

**Iowa State University  
FACULTY SENATE  
Session XIII, Meeting 7  
MINUTES  
February 13, 2001**

**APPROVED**

1. The ISU Faculty Senate met in room 260 of the Scheman Building on Tuesday, February 23, 2001, at 7:30 PM. David Hopper introduced substitute senators and called the meeting to order.
2. Attendance:
  - a) Members Present: S. Agarwal; D. Anderson; R. Angelici; D. Ashlock; C. Baldwin; T. Barta; D. Bullen; D. Catron; M. Chen; G. Colver; E. Cooper; B. Coree; J. Cunnally; P. Dail; M.L. Damhorst; J. Dana; N. Davis; R. Dearin; M. Doran; M. Dyrenfurth; T. Emmerson; D. Epperson; C. Ford; D. Fowles; J. Gilley; J. Girton; R. Hall; A. Hendrickson; J. Hill; P. Hoffman; P. Holden; D. Hopper; S. Huang; J. Hutter; J. Iles; G. Jura; P. Korsching; J. Lamont; P. Martin; J. Maves; C. Miller; G. Miller; C. Mize; F. Nutter; J. Opsomer; G. Palermo; G. Phye; C. Pope; M. Porter; G. Rajagopalan; B. Robinson; J. Robyt; S. Russell; C. Schilling; K. Schilling; D. Simonson; B. Summers; B. Thacker; S. Tim; D. Ulrichson; B. Wagner; C. Walter; T. Weber; W. Woodman; M. Wortman; M. Yaeger; B. Yang.
  - b) Substitute Members: W. Tavanpong for G. Leavens; D. Vrchota for B. Mack; J. Courteau for M. Mattson; D. Jones for Y. Niyo; W. Lee for J. Pine; M. Holmgren for W. Sanford; M. Holland for W. Ware.
  - c) Absent Members: A. Dispirto; W. Dolphin; M. Duffy; W. Franke; G. Hightshoe; G. Koppenhaver; G. Kunz; D. Lewis; D. McCarthy; M. Owen; S. Rodermel; C. Thoen.
  - d) Guests and Visitors: R. Richmond, Provost Office; L. Charles, University Relations; L. Allen, Ames Tribune; L. Kennedy, ISU Daily; F. Whitaker, Provost Office; K. Dixon, P&S Council; G. Sriram, GSS; K. Rau, GSB; T. Wheelock, Task Force on Non-Tenure Track Faculty Member; K. Andre; J. Bloedel, Vice Provost for Research and Advanced Studies.
3. The Consent Agenda was unanimously approved with a minor revision.
4. President-Elect Announcement: Christie Pope announced that the Faculty Spring Conference would be held in Pella, Iowa on March 31 and 31, 2001. The conference title is "Redefining the Borders: The Faculty's New Role in a Changing Society." The program will have six sessions focusing on academic freedom, partnering with corporations, virtual and satellite campuses, intellectual property, the impact on faculty governance, and integration of disciplines.
5. Jim Bloedel, Vice Provost for Research and Advanced Studies, addressed the senate regarding a proposal to increase the recovery of indirect costs. Following a transition period during which indirect costs increase progressively and some transition formulas are applied, the indirect costs will be distributed as follows: 50% to central

facilities, 15% to the principal investigator, 15% to the Office of the Vice Provost for Research, and 20% to colleges, institutes, and centers. The latter return is based on the following: indirect cost distribution will be shared between participating units in order to avoid a competitive framework for these funds among collaborating faculty and units. Also, the actual return to any unit will be based on a formula that includes two factors, one based on the percent of total possible indirect costs actually recovered by the unit and a second based on the number of collaborative units involved in a proposal.

- a) Doug Epperson pointed out that a significant portion of indirect costs is currently returned to central administration. Why isn't the department figured into this instead of the college? Jim Bloedel said this would not be consistent with block budgeting.
  - b) Dan Ashlock said he noticed a security flaw in the collaboration index. What is to prevent listing a "token" principal investigator from, say, the College of Agriculture, for the sole purpose of providing the College of Agriculture with a piece of the indirect cost? In this case, he implies that the "token" researcher would not play a significant role in the contract research, however, the researcher's name would ensure allocation of money to his or her college. Jim Bloedel said this is bound to happen, and we don't have a perfect system.
  - c) Paula Dail asked if the underlying assumption of the proposed cost recovery policy pertains to federal grants only. Jim Bloedel said the policy pertains to all sponsored research.
  - d) Jim Bloedel said a principal investigator would get 15% return only if the funding agency provides full recovery of indirect costs.
  - e) Clark Ford expressed concern that the current 44% overhead "takes a big bite" out of a researcher's grant. He said, "This is like a tax," and asked how much higher than 44% will the indirect costs climb to? Jim Bloedel disagreed with the description of overheads as "tax." Richard Hall supported the description of overhead as tax, and he said, "As the 44% gets larger, we do less research."
  - f) Palmer Holden asked if the Vice Provost would make publicly available a summary of where indirect costs are currently allocated. Jim Bloedel said he would provide this information on his office's website.
  - g) Jack Girton pressed the Vice Provost for an answer to the question of how high the overhead will go above its current 44%. Jim Bloedel said he did not have a firm answer because it depends on negotiations with the Office of Management and Budget. He said it may go as high as 48% and that his office is hoping for a much smaller increase of 2 or 3%. He said his office has a prerogative to ask for 54%. He also said a key problem is that many grants do not currently get full cost recovery. He said 44% ranks ISU low among our peer-eleven universities.
6. Denise Vrchota invited faculty to attend the ISU Comm 2 symposium on February 23-24, 2001 in the Scheman Building. The focus of the symposium is to discuss new ways to deliver undergraduate communication education.
  7. Interim President Richard Seagrave gave a report on strategic planning progress that he presented to the Board of Regents in September. He said the number one goal is to strengthen undergraduate teaching. The metrics for that goal are: increased

graduation rates, increased retention, increased enrollment, an increased percentage of senior faculty teaching introductory courses, high rates of placement for ISU graduates, and the existence of learning communities. The second goal is to strengthen graduate education and research programs. Metrics for this goal include research dollars attracted, rates of graduate student graduation, rates of graduate student retention, and the presence of the Plant Sciences Institute and the National Swine Research and Information Center. Goal three is to strengthen outreach and extension efforts. The metrics for this goal include enrollment in off-campus courses and the number of extension clients served. Goal four is to support an intellectually stimulating university environment, and the metric for this goal is increasing diversity among the faculty. Goal five is to provide effective use of information technology and computation. Metrics for goal five focus on expanding and enhancing services and facilities that support information and computation users. Goal six is to strengthen initiatives to stimulate Iowa economic development. The metrics for goal six are the number of licensing agreements signed, the number of licenses generating revenues, the total revenues generated from these licenses, and the number of companies at the ISU Research Park. The central goal is to become the best land grant university.

8. Old business: Honors and Awards Task Force Report [S00-27]. Ganesh Rajagopalan discussed the task force report that proposes new procedures for selecting university professors and distinguished professors. A new standing committee, to be called the Distinguished Professor and University Professor Nomination Review Committee, is proposed. He raised questions:
  - Should we limit the university professor to those who have achieved the rank of full professor?
  - Can a distinguished professor from another institute be nominated immediately upon joining the ISU?
  - If the university professor is a university citizenry award, should the Faculty Senate be not involved in selecting university professors?
  - Can the citizenry requirement be established in 10 years instead of the current 20-year requirement?
  - Are there advantages of time and thoroughness in having two committees working independently and in tandem?
- a) Joanna Courteau said, according to the Senate Basic Document, the Senate Awards Committee would be involved in award selection for distinguished and university professors. The new proposal violates what was intended in the Basic Document. David Hopper said he would check if we were in compliance with bylaw changes.
- b) Max Porter mentioned that the proposal helps safeguard against the possible corrupt influences of “the old boys network”, but this safeguard is only at the university level. The proposal does not address corrupt influences of the “old boys network” at the college level.

9. New business: Report of the Task Force on Continuing Non tenure Track Appointments [S00-30].
  - a) Christie Pope, the Chair of the Task Force, said the Task force consisted of one member from each college and was selected by the Senate Committee on Committees. She said the Task Force had a desire to hear voices from all parts of the ISU community, including temporary instructors, administrators, student advisors, and so on. The Task Force met individually with members of these constituencies, and the Task Force also held two open forums. From all these sources of information, the Task Force structured a brief report that focuses on principles of a policy for hiring nontenure-track appointments. Christie said the Task Force would incorporate suggestions and revise the report on Friday, February 16, 2001. Christie Pope said the first resolve of the Task Force was to provide a commitment to the tenure system. She said, in general, the Task Force report pertains to those individuals with teaching as a primary responsibility. She said the Task Force heard concerns that the draft report did not adequately give credit to nontenure-track faculty for the valuable service they provide the university. She also said that concerns were expressed that the proposed limit on hiring nontenure-track appointments would produce lay offs.
  - b) Christie reviewed the history of hiring nontenure-track appointments at ISU. In the nineteen seventies, instruction at ISU was largely performed by tenure-line professors. During that time, however, largely nontenure-track appointments performed instruction in the Department of English, and many of these appointments were wives of tenure-line faculty. Exploitation of these nontenure-track appointments followed. As a result, in the late nineteen seventies there was an attempt to put a limit on the number of years that a nontenure-track instructor could teach. At that time, the American Association of University Professors said that if a teacher's length of employment exceeded seven years, that teacher deserved tenure whether he or she was reviewed or not. As a result, many nontenure-track instructors were promoted at ISU in the nineteen seventies. Since then, the number of nontenure-track appointments increased significantly at many universities across the U.S., and working conditions are becoming more and more exploitive at many schools. As a result, nontenure-track teachers are recently organizing into a national employee union. Treated as "gypsy academics," they want more pay, more job security, and more respect. Recently, university teaching assistants have organized into a union. The American Association of University Professors studied the exploitation of nontenure-track appointments and suggests that nontenure-track appointments carry out no more than 15% of university instruction and that no more than 25% be allowed in any one academic department.
  - c) Christie said that we have some problem areas at ISU. English first year composition is one such area. In Veterinary Medicine there is an explosion of hospital cases that prompted the hiring of nontenure-track clinical appointments. And the College of Design is never fully funded so they must use adjunct professors extensively. Adjuncts are needed because they have valuable practical experience.
  - d) Christie said academic freedom a big issue that should not be overlooked. The Task Force learned there is no question people with tenure are able to teach at ISU in a non-self-censored way relative to nontenure-track appointments. The Task Force

found a significant level of self-censorship among nontenure-track faculty, because their job is on the line. Academic freedom is based on job protection. Without job protection, censorship in the classroom prevails, and the quality of education suffers.

- e) Christie also said we need to recognize that the national system for ranking universities is elitist. Universities that have large percentages of nontenure-line instructors put university rankings in jeopardy.
- f) Christie asked, “What does scholarship mean? Creating new knowledge. We are a research university.” We also have temporary instructors teaching the same courses year after year. What is temporary about that?
- g) Christie asked the Faculty Senate to think broadly about solutions. For example, the Faculty Senate cannot lobby the state legislature for money. Instead, we depend on the ISU administration for this, and the prospects are not rosy because the governor is focused on improving K-12 education statewide. Another option is to put a limit on enrollment, and this is difficult to accept since “providing access” is central tenet of the ISU strategic plan. We could also declare that certain of our courses provide basic education and therefore do not require PhDs for instruction. She said other universities are doing this, including Princeton. She mentioned that clinicians at the University of Wisconsin have governance through their equivalent of our Professional and Scientific Council. She asked for questions from the floor.
- h) Dan Ashlock asked if the envisioned group of academic staff would go into merit positions. Christie said, “No.” She said they would either be in Professional or Scientific or they could form an independent unit called Academic Staff.
- i) Christie mentioned the current problem of DEOs having the sole authority to review and hire nontenure-track appointments. In order to safeguard against “DEO caprice,” a central goal of the proposed policy is to shift the review and hiring of nontenure track appointments to tenure-line faculty in a given department.
- j) Clark Miller said the LAS caucus discussed this policy and was concerned that there are at least five job activities in which nontenure-track appointments are used in that college. The LAS caucus is concerned that a setting a university-wide policy will make it difficult for departments to do their own hiring and reviewing.
- k) Rebecca Davis of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction said her department considers nontenure-track appointments to be valued partners. Her department hires a large percentage of nontenure-track appointments, and she expressed concern with putting a university-wide limit on this percentage. She made a case for increasing the flexibility of the policy so that individual departments could work according to their principles. She said her department would welcome making more permanent or longer-term contracts for their valued partners.
- l) John Robyt expressed concern that the proposal creates an unequal and 2-tiered system of faculty . How do people get promoted in this system? He also said the policy violates the strategic plan which says senior professors are to do more teaching of introductory courses. Christie answered that ISU currently has a 2-tiered system and that the new policy would put tenure-line faculty more in control of instruction because they would have a bigger say in hiring.
- m) Bill Woodman said there is nothing temporary about these positions, even though we call them temporary. He said it is immoral to put a time limit on their service and then cast them out the door. He said we play a shell game, where we keep them for 5

years, fire them for a semester, and then bring them right back in the next semester. If we were to “shut off the valve on this today”, the university would fail to meet many important functions and obligations.

- n) Faye Whitaker said the Provost’s office had an ad hoc committee to study the quality of employment of nontenure-track appointments.
- o) Dan Ashlock expressed concern that the core of the proposal is an 84% reduction in temporary staff . For this to occur, he said somebody needs to give the Mathematics Department more tenure lines, or they must say to engineering that ISU cannot provide enough calculus courses for engineers.

10. The meeting adjourned at 9:25 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christopher Schilling  
Faculty Senate Secretary