

**Iowa State University  
FACULTY SENATE  
Session XIII, Meeting 9  
MINUTES  
April 10, 2001**

1. Attendance:
  - a) Members Present: D. Anderson; R. Angelici; D. Ashlock; C. Baldwin; T. Barta; D. Bullen; D. Catron; M. Chen; G. Colver; B. Coree; J. Cunnally; M.L. Damhorst; N. Davis; R. Dearin; A. Dispirto; M. Doran; M. Duffy; M. Dyrenfurth; D. Epperson; C. Ford; D. Fowles; W. Franke; J. Girton; R. Hall; A. Hendrickson; J. Hill; P. Hoffman; H. Hohmann; P. Holden; D. Hopper; S. Huang; J. Hutter; J. Iles; G. Koppenhaver; P. Korsching; J. Lamont; D. Lewis; P. Martin; J. Maves; G. Miller; C. Mize; Y. NiyoJ. Opsomer; G. Palermo; J. Pine; C. Pope; M. Porter; G. Rajagopalan; B. Robinson; C. Schilling; K. Schilling; D. Simonson; B. Summers; C. Thoen; S. Tim; D. Ulrichson; B. Wagner; C. Walter; W. Ware; T. Weber; W. Woodman; M. Wortman.
  - b) Substitute Members: M. Torrie for P. Dail; J. Huss for J. Dana; T. Spektor for G. Jura; W. Tavanapong for G. Leavens; K. Kruempel for S. Russell; M. Holmgren for W. Sanford.
  - c) Absent Members: S. Agarwal; E. Cooper; H. Cravens; T. Emmerson; J. Gilley; G. Hightshoe; G. Kunz; B. Mack; M. Mattson; F. Nutter; m. Owen; G. Phye; J. Robyt; S. Rodermel; B. Thacker; M. yaeger; B. Yang.
  - d) Guests and Visitors: R. Seagrave, ISU Interim President; R. Richmond, Provost Office; L. Charles, University Relations; L. Allen, Ames Tribune; L. Kennedy, ISU Daily; F. Whitaker, Provost Office; T. Wheelock, Task Force on Non-Tenure Track Faculty Member; C. Kostelnick, DEO English Department.
2. The Iowa State University Faculty Senate met in Room 220 – 230 of the Scheman Building on April 10, 2001. Senate President, David Hopper, called the meeting to order at 7:45 P.M. and introduced substitute senators.
3. Bill Woodman moved that the Report from the Council on University Resource Policies and Allocations be removed from the consent agenda. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously. Approval of the modified consent agenda was subsequently moved, seconded, and carried unanimously.
4. Senate President Announcements: David Hopper announced that the Faculty Senate will have a special meeting on April 24, 2001, to discuss the recently-completed draft of the Faculty Conduct Policy. He also announced that it is important for the Faculty Senate to do a better job recognizing memorial resolutions. He also announced that Warren Dolphin resigned from the Senate, leaving vacant his position as Chair of the Council on University Resource Policies and Allocations. Bill Woodman agreed to substitute for Warren in this capacity.
5. President-Elect Announcements: Christie Pope thanked the faculty for making the March 30, 2001 Faculty Spring Conference a big success.
6. Associate Provost Announcement: Faye Whitaker thanked the Faculty Senate for developing a faculty survey on university budget cutting preferences. She said the administration forwarded the results of that survey to the Board of Regents.

7. Council Reports:

- a) Bill Woodman, Chair of the Council on University Resource Policies and Allocations, presented the following statement: “We the Iowa State University Council on University Resource Policies and Allocations strongly support continuation of the retirement incentive program, reflecting both faculty and administration needs, as a component of an overall faculty development policy that is uniformly applied to all eligible faculty.” He also presented a brief summary of the results of the faculty survey on university budget cutting preferences. Chris Schilling said the Faculty Senate website posts an incomplete summary of that survey because it excludes the section where faculty are asked to write specific recommendations on how to remedy the budget shortfall. He suggested that the Senate website should post a comprehensive summary of the survey with verbatim written comments of the faculty. Bill Woodman said the Council on University Resource Policies and Allocations preferred not to post these verbatim comments because of the possibility of identifying specific survey respondents. He said the Council preferred posting on the website a brief summary of these verbatim comments.
- b) Max Wortman presented three motions from the Academic Affairs Council:

The Academic Affairs Council moved that the Senate approve: (1) the change from a joint Ph.D. program to an independent Ph.D. program in Foodservice and Lodging Management, and (2) the change of the Ph.D. and M.Sc. programs to the name of Foodservice and Lodging Management [S00-33]. The motion unanimously carried.

The Academic Affairs Council moved that the Senate approve a Master of Arts program in Teaching English as a Second Language / Applied Linguistics [S00-32]. The motion unanimously carried.

The Academic Affairs Council moved that the Senate adopt the ISU Comm Principles Statement [S00-31]. The motion unanimously carried.

8. Report of the Task Force on Continuing Non-Tenure Track Faculty Appointments [S00-30].

- a) Christie Pope expressed concern with the March 6, 2001 vote of the Faculty Senate to exclude a maximum hiring limit on non-tenure track faculty at ISU. Starting with some background information, she said the ISU administration favors non-tenure track faculty because this is more economical than hiring tenure-line faculty for teaching purposes. Unlike non-tenure track faculty, tenure-line faculty are expected to perform sponsored research. In order to find time to conduct sponsored research, tenure-line faculty are becoming more willing to relinquish teaching responsibilities to non-tenure track faculty. She cited statistics showing that, in the past 15 years, ISU significantly decreased the number of tenure-line faculty, whereas the University of Iowa and the University of Northern Iowa significantly increased the number of tenure-line faculty. She argued that the continued erosion of the number of tenure-line faculty harms ISU’s reputation and quality of education. She also said that, in contrast to tenure-line faculty, non-tenure track faculty are selected without the input of the general faculty and that non-tenure track faculty are often selected primarily from a pool of local candidates resembling “an old boys’ network.” This practice is unfair to women and to those people throughout the nation who want to be eligible as candidates for semi permanent positions at ISU. She also said undergraduate program accreditation could be hurt by the continued replacement of tenure-line faculty with large numbers of non-tenure track faculty. As tenure-line faculty are replaced with non-tenure track faculty, she suggested it is possible that the administration may someday require non-tenure-track faculty to perform sponsored research. Before proposing a hiring limit on the number of ISU non-tenure track faculty, the Task Force unanimously supported the American Association of University Professors’ document on good practices in this area ([www.aaup.org/ptguide.htm](http://www.aaup.org/ptguide.htm)). That document applies to community colleges and research institutions. That document recommends an institution-wide 15% hiring limit and a 25% hiring limit for any

particular department. The Task Force suggested a motion to replace the March 6, 2001 motion to eliminate hiring limits.

- b) David Hopper spoke in favor of Christie's position that hiring limits should be imposed. He argued that the quality of education at ISU is at risk when (1) curriculum, advising, and instruction are not under the control of tenure-line faculty and (2) the Faculty Senate gives carte blanche to the administration to hire as many non-tenure track faculty as it prefers. He offered the following motion from the Task Force:

Instruction by non-tenure track faculty shall be limited to no more than 15% of the total instruction within the institution and 25% of the total instruction within any given department. Such limits shall neither be exceeded when calculated in terms of FTE nor shall they be exceeded when calculated in terms of student credit hours. Such targets shall be achieved within five years of the date of approval. These hiring limits are taken from the American Association of University Professors' September 28, 2000 Guidelines for Good Practice, Part-time and Non-tenure-track Faculty. In that document, the hiring limits are set high enough to include community colleges. Max Wortman seconded the motion.

- c) Jim Hutter called the motion out of order, because the Senate addressed this matter on March 6, 2001. Max Porter, the parliamentarian, said the chair (the Senate President) determines if the motion is out of order. Jim Hutter said it is out of order for the Faculty Senate President, who spoke in favor of the motion, to direct discussion on this motion. Dean Ulrichson, Past-President of the Senate, agreed to chair the discussion. Dean moved that the motion offered by the Task Force be in order. Jim Hutter moved to appeal the chair's decision. Jim Hutter's motion to appeal was seconded and defeated by a voice vote.
- d) Jack Girton spoke in favor of the Task Force motion and said the guidelines of the American Association of University Professors are reasonable.
- e) Tony Hendrickson argued that, if the motion passes, economic pressures would result in fewer faculty teaching more students. Neal Harl agreed that this economic pressure is serious, however, he argued in support of the Task Force motion because (1) ISU's reputation and quality of education will suffer without hiring limits, (2) the Task Force motion counteracts the continued unfair working conditions and exploitation of non-tenure track faculty at ISU, and (3) the motion sets an important principle of placing the faculty in charge of selecting their academic co-workers. He said this is the most important issue he has had to deal with in his 30-plus years of teaching at ISU.
- f) Bill Woodman said the motion is "about the soul of the institution." He said that, while serving on the Task Force, he was initially skeptical of hiring limits, however, he changed his mind upon hearing many non-tenure-track faculty speak of (1) exploitive working conditions and (2) what appears to be a widespread pattern of self-censorship in the classroom, self-censorship because of fear of administrative reprisals. He said passing the motion is not about "feathering the nest" (job protection) of tenure-line faculty. He said passing the motion is essential if we wish to preserve the university as the "last honest broker of honest information in this society."
- g) Dan Ashlock said the Mathematics Department opposed hiring limits at the time of the March 6, 2001 meeting of the Faculty Senate. However, that department is now targeted to meet those limits because of budget cuts. He said the university budget is going up from tuition, donations, and grant overhead. Only one fraction is going down: that from the legislature. He said many faculty are cash producing by virtue of the research overhead they generate. He spoke in favor of the Task Force motion.
- h) Greg Palermo asked for clarification of the meaning of "student credit hours" in the Task Force motion. Christie Pope said the Task Force defined this as the total number of student credit hours per course. Greg offered a friendly amendment that this clarification be inserted into the Task Force motion. Christie Pope accepted the friendly amendment.

- i) Doug Epperson suggested it is important for the Task Force motion to have a clear definition of “student credit hours.” He said the proposed hiring limits are potentially excessively harsh if “student credit hours” is defined as the number of hours spent in the classroom per student. However, if “student credit hours” is defined on a course section basis, he would support the Task Force motion. He moved to replace the first sentence of the Task Force motion with the following language: “Instruction by non-tenure track faculty shall be limited to no more than 15% of total course sections instructed in the institution and 25% of total course sections instructed within any given department.” The motion was seconded.
  - j) An unknown gentleman (I’m sorry I didn’t catch his name) spoke against Professor Epperson’s amendment, arguing that maneuvering these numbers to give more flexibility to individual departments could raise a damaging public perception that “we are getting around teaching students.” He warned that a movement to reduce funding for higher education prevails in the state legislature. He argued in favor of hiring limits because parents complain that students are taught by “non-real professors” (i.e., non-tenure track faculty).
  - k) An unknown woman (I’m sorry I didn’t catch her name) spoke in favor of Professor Epperson’s amendment. She moved to replace the first and second sentences of the Task Force motion with the following language: “Instruction by non-tenure track faculty shall be limited to (1) no more than 15% of the number of individual course sections instructed in the institution including the number of section subdivisions taught in the institution and (2) no more than 25% of individual course sections instructed in a given department including the number of section subdivisions taught in a given department. Such limits shall neither be exceeded when calculated in terms of FTE nor shall they be exceeded when calculated in terms of the number of individual courses and sections including the number of section subdivisions.”
  - l) Palmer Holden moved to postpone the discussion until the May 1, 2001 meeting of the Faculty Senate. The motion was seconded and carried by a voice vote. Senate President, David Hopper resumed the position of meeting chair.
9. Richard Seagrave, ISU Interim President, addressed the Senate. He said he wants to promote communication with university employees regarding the ISU budget cuts. He said it is clear the legislature will not allocate enough money for full salary increases at ISU, although the university is required by law to allocate enough money for Merit Staff salary increases. He said he does not want to create a situation where anybody’s take home pay goes down next year. If the statehouse budget allocation continues to decline, the Board of Regents will need to address the problem of whether ISU should get smaller or reduce the quality of services offered. After President Geoffrey arrives in the summer, the administration will start an in-depth study of ISU’s future and the types of academic programs offered. He suggested that this is an opportunity to plan for some reconfiguration. He set 3 priorities: try to preserve quality of undergrad education, try not to chase any students away at this point, and try not to lose momentum in those areas in which we are trying to become extraordinarily good at, like Plant Sciences. He suggested that eliminating the cost of the 4.8 million dollar administration in Beardshear Hall is too small to have a substantial impact on the overall budget shortfall. He thanked the faculty for participating in the survey on budget cutting preferences. David Hopper thanked Richard Seagrave for being so forthcoming in providing financial data to the Senate Executive Board. The Senate gave Richard Seagrave a big applause.

10. The meeting adjourned at 9:35 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christopher Schilling  
Faculty Senate Secretary