate agenda with clarification to come later.

It was moved and seconded to extent the meeting for 5 minutes. Motion passed.

VI. Approval of Senate Agenda for March 8, 2011

The old business on the preliminary agenda was reordered so that Early Tenure will be A., Post Tenure Review will be B, and Unacceptable Performance of Duty will Be C. The Non-Tenure Eligible Faculty wording will move to the Consent Agenda. New Business will be A. the Name Change, B. Academic Program Approval, and C. University Outcomes Assessment Committee.

VII. Good of the Order--There was none

VIII. Motion to adjourn was made and seconded. Meeting adjourned at 5:05.

NEXT MEETING – TUESDAY, March 29, 2011

Respectfully submitted, Veronica Dark, Faculty Senate Secretary, 24 March 2011