

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING MINUTES
JANUARY 10, 2017
3:00-5:00 P.M.
107 LAB OF MECHANICS**

Present: Bigelow, T. (Academic Affairs); Bratsch-Prince, D. (Associate Provost); Brown, J. (Business); Butler, A. (Secretary); Day, T. (President-Elect); Derrick, T. (FDAR); Freeman, S. (CALs); Holger, D. (Associate Provost); Kimber, M. (Veterinary Medicine); Martin, P. (RPA); Padgett Walsh, C. (LAS); Rippke, S. (Parliamentarian); Russell, D. (Human Sciences); Sponseller, B. (Governance); Sturm, J. (President); Wallace, R. (Past President); Wickert, J. (Senior VP and Provost); Zarecor, K. (Design)

Substitute: C. Schwab for M. Owen

Guests: Dark, V.; Donley, B. (BOR); van Leeuwen, H.; Mulholland, K. (BOR; regentkm@iastate.edu); Smiley-Oyen, A.; West, C.

I. Call to Order

President Sturm called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

II. Consent Agenda

A. Agenda, Executive Board Meeting January 10, 2016

B. Minutes, Executive Board Meeting December 6, 2016

Past President Wallace moved to accept the consent agenda. Senator Butler seconded. The motion passed without dissension.

III. Special Order: Bruce Rastetter, BOR President; Katie Mulholland, BOR President Pro Tem; and Bob Donley, BOR Executive Director

President Sturm introduced the guests from the BOR office. He expressed concern about budget reversions and frustration that the joint resolution from Student Government and Faculty Senate about differential tuition was not considered by BOR in December. Senator Freeman added that it is “extremely rare” for the administration, faculty, and students to agree on an issue. He thought that this widespread agreement would slow down BOR’s deliberations about tuition. He expressed frustration that ISU was asked for input, but the input offered did not make a difference.

Executive Director Donley objected to the claim that it didn’t make a difference. He identified a communication problem. While ISU FS thought that a proposal had been made, BOR did not receive any proposal. The first mention of differential tuition by ISU President Leath occurred at a town hall meeting. There was no formal discussion with BOR members or BOR office. Governor Branstad was the first to comment on the proposal, rejecting it. In the meantime, ISU President Leath’s use of the university airplane came to dominate the news cycle, displacing consideration of tuition.

Executive Director Donley said that the process should involve conversations with at least BOR Office. BOR needs to consider the impact on the other two Regents universities. There was no communication.

President Sturm asked how best for ISU faculty to provide their perspective to BOR. Regent Mulholland said that BOR has a schedule, which requires two readings of any proposal. BOR needs to consider the effect of proposals on the other two universities. She thought that there should be listening sessions. She would want to see a model of the effect of the proposal five years out. (She noted the importance of models for helping everyone to understand. She recalled the opposition that some people had to performance-based pay proposal, and the difficulty encountered in getting people to understand exactly what was being proposed, notwithstanding clear models.)

Senator Zarecor asked Provost Wickert to confirm Executive Director Donley's claim that there was no proposal. Provost Wickert said that he deferred to Executive Director Donley and Regent Mulholland's claims. His understanding was that CFO Miles Lackey was in conversations with BOR.

Executive Director Donley replied that there was no formal presentation.

Executive Director Donley provided an example of a good process. UI students wanted a tuition tax credit. They asked BOR for a meeting, which was attended by Executive Director Donley, Regent Mulholland, Regent Johnson, and Regent **MARK**. BOR representatives explained what they were willing to do and asked whether the students understood the fiscal impact. Students had talked with some legislators, but did not move formally until after they secured BOR agreement. BOR said that they would support the proposal if it worked for all three universities. Executive Director Donley thought that that was a good process.

He added that this avoids surprises. SG President Staudt had passed a resolution in SG and sent it to BOR without discussing the matter with BOR first. In fact, the students had not mentioned the matter at their breakfast meeting with BOR, but sprang it upon BOR in the meeting. Had they talked about the matter privately first, a frank conversation could be had. But at the BOR meeting, all comments are in the public domain.

Senator Butler said that she understood that BOR rejected the request for a faculty regent, but asked whether there was a way for faculty to serve in an ex officio capacity at BOR meetings. Absent that, how could faculty become aware of items under consideration (but not yet formal proposals) by BOR? Executive Director Donley said that **KRISTEN FAILOR** works for BOR but advocates for ISU. She will work with the state legislature while it is in session. Executive Director Donley added that he is always available for discussion.

Regent Mulholland added that she would like faculty to use **Failor** instead of cutting into their own time. She said that if an ad hoc group is working on something, they should contact Executive Director Donley or her.

Senator Zarecor said that she felt that BOR had failed to get enough revenue for the university. She said that ISU is in a crisis situation. Instruction for each Iowa student costs \$6,000-7,000 more than we get from their instate tuition. 64% of our 37,000 student population is instate, and it continues to grow. The Enrollment Management Task Force (EMTF) made recommendations to increase the GPA for transfer students, to institute changes to the RAI, and other recommendations. She expressed concern that there does not seem to be any urgency from BOR. She added that ISU faculty had worked on proposals concerned performance-based funding and TIER efficiency. But the efficiency changes did not generate much revenue, because we are already lean; and the performance-based funding, which would have shifted \$40 million our way, failed. The lower/upper level tuition differential was proposed in June. Senator Zarecor said that she was frustrated to hear that there was no communication or sense of crisis.

Senator Bigelow said that while he is grateful for the amount of support the state provides, he is disgusted that UI gets a lot more per student from the state and from tuition and continues to mismanage those allocations. They get rewarded for being poor stewards of the state's money.

Executive Director Donley expressed skepticism about whether UI “plays dirty.” But he added that the formula for allocation to the three universities was established before he or Regent Mulholland began working with BOR. He added that BOR (especially BOR President Rastatter) articulated that they share frustration with the state's allocations.

Executive Director Donley pointed out that ISU faculty had supported UI faculty in their criticisms of UI President Harreld. Then in the performance-based funding (PBF) discussion, UI faculty rallied against the proposal, and convinced legislators not to move on the proposal. BOR does not have the authority to make changes, only to make suggestions to the legislature. He suggested that senators may have not heard much, because there has been less discussion in the legislature.

Executive Director Donley added that the state will take 4.5% of appropriations back from this year's budget. He does not know what next year will look like. There is no support in the legislature to use reserve dollars (\$750 million) to address the budget shortfall. And they do not want to cut into the promised tax credits or K-12 education. He added that our base numbers will go down 2.5% in FY18 even if we get the 2% we asked for. He said that although our tuition is lower than our peers, there is no appetite in the legislature to raise it. If we raise tuition, they will lower our appropriations.

Executive Director Donley added that it might be time for faculty to work with the administration in being more vocal and advocating for what they believe is fair. Senator Zarecor replied that that's what faculty thought they were doing.

President Sturm said that he had spoken with CFO Lackey about this. PBF was a way of distributing resources across the universities in a manner proportional to the number of instate students taught. The budget reversion of 4.5% and the possible 2.5% decrease

indicate that the state is going to fund us less. ISU continues to teach the largest number of instate students. Is it reasonable to ask BOR to distribute the reversions differently, so that those universities that serve more instate students will receive smaller cuts? UI will continue to get out-of-state tuition dollars.

Regent Mulholland replied that she met with Iowa State Senators and Republican leaders, who would be willing to work with BOR in possible proportional allocations. But anything called “performance-based funding” will be rejected. The proposal would have to provide a clear model and explain the effects on the universities.

Senator Russell said that if instate students are a net revenue cost at ISU, then it would make sense for ISU to reduce the number of instate students. This wouldn't be fair, but is it something we should be thinking about? Regent Mulholland said that ISU is the choice for many of our students. Some companies (e.g. Rockwell Collins) specifically hire ISU graduates. The legislature is interested in hearing ways to ensure that state dollars flow to Iowa students.

Senator Martin underscored that our claim is not that we do not want instate students; instead, we can't afford instate students. Regent Mulholland agreed with that way of framing the issue.

President-Elect Day expressed concern about students who are underprepared for ISU coursework. ISU does not have control over admissions standards. Helping underprepared students cuts into our ability to serve the best and brightest students. Although we love serving all students from Iowa, it is a difficult model to maintain. In reply, Regent Mulholland said that she would need to see whether transfer students or students from certain regions (e.g. certain rural areas) require more resources to support. She would need to see data. Then, de-allocations can be distributed differently to the universities in proportion to need. This might help to get the ratio of students to professors closer to 16:1.

Executive Director Donley asked where that number came from. Senator Zarecor said that it is an abstraction. Some senior level courses have 40-50 students still. Provost Wickert said that the number is computed by the total number of students and total number of faculty. Senator Bigelow said that the ratio is 30:1 in engineering; some junior/senior class sizes are as big as 250. Provost Wickert said that getting to 16:1 would require hiring 423 new faculty. Even if we had the salary money for the hires, there is no place to put them.

Regent Mulholland noted the different perspective of the problem concerning capacity issues rather than entrance qualifications. It's clear that ISU has problems with capacity, space, and availability to serve students.

Senator Bigelow said that on average 10% of students fail. Some students take a class five or more times until they graduate. He thought it would be better to get to those students earlier to help them identify a different major where they will be successful.

Raising admissions standards as a university or within a college may not be the ideal solution, but it might reduce bandwidth in a lot of courses.

Regent Mulholland asked whether students who fail a course are put on a waitlist for the course. Senator Zarecor said that we are not allowed to do that.

Regent Mulholland repeated her concern about whether students from certain areas are underprepared for ISU coursework. Senator Bigelow said that we do not currently have the ability to track that. Perhaps the new ERP system would help with that. Currently information about students is broken down by income, but some students' families have a farm as their primary asset.

Regent Mulholland suggested guaranteeing students a seat if they accept by a certain date. Senator Zarecor replied that we are not allowed to limit that way.

Senator Zarecor repeated a suggestion from EMTF to raise the GPA requirement for transfer students. Associate Provost Holger said that such a proposal is coming forward from Academic Standards and Admissions Committee.

Senator Martin suggested that it might be helpful to identify how many ISU students are from different rural counties. Then contact their legislators and explain to them how their students are affected by the restricted state resources. Regent Mulholland thought that was an outstanding suggestion. Associate Provost Holger said that we already have the data.

Executive Director Donley asked whether a certain percentage of community college transfer students take more time to go through ISU courses once they have an AA. Associate Provost Holger said that students with an AA do not tend to struggle; they tend to perform comparably to students who enter straight from high school. Senator Bigelow added that different community colleges do a better or worse job. Associate Provost Holger said that BOR provides information to community colleges about the grades and success rates of their students. Senator Zarecor said that transfer students to Architecture still take seven years.

Noting the time, President Sturm summarized the main points of the discussion. He noted that the increase in enrollment coupled with the budget reversion have created a lot of frustration and impact on how we do business. Regent Mulholland said she understood the frustration and was struck by how the discussion focused on the impact on students. She added that she was surprised when Republican leads suggested something like PBF (without the name). Regent Mulholland also said to send her a copy of the EMTF report.

IV. Announcements and Remarks

A. President

President Sturm repeated the news about the mid-year budget reversion of 4.5%. There will be a 2.25% reduction for AY 2017-2018. He said that we should be able to avoid pay cuts or furloughs. But at this point, an across-the-board 3.5% pay raise is off the table.

The Open Access proposal passed through RPA Council. The Provost and department chairs are now considering it. President Sturm thought it might reach EB by February.

President Sturm encouraged EB members to consider running for President-Elect.

B. President-Elect

None

C. Senior Vice President and Provost

Provost Wickert said that the full document of the Governor’s budget proposal is on the department management website, including spreadsheets and other documentation. He emphasized that this is the first step in a long process.

He added that midyear cuts are difficult because half of the year’s allocated money has already been spent. \$25 million has been cut from BOR institutions. The total state budget is \$7 billion, and December projections showed a \$100 million shortfall. A significant fraction of the budget (K-12 education, Medicaid, tax credits – nearly 2/3 of the budget) was taken off the table for the midyear cut. (He confirmed Executive Director Donley’s observation that the state has a \$720 million rainy day fund, which state officials don’t want to touch.)

ISU’s Academic Affairs budget is \$650 million. Much of that is paid for by tuition revenue. The budget reversion is not across all revenue, but just state appropriations. Provost Wickert has been discussing with the President’s Office what can be handled centrally and how best to protect the academic colleges. He emphasized that this situation is different from that in 2008, 2009, and 2010.

For FY18, Governor Branstad proposed a reduction of half of that amount in the base. FY17 budget will be down 2.25%. In FY19, we may see an increase again.

Provost Wickert said he was enthused by the discussion with Executive Director Donley and Regent Mulholland. He had not heard anything about differential allocations to the three universities.

Provost Wickert said that his office would continue to work with RPA on handling the budget reversion and planning for FY18. He said that we would likely slow down hiring, not fill unfilled positions, postpone renovations, and not purchase equipment.

President-Elect Day asked whether Provost Wickert thought it would be worthwhile for faculty and administrators to work on “PBF” (without the name). Perhaps that could be implemented in the 2018-2019 distribution? Provost Wickert replied that this was the first he had heard of the proposal. He has not discussed the matter with ISU President Leath. He thought there was a lot of merit in the idea. He expressed reservations about whether such a campaign would be successful. We had marshalled everyone (alumni, businesses,

political supports, extension and outreach, etc.) to support PBF, and the other side marshalled their supporters. If we do this again, would the outcome be any different?

D. Council Chair Reports

None

E. Caucus Chair Reports

None

V. Unfinished Business

A. FH 5.2.4.2.6 Factual Information - [S16-11] – Derrick

Senator Derrick said that the proposal put forward is a compromise between him, Professor Dark, and Senator Butler. The proposal retains a department's ability to decide if the P&T committee's letter may be viewed by the candidate. The parties could not agree whether to restrict the candidate from viewing the department chair's letter. The proposal permits departments to decide on that matter. Senator Derrick's amendment would prohibit departments from allowing candidates to see the chair's letter.

Senator Zarecor asked whether department chairs are allowed to communicate the outcome to the candidate. Senator Derrick replied that FH requires chairs to do so. Senator Freeman added that negative decisions must be communicated in writing.

Professor Dark clarified that the proposal says that no candidate has a right to see the chair's letter, unless the department's P&T document grants the candidate the right. The amendment prohibits department P&T documents from granting that right. So the amendment restricts the chair's ability to share his or her letter with the candidate.

Senator Brown asked why the difference of opinion. Senator Derrick replied that he thought the candidate should not be able to see any of the documents. Senator Brown said he disagreed. What's the level at which the governance should be decided? Associate Provost Holger argued against "local control": every level after the department, there is a difference about what to expect from the department committee or chair's letters, and the letters have to explain whether the department shares letters or not.

Senator Sponseller suggested introducing a checkbox on a form to indicate whether the candidate was able to see the letters. Senator Brown thought that this spoke in favor of granting all candidates the right to see letters. Associate Provost Holger replied that some departments don't want to share the information.

Senator Butler said that we recognize different disciplinary norms in P&T expectations in research output and teaching; similarly, why can't we respect different disciplinary norms in what is shared? Associate Provost Holger replied that the department committee and chair's letters need to do serious evaluation, not just summary of facts. He thought that people might be reluctant to offer honest evaluations if the candidate can see the letters.

Senator Freeman said that when he wrote external letters and was told that the candidate will see the letter, that affected how he wrote the letter. Provost Wickert agreed with Senator Freeman. When candidates have access to the letters, he has seen cases where the candidate writes rebuttals to every letter. Allowing candidates to see letters creates an environment of debating judgments all the way up the line. When Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince asked FS to consider this issue, the goal was to create uniformity across the university. Differences in personnel decisions, promotions, dismissals, etc. create institutional risk. He added that EB should not assume that he will sign off on any proposal that passes FS. He said that he would prefer to stick with the current ambiguous FH language than the current proposal.

Senator Brown asked for clarification. He thought the FH currently allows departments to decide which documents are shared. Provost Wickert replied that FH is ambiguous. Very few departments interpret FH in that way. If the current proposal were broadly adopted, committee and chair's letters would lose much of their value (honest evaluation and frank comments about the quality of the candidate's work). In turn, this will make college level decisions harder, because the letters will be shorter.

Senator Martin said that one voice had not been represented well in this discussion: untenured professors. All assistant professors he spoke with wanted greater transparency in the P&T process and would like to see the committee and chair's letters. We need to offer arguments for why it's not positive for them to see the letters.

Senator Bigelow contested Senator Freeman's anecdote. This is not a peer evaluation, but an evaluation by a boss. Any chair who is not willing to be honest in his or her evaluation is not doing his or her job. Senator Freeman countered that chairs already have a difficult job; this would make their jobs more difficult. He added that annual review is different from P&T review. If he were chair and this policy were in place, he'd write a one paragraph letter and then have a frank conversation with the dean.

Professor Dark thought the conversation had veered away from the motion.

Associate Provost Holger challenged an assumption that all unshared evaluations will be negative for the candidate. He pointed out that weak cases have made it through the promotion process because the chairs were candid and didn't exaggerate to make the candidate sound stronger. Chairs admit that it is a borderline case and discuss the strengths and weakness, offering an argument for why this case should be supported.

Senator Freeman moved to postpone further discussion to the next meeting. The motion passed with one dissension.

B. FH 10.6.4 Dead Week – [S16-10] – Bigelow

Professor Smiley-Oyen said that the previous discussion with EB was for a single motion: no assessments on Thursday or Friday of Dead Week. She added that she thought this motion better aligned with what students want.

Senator Bigelow said that the motion needs to be clear about what types of assessments are permitted and what types are forbidden. He thought the distinction should be drawn by how much (what percentage) of the grade the assessment is worth. Professor Smiley-Oyen replied that the list of exceptions clarifies this.

Senator Freeman thought that the motion could stay as “no assessments” without further qualification. Projects can be due on Wednesday instead. Senator Butler replied that oral presentations cannot be rescheduled; other presentations are being given on Wednesday. Past President Wallace said the same holds for final practical exams. Professor Smiley-Oyen said that labs are also excluded.

Senator Bigelow worried that while the exceptions are clear to us now, in ten years they might not be as clear. He thought this problem could be resolved by specifying a percentage. Senator Zarecor pointed out that problems arise only if students file a complaint. She thought that students would not bother for a quiz worth a few points.

Mr. West said that students asked SG to come up with a policy, because they don't have time to submit a complaint during Dead Week. He wanted students to be able to spend their time studying for whole semester exams rather than the details of the last three weeks.

Senator Butler thought that it was too heavy-handed to pursue a policy. Perhaps an awareness campaign would reach the desired effect without limiting faculty autonomy. Professor Smiley-Oyen disagreed.

Professor Smiley-Oyen said that she had concerns about tests in the Testing Center. An exam may be available to take on Friday, but new content was given on Friday and so the student is not ready to take the exam on that day. Mr. West said that he had heard cases where the test opened on Wednesday, but new content was given on Friday. Associate Provost Holger said that there have been some violations in what faculty are doing with the Testing Center.

Senator Brown suggested that this is a similar issue to quizzes delivered through Blackboard. Students have the flexibility to take the quiz on their schedule. Professor Smiley-Oyen said that that's a different issue of time management. Senator Brown replied that he thought this proposal would require an end date on Wednesday. She replied that she wanted to avoid the situation where students are locked into taking an exam on Thursday or Friday because of new material.

Senator Bigelow asked whether take home exams are just homework with a lot of points. Senator Freeman and Professor Smiley-Oyen disagreed.

Senator Freeman moved to change the motion to: “No quizzes, tests, or exams may be given on the final Thursday and Friday of the semester. Presentations and Projects that have been on the syllabus for the semester can be given on these two days.” President-Elect Day seconded. The motion passed without dissension.

EB agreed to leave renaming Dead Week to another time.

Senator Freeman reminded Senator Bigelow to point out that if this motion passes, it wouldn't take effect until next Fall.

C. Statement on Faculty Core Values – [S16-12] – Wallace

Past President Wallace acknowledged that the statement is not urgent.

D. FS Bylaw Change: Committee on University Services – [S16-8] – Martin

No comments.

E. Merchandising Undergraduate Certificate – [S16-9] – Bigelow

No comments.

VI. New Business

None

VII. Approval of the January 17, 2017 Faculty Senate Agenda

EB agreed to remove items VII(B) and (C). Senator Freeman moved to accept the modified agenda. Past President Wallace seconded. The motion passed without dissension.

VIII. EXECUTIVE SESSION

A. Honorary Degree

Senator Freeman moved to enter Executive Session. Senator Butler seconded. The motion passed without dissension.

IX. Good of the Order

None

X. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.