

Iowa State University
FACULTY SENATE
Session XIV, Meeting 2
MINUTES
October 9, 2001

I. The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m.

II. Members present/absent

1. Attendance:

- a) Members Present: D. Anderson; C. Baldwin; D. Bazyllinski; D. Bullen; J. Chen; M. Chen; D. Coffey; G. Colver; E. Cooper; B. Coree; J. Cunnally; J. Dana; F. Dark; R. Dearin; M. Doran; M. Duffy; T. Emmerson; C. Fehr; A.M. Fiore; J. Girton; R. Gregoral; B. Hand; C. Heising; A. Hendrickson; J. Herwig; J. Hill; P. Hoffman; P. Holden; D. Hopper; J. Hutter; H. Ilahiane; D. Jones; G. Jura; J. Lamont; G. Leavens; P. Martin; M. Mattson; G. Mattson; J. Maves; J. Moses; F. Nutter; J. Opsomer; M. Owen; G. Palermo; G. Phye; C. Pope; C. Post; P. Premkumar; G. Rajagopalan; B. Robinson; K. Schilling; J. Schuh; D. Simonson; L. Stephens; B. Summers; B. Thacker; A. Thieman; C. Thoen; S. Tim; J. Tollefson; W. Trahanovsky; C. Trexler; D. Vrchota; T. Weber; W. Woodman; M. Wortman; M. Yaeger; B. Yang.
- b) Substitute Members: R. Kottman for H. Cravens; D. Russell for D. Epperson; A. Katz for D. Fowles; K. K. Kruempel for S. Russell.
- c) Absent Members: S. Agarwal; I. Anderson; C. Ford; W. Franke; R. Hall; G. Hightshoe; R. Johnson; P. Korsching; C. Mize; M. Porter; J. Raich; J. Robyt; W. Ware..
- d) Guests and Visitors: G. Geoffroy, ISU President; M. Shelley, Nontenure Track Task Force; J. Courteau, Nontenure Track Task Force; M. Torrie, Nontenure Track Task Force; D. Gibson, University Relations; R. Richmond, Provost Office; S. Carlson, Provost Office; Rex Heer, P&S Council; A. Adkins, ISU Daily; J. Christensen, GSS.

III. Consent Agenda

- A. The minutes of September 18, 2001 [01/M/1] were approved.
- B. A change has been made in the docket calendar because we weren't always certain the Faculty Senate agreed with things we passed, e.g., approval for conduct policy ratification. Now we have a new listing that should say President and Provost, letter received on Sept. 24, which moves the process up one step.

IV. Guest speakers

Tom Mitchell and Ben Allen of the ISU Foundation addressed the Faculty Senate. Mitchell reminded the Senate that the foundation seeks to help ISU become the best land-grant university in the country by securing private gifts and grants. The foundation's governing structure is a board of individuals elected by a group of governors. There are 175 members from units across campus and eight standing committees. Fully 93% of the \$10 million operating budget is self-generated.

Minutes of the 10/9/01 Faculty Senate Meeting

This leaves only 7% as a fee for service to support the care and feeding of the data base, which includes the names of 180,000 persons as well as their phone numbers and addresses. Mitchell reported that the ISU Foundation Board supports President Geoffroy's new initiative, Investing in People, and that the governors have ratified it.

Mitchell and Allen then fielded questions:

Q: Why is there so much secrecy surrounding disbursements?

A: We are concerned about confidentiality as it impacts fund-raising strategies. To reveal the names of people we're talking with might make others, upon finding this out, want to talk with them too. Sometimes potential donors do not want everyone in their family to know their plans.

Q: What is the cost of raising money?

A: According to the national average, it takes 14 cents to raise a dollar. To raise a dollar at a cost of only 5 or 6 cents is good, and last year the foundation spent just 8-8-1/2 cents to raise a dollar.

Q: When we see public announcements about your successes, it gives the impression we're doing great. To what extent can we use those funds to offset shortfalls?

A: We need to do a better job of explaining disbursements. A large piece of the cash goes into the endowment; this year about \$60 million was put into it. Another \$35-40 million is transferred to the university per year. There is a fine line between announcing gifts and keeping up the momentum of a campaign, on the one hand, and focusing on what the funds do, on the other. We may have moved too far in the direction of talking about the money instead of explaining how it helps us move toward our goals. One thing we must keep in mind is that 90 to 95% of the gifts we get are restricted; to redirect these funds is not consistent with donor intent. Clearly, though, it is hard to raise money to substitute for budget shortfalls.

Q: Money comes for perceived excellence, so this ought to be capitalized on.

A: Our staff is working hard to do better job of communicating and explaining what we do. There is a great need to strengthen private gift support, especially now in times of tight budgets. We need to work hard on the new campaign, Investing in People, and we hope you will give us your suggestions. Basically it is the faculty that make it possible for us to raise funds. If you weren't doing the job you are, we couldn't do ours. It's your work as faculty that makes our success possible.

V. Reports by the Faculty Senate President and the Provost

A. Report by the President of the Faculty Senate

President Pope announced that she wants to start a new tradition by giving a State of the Faculty Report, in part because we often become so engrossed with small matters that we lose sight of the larger picture of what constitutes major trends in American higher education and the interrelationships between them and issues at ISU.

Pope noted, first, that the landscape is changing as we move from an industrial society to a technical one, a change that poses particular challenges for which Novartis is emblematic. The company wanted to fund a department at UC-Berkeley in exchange for a hand in governing matters; at issue is how much control these entities should have.

Minutes of the 10/9/01 Faculty Senate Meeting

Second, the demographics are changing with public universities looking more like private institutions. At the University of Iowa, 18% of the budget comes from state appropriations; at the University of Michigan, 15%.

Third, the convergence of broadcasting, telecommunications, etc. blurs distinctions between entertainment and news, just as click-and-brick universities, brick universities, and click universities blur old distinctions in higher education. Such convergences raise intellectual property issues that make it difficult to know what we control. An added problem is the race for money to support sports.

A fifth development is the unbundling of the teaching/service/research triad. More teaching is now being done by non-tenure track faculty with a saving of salary and benefits. The result is an incredibly shrinking faculty.

Six, the corporate model is becoming more important. Faculty and students are not just the core of the university, they are the university. Faculty are not simply one of the many stakeholders; instead, the role they play is central.

The larger picture of higher education brings many challenges to ISU. One of the things we must do is strengthen our faculty by making it more female and more multicultural. In 1971 the ISU faculty numbered 221 female and 893 male, a ratio of roughly one to four. Another issue we need to work on is a family leave policy. Pregnancy here is treated like an illness, and we need to consider a leave policy that will enable faculty members on family leave to receive half of their salary with the other half used to pay for temporary replacements. More child care is also needed.

A pressing matter in our curriculum is to study our diversity requirements to determine if we are meeting the goals we have set. Grade inflation remains a problem, making it hard for faculty to hold the line. A recent study shows that our students study very little, and we need to consider whether coaches are contravening matters.

Ultimate authority over Iowa State rests with the Board of Regents. Given the unique culture the academy, said Pope, why not have a faculty member from one of the three universities serve on the Board? She noted that the University of Kentucky has a faculty representative, and said that when she discussed idea this with the faculty senate presidents of UI and UNI, it was welcomed.

Everything, of course, is now overshadowed by the budgetary crisis, which threatens to reduce the number of faculty because of the high percentage of the budget that salaries take up. Already there is a greater reliance on non-tenure track faculty. So far, Pope noted, there has been no declaration of financial exigency that would permit the firing of faculty. Nevertheless, even though last year there were 30 positions open and this year there are 70, the faculty are teaching more students because of increased enrollments. The erosion of faculty lines continues, and we must take a stand.

B. Report from the Provost

Minutes of the 10/9/01 Faculty Senate Meeting

Provost Richmond reported that Task Force on Strategic Effectiveness and Budget Priorities is trying to find \$5 million centrally for spring courses. President Geoffroy and his advisors say construction projects can also be deferred to save \$13.8 million. This leaves \$5 million that we need to cut, and there are two ways to solve this: one, ask the units to come up with cost-cutting measures; or, two, institute a furlough of three to five days during the year. With the saving of \$1 million a day, we can save \$5 million in five days.

The advantage of a furlough is that it delays decisions a little while. Richmond noted that the Task Force meets weekly, that two members here are on it, and that there is a meeting tomorrow morning to review the guidelines we have proposed to the President to handle the \$18.6 million cut plus the anticipated decrease next year for 2003. Provost Richmond noted that his office will work with deans and DEOs to develop plans quickly and that the Task Force may add guidelines.

Although there were no new questions from the general faculty for the Provost to answer this week, several questions were posed by senators during the meeting. They include the following:

Q: How will the additional \$57 million shortfall announced this week impact us?

A: We don't know. I hear \$50 million or \$108 million. Coalitions are being forged to find ways the state can deal with this. It is possible that the reduction may be spread across state agencies.

Q: I don't favor furloughs unless we have plan for what we will look like in two years.

A: One recommendation to the President is that the plans not be across the board that the deans and DEOs turn in. We may consider program elimination by identifying units that aren't quite as strong, so when the cycle turns up we can reinvest in a substantial way.

Q: Will there be furloughs during the holidays?

A: We're looking at how to implement a furlough, for which there are many models, such as a break during the semester when facilities can be shut down. Spreading the furlough through the second half of year may be important for merit staff. We need to decide how broadly the furlough will apply through the university.

Q: What about A and B-base faculty in this furlough?

A: A-base make more money than B, usually. Some believe these groups needed to be treated differently.

Q: If you implement the furlough over the break, you are stealing from us. You are not simply taking our vacation days. Why not furlough us in the Spring?

A: Perhaps.

Q: You should do it in the teaching week: if it is done during a holiday, no one hurts besides us. Students should know about it and go home to let their parents know.

A: This has come up.

Q: What has already been the impact of cut? Have any of the centers on campus been reduced? Photo service? Microproducts service?

Minutes of the 10/9/01 Faculty Senate Meeting

A: Yes. Those are two I know about.

V. Old Business

A. Continuing Non-tenure track Appointments

As last year's Chair of the Task Force on Non-Tenure Track Appointments, President Pope, seeking to avoid the merest hint of bias, asked Denise Vrchota to chair this part of the meeting. David Hopper, current Chair of the Task Force on Non-Tenure Track Appointments, began the discussion by noting that one-third of the members of Faculty Senate are new since the final revision of 4/10/01 submitted by the Task Force. New motions can be entertained, and so far only three have been made on this and all by the same person: Senator James Hutter. Hutter and Hopper led the discussion on the three motions.

Revised Motion #1:

"Delete old item #3 on caps (5% and 15% limits--passed 40-18 at the April Faculty Senate meeting) and replace it with the following:

"ISU subscribes to and will adhere to AAUP guidelines and standards for part-time and non-tenure track faculty, including the AAUP recommendation that part-time and non-tenure track faculty appointments be limited to no more than 15 per cent of the total instruction within the university, and no more than 25 percent of the total instruction within any given department."

Hutter reminded senators that the revised motion changes the caps from 5% and 15% to 15% and 25%. He also announced that a new motion has been worked out between himself, Hopper, and Counsel for AAUP, which the Task Force has approved, entitled Revised Motions to Amend the Task Force Report. Total instruction can be defined in different ways, whether by FTE, SCH, class section, or a combination of those variables; the goal is to limit instruction to 25%.

Revised Motion #2:

"Delete item #5 on barring non-tenure track faculty from the Faculty Senate (we currently include all "regular" and "adjunct" faculty) and substitute the following:

"Non-tenure track faculty will be included in the departmental and institutional structures of faculty governance. Individuals who are degree candidates from ISU and teach as part of their educational experience will not be given faculty rank nor counted as non-tenure track faculty."

Hutter noted that the revision is a compromise.

Revised Motion #3:

"Delete all of item #7 and substitute the following:

"Except for retired faculty, individuals filling temporary vacancies, and those whose appointments are less than full-time, individuals holding faculty positions will hold either probationary or continuing appointments. The performance of faculty members on renewable term appointments, full-time and part-time, will be regularly evaluated with established criteria appropriate to their positions. The university will define the credentials and the quality of schol-

Minutes of the 10/9/01 Faculty Senate Meeting

arship it requires of faculty members in different academic positions and will make appointments and decisions regarding compensation and advancement based on the criteria specific to the position.”

The following part of the Revised Motions was also discussed:

“In addition to adjunct faculty, the Faculty Senate recommends to the administration that these additional non-tenure track faculty designations be considered for use at ISU:

- Lecturer and Clinician (a limited term, full-term or part-time appointment not to exceed three years and renewable for no more than a total of six years.
- Senior Lecturer and Senior Clinician (a continuing, full-time or part-time appointment that may be bestowed after a total of six years and requiring the vote of the appropriate promotion and tenure unit; must be peer reviewed by tenured faculty at least even seven years). Any Senior Lecturer or Senior Clinician recommended for termination will be accorded all the rights of due process normally reserved for tenured faculty members.”

In discussing Revised Motion #3 (old #7), Hutter commented on the classifications and stressed that this document is not saying that such persons have tenure but that they do have due process. Knight of AAUP says it is tenure-like but not tenure. Hutter acknowledged that caps do constrain some of our units.

Revised Motion #4 (old #8):

“Add the following language (after the italicized words) to item #8 so that it reads, in whole:

“The Faculty Senate will exercise oversight of compliance with these recommendations and will accept and review applications for exceptions to this policy from the Provost, consistent with shared governance.”

Hopper stated that these are the compromise recommendations being brought forward and noted that they are acceptable to the Task Force and to Hutter.

On behalf of the Task Force, it was moved by Hopper that these changes be accepted; Hutter seconded the motion. Discussion of the proposed motion followed, with several senators expressing concern that the guidelines to be adopted were those of the AAUP. Hopper acknowledged that decision of what is good for ISU should reside here and not be subject to an organization somewhere else, but pointed out the importance of establishing principles so this can then go forward eventually to receive the approval of the President and the Board of Regents. The details must be carefully worked out, and this is best done in a conference committee rather than the full senate.

Palmer Holden, suggesting that the first three lines be deleted so that the recommendations we make will be our own and not those of the AAUP, asked if this could be considered as a friendly amendment. Hopper said we can do what Holden suggests, but that it may not be what we should do. Noting that is one thing to have a rationale on principle and another thing to recognize reality, Hopper said the Task Force has tried to address the environment we’re operating in right now. Michael Duffy noted that the Revised Motions suggest that if the

Minutes of the 10/9/01 Faculty Senate Meeting

guidelines of AAUP change, then ours will change, which Hopper conceded. Joanna Correau pointed out that the benchmark of 5% and 15% came from Purdue, not AAUP, and urged us to follow AAUP because it is a national benchmark. Max Wortman, acting as parliamentarian for the meeting, noted that Correau was speaking against Holden's motion and asked if anyone else wished to speak on behalf of it. No one responded. Instead Hutter spoke against it, stating that he does not believe that the first three lines are throwaways. They are intended to say to the administration that there are guidelines in this matter. Several senators commented that have not read the AAUP guidelines and were reminded by Hopper that they are easily available on the ISU website by clicking on AAUP. ***Motion by Holden to amend Revised Motion #1 by striking the first three lines did not pass.***

A motion was made to amend Revised Motion #1 by adding the date of 10/19/01 so that Revised Motion #1 now reads as follows (the additions appear in italics):

"ISU subscribes to and will adhere to AAUP guidelines and standards for part-time and non-tenure track faculty, *in effect as of 10/09/01*, including the AAUP recommendation that part-time and non-tenure track faculty appointments be limited to no more than 15 per cent of the total instruction within the university, and no more than 25 percent of the total instruction within any given department."

Motion by Palermo to amend Revised Motion #1 by adding the date of 10/09/01 passed.

Vrchota proposed that the senate vote on whether it is ready to vote on Revised Motion #1, and Senators voted yes by acclamation. President Pope wondered if the matter could be held over to the November meeting, and the Senate voted yes.

VI. New Business

A. Resolution about holding faculty lines

President Pope reported that the Executive Board of the Faculty Senate unanimously approved a resolution concerning the sharp decline in tenure and tenure-line faculty and recommended that the Faculty Senate also approve it:

"Whereas, tenure-line faculty are essential to maintaining and enhancing the quality of undergraduate and graduate education and the research and service missions of the university;

"Whereas, there has been a steady decline in the number of tenured faculty from 1,284 in 1985-86 to 1,077 in 2000-01;

"Whereas, the number of tenure-line faculty has increased by +4.1% and 25.0% respectively, at the University of Iowa and the University of Northern Iowa from 1985-2001, and declined by -11.3% at Iowa State University during the same period;

"Whereas, during the period 1985-2001 the number of FTE P&S staff has increased by 68.6% from 1,320 to 2,226 positions;

"Whereas, the university administration cut 30 faculty positions in 1999-2000 and another 70 faculty positions in 2000-2001;

"Whereas, enrollment has increased by nearly 1,400 students, from 26,431 in 1986 to 27,823 in 2001;

Minutes of the 10/9/01 Faculty Senate Meeting

“Whereas, President Geoffroy stated at the September 18, 2001 Faculty Senate meeting that his highest priority is ‘to increase the number of tenure and tenure-track faculty’;

“BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

The Faculty Senate strongly recommends to the university administration that there be no further reductions in the number of tenure-line faculty at Iowa State University.”

In discussing the resolution, it was suggested that the Faculty Senate have a Task Force whose purpose is to work with the President to increase the number of tenure-track faculty.

Resolution was passed.

B. Priorities

Possible priorities for the 14th Session of the Faculty Senate were reviewed: (1) responding to the Regents’ areas for further study; (2) filling the position of an ombudsperson; (3) increasing daycare facilities; (4) adopting a family leave policy; (5) refining our basic documents; (6) ensuring a Faculty Senate voice in such matters as the student government’s initiative to provide student evaluations of faculty and the Electronic Learning Task Force’s recommendations that require Faculty Senate follow-up because of their impact on the curriculum and the necessity of technical support for faculty; and (7) instituting permanent oversight committees of athletics and the ISU Foundation. President Pope stated that the priorities do not appear in a particular order, adding that they would go out to different councils to work on. Discussion followed about the priority of setting up a council for the ISU Foundation and an athletic council, which Kevin Schilling suggested we broaden to include oversight of Greek organizations.

It was moved and seconded that the Senate add a committee to monitor the academic performance of Greek houses. Discussion that followed sought to broaden it further, given the number of hours many students at ISU are studying. Wortman noted that last year Barbara Licklider informed the Senate that the Council had been dissolved so asked us to have a group meet with her; we believe we need a broader group.

Motion was proposed by James Hutter that we establish councils for athletics, for the ISU Foundation, and for oversight of student progress.

Motion to extend the meeting for five minutes was passed.

President Pope noted that there was a motion to delete #7 and send it back to the Executive Board for consideration, and Duffy stated that there was a motion to add an item to #7 on the floor. Adding oversight of academic performance at Greek houses was withdrawn by Schilling with Pope adding that the Executive Board will include a more general look at the matter of oversight.

Motion to delete #7 on the list of priorities and return it to the Executive Board was passed.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Constance Post,
FS Secretary