

**Iowa State University
FACULTY SENATE
Session XIV, Meeting 3
November 13, 2001**

Members present/absent

1. Attendance:
 - a) Members Present: S. Agarwal; D. Anderson; I. Anderson; C. Baldwin; D. Bazylnski; D. Bullen; D. Coffey; G. Colver; E. Cooper; H. Cravens; J. Cunnally; J. Dana; F. Dark; R. Dearin; M. Doran; M. Duffy; A.M. Fiore; C. Ford; D. Fowles; W. Franke; R. Gregorac; R. Hall; B. Hand; A. Hendrickson; J. Herwig; J. Hill; P. Hoffman; P. Holden; D. Hopper; J. Hutter; H. Ilahiane; D. Jones; P. Martin; M. Mattson; G. Mattson; J. Maves; J. Moses; F. Nutter; G. Palermo; C. Pope; M. Porter; C. Post; P. Premkumar; J. Raich; G. Rajagopalan; B. Robinson; J. Robyt; S. Russell; J. Schuh; D. Simonson; L. Stephens; B. Summers; B. Thacker; A. Thieman; C. Thoen; S. Tim; J. Tollefson; W. Trahanovsky; C. Trexler; D. Vrchota; W. Ware; T. Weber; W. Woodman; M. Wortman; B. Yang.
 - b) Substitute Members: S. Freeman for J. Chen; D. Russell for D. Epperson; J. Badenhope for G. Hightshoe; H. Van Auken for R. Johnson; T. Besser for P. Korsching; K. Kruempel for J. Lamont; W. Tavanapong for G. Leavens; M. Al-Kaisi for M. Owen; A. Deare for K. Schilling; R. Holland for M. Yaeger.
 - c) Absent Members: M. Chen; B. Coree; T. Emmerson; C. Fehr; J. Girton; C. Heising; G. Jura; C. Mize; J. Opsomer; G. Phye.
 - d) Guests and Visitors: R. Richmond, Provost Office; Rex Heer, P&S Council; R. Peterson, Ames Tribune; J. Christensen, GSS; L. Charles, University Relations.

I. Call to order

The meeting of the Faculty Senate in 275 Scheman was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Christie Pope, President of the Faculty Senate. Following the introduction of substitute senators, Pope welcomed Honorable Barbara Finch, Johnie Hammond, and Jane Greimann. Pope stated that Teresa Garman was unable to attend.

II. Consent Items

Motion to accept the minutes of October 9, 2001 [01/M/2], the agenda for the meeting of November 13, 2001 [01/A/3], and the Faculty Senate Docket Calendar for 2001-2002 [01/C/3] was approved.

III. Guest speakers

A. Johnie Hammond (D-Story)

Johnie Hammond expressed her regret that legislators have become so important to ISU this year but said it was good to be at the meeting of the Faculty Senate, her first in twelve years. Hammond then addressed the matter of how we can interact better with the legislature and with the legislators. The most popular way now is e-mail. For her, snail

mail mostly brings reports. Phone calls are also important, both at the capitol and at her home which serves as her office on the weekend. Hammond also said it is easy to get legislators out to chat over coffee, and that on Fridays they are at home to chat with constituents. Another way of reaching them is through a lobbyist, including a university lobbyist. We could also attend the \$2.98 breakfast for all the legislators, although it does not provide an opportunity for much in-depth discussion. Other venues include the League of Women Voters Forum held on the fourth Saturday of each month, which you can attend in person or watch on cable. In conclusion, Hammond recalled that the GSB used to sponsor a Friday afternoon club at which legislators would talk about issues of concern to students. The same, she noted, could be done for issues of concern to faculty.

B. Jane Greimann (D-Story)

Jane Greimann stated that as a graduate of ISU, she wants to continue the tradition of providing education to poor students. Of the students she polled, 1/3rd of students were the first in their family to attend college. Greimann, who credits her experience at ISU with broadening her horizon and teaching her critical skills, believes the legislature should now use the emergency fund. She decried the number of hours ISU and other agencies have spent revising budgets, noting that it causes a loss of moral and raises anxiety and that it is being done at the very time the government is trying to downsize. According to Greimann, it is not clear how much savings will be realized by early retirements. What is clear, however, is the need to revise the taxing scheme in the State in order to achieve a more progressive tax. Work is also needed on an Internet tax as well as taxes on gasoline and cigarettes. Another possibility is to reverse tax cuts, and Greimann stated she would especially like to reverse "Get tough" laws. Iowa spends \$26,000 a year on each prisoner but only \$2600 a year on each student in the K-12 system. She concluded her remarks by encouraging faculty senators to tell people how hard they are working and the difference they are making in students' lives. In doing so, she also urged the senators to get involved with their favorite political party.

C. Barbara Finch (R-Story)

Barbara Finch enjoined the senators to use their legislators, stating that this is her job and that she will answer questions by e-mail just as soon as she knows the answer to our questions. Affirming her decision to attend the entire meeting of the Faculty Senate in order to hear what concerns us, Greimann stated that it is not her job or the job of other legislators to go down to the Capitol with their own opinions. She also suggested that we could use our web page to greater advantage. Encouraging the senators to invite legislators to things faculty think may be of interest to their representatives, Finch ended her remarks with the reminder that "We're here."

Questions/Answers:

Q: Hutter: I am delighted that we have three women legislators. Do you have a notion of offsetting increases in other places to balance the loss of \$800,000,000? What have you done to gain revenue?

A: Hammond: We have good models to project what happens to the revenue stream. In 1997 the Senate Republican Caucus had a sophisticated model for looking at tax cuts. Their own staff

said we had a surplus, we can pay off the cuts over the next four years, but in 2001 demand will hit the wall and you will be in trouble. There was an \$807 million cut that year. That continued to 1998, along with a 10% income tax cut together with an argument about taking a 15% cut. In 1997 we did a property tax cut, an exchange whereby the state assumed some of the county costs. For the first time in 19 years, I had a chance to vote for a progressive tax cut, and I did. Jane and I, though, wondered if we should postpone it for a year. You'll feel it in January. I like the tax cut, even though now we can't afford it.

Q: Hutter: Have there been any enhancements?

A: Hammond: There have been increases in hunting fees and licenses, but these are all very small and nowhere come near to offsetting the drain on budget.

A: Finch: The state income tax ran about 2%, sales tax is up 7%, but corporate tax is down 12%. We're not getting venture capital. Businesses, which are just starting to average \$15 an hour with benefits, may need tax incentives. As far as tax cuts are concerned, I've only been around for one year. I don't believe in utilities being taxed and do not feel comfortable repealing the tax cut on utilities.

Q: Porter: A cut for one year is one thing, but what about cuts for multiple years? How soon can we get back to normal?

A: Finch: In 1988 they said this was the lowest increase in revenue and would last one year. Now we know it will be two years. There may be some glimmer if we can level off.

A: Greimann: We can take comfort in the fact that many states are in the same boat. It is also clear that other universities may not be able to increase their funding, except for Texas and California.

A: Hammond: I have deep concerns about maintaining quality at the universities. We need to identify essential services, prisons, courts, public safety, fire, etc. We also need to look at the safety net. I know there's a big hole there for children, the elderly, the poor, the mentally ill, etc. There is also a need for transportation. Clearly, all will see the pinch and it will last for at least two years.

Q: Pope: We often hear that this is a state with a graying population that perhaps is not as supportive of education, K-12 and higher, as it has been in the past.

A: Finch: I say no, that they understand that you need more education for a better job. The money we have been able to set aside-- unfortunately, from gambling-- can be used. That is a glimmer of hope.

A: Greimann: Sometimes it looks as though community colleges are pitted against universities and each of them against K-12. I would like to see seamless education. In the legislature we have a new plan for regional academies to teach advanced language and science, a move that I believe will help us rather than divide us.

IV. Reports

A. President Pope - none

B. Provost Richmond answered questions from the Faculty Senate about salary

increments, budget reductions, and undergraduate programs:

1. Salary increments

Question: At the September meeting of the Faculty Senate, the Provost reported the following average salary increments: All faculty, 3.78%; DEOs, 3.90%; VPs to Asst. Dean, 4.02%; senior administrators, 5.45%. The pattern of these average increments suggests that someone in central administration accepts a Law of Rising Proficiency, according to which administrators are better in discharging their duties than faculty members, and higher level administrators perform better in their jobs than do lower level administrators. Does the Provost actually believe this absurdity? Or has he some other explanation of the pattern of reported average increments?

Answer: Salary Data for Faculty and Administrators

Average increase for	FY02	FY01	FY00	FY99
all faculty	3.8%	3.8%	4.3%	4.5%
all administrators	4.1%	4.3%	4.6%	4.4%

1,387 is the denominator for the average increase for all faculty;
118 for administrators (A&B-base administrators - all faculty)

Highest increase given to any individual (both due to retention effort)
faculty (non-administrator) - 36.96%; administrator - 13.31%

Number of faculty increases exceeding 5.45% = 204 (14.7% of faculty)
Number of administrators exceeding 5.45% = 16 (13.6% of administrators)

Number of faculty increases exceeding 4.02% = 340 (24.5% of faculty)
Number of administrators exceeding 4.02% = 36 (30.5% of administrators)

Number of faculty increases exceeding 3.9% = 374 (27.0% of faculty)
Number of administrators exceeding 3.9% = 47 (39.8% of administrators)

Our FY01 salaries are below the Peer 11-mean for administrators and faculty
(nonadministrators) -- 99.07% and 98%, respectively

2. Budget Reductions

Question: After looking at the guidelines for the strategic reduction of the university budget which the task force has established (<http://www.iastate.edu/budget/documents/guide-lines.shtml>), I was wondering if the Provost could comment on them further. Particularly numbers four and five strike me as being very vague. I appreciate both the task force and the President's commitment to academic excellence rather than just knee-jerk criteria about the level of external funding or number of student clock hours. Nonetheless, the criteria as formulated by the task force give no clear guidelines for departments and

what they can expect in the budget re-evaluation process. Is there any way for the task force at this point to clarify how it understands these criteria?

Answer: The guidelines for FY '03 Budget Reductions include the following:

- (1) Budget reduction plans should maintain consistency with the university's mission and strategic plan.
- (2) Budget reductions should be accomplished through differential reductions across all units and levels of the university, not through across-the-board cuts.
- (3) Budget reductions should be accomplished by identifying activities, programs, and services to eliminate or significantly reduce in scope, recognizing that these changes could result in the loss of faculty and staff positions.
- (4) Plans should have a strong focus on academic excellence. Programs, activities, and services that are currently of very high quality should be preserved along with those that have high potential to achieve that quality level in a relatively short period of time. Conversely, programs, activities, and services of lower quality should be eliminated or significantly reduced in scope.
- (5) Programs, activities, and services that are central to the academic mission of the university should be identified and appropriately supported in order to continue improving the quality of undergraduate education, student access to courses and services, and faculty and staff development.
- (6) Plans should reflect the university's commitment to building a diverse faculty, staff, and student body.
- (7) Wherever possible, plans should reduce non-academic services, eliminate units that provide services that can be readily obtained external to the university at a reduced cost, and incorporate the charging of fees for the provision of university services as a substitute for state support.

3. Undergraduate Programs

Question: To what extent do the CTE and the Office of the Associate Provost assist the undergraduate teaching mission of the University, and to what extent in a time of scarce resources could limited resources be channeled from them into line departments for the purpose of retaining faculty (permanent or temporary) or filling positions left open in recent years? Insofar as faculty are directly responsible for undergraduate teaching, it is they who should be consulted on these matters, though I would have no objection were students, as customers, allowed to provide their views.

Answer: Provost Richmond first outlined the role of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Programs:

- (1) Maintains the quality of our undergraduate programs, one of our most important strengths;
- (2) Helps to implement the strategic plan's focus on learning and preparing for our re-accreditation visit in 2005/06;
- (3) Supports institutional initiatives focused on learning such as learning communities, ISU-Comm, revision of student evaluation of teaching, and leadership for development of program for assessing student learning;
- (4) The Center for Teaching Excellence provide opportunities for (1) faculty to develop

pedagogies that enhance student learning; and (2) faculty to develop expertise in the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Provost Richmond then reviewed the role of the Faculty Senate in the development of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Programs and the Center for Teaching Excellence.

- (1) Senate developed and approved ISU's institutional policy on student outcomes assessment;
- (2) Senate authorized the creation of the Center for Teaching Excellence;
- (3) Senate approved our current promotion and tenure policy with its emphasis on the scholarship of teaching;
- (4) Senate was a central player in the development of ISU's current strategic plan and other related initiatives such as ISUComm and the revision of student evaluation of teaching process;
- (5) The Senate and the Office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Programs are creating an environment that demonstrates ISU's future orientation and continuing vitality as a provider of learning, and this will be important as we seek re-accreditation under new criteria in 2005-2006.

Richmond noted that Iowa State University's institutional accreditor, the North Central Association's Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, recently changed its name to the Higher Learning Commission. Along with this change came a new mission: "Serving the common good by assuring and advancing the quality of higher learning."

Finally, Provost Richmond noted which administrators have responsibility for undergraduate programs at Peer 11 institutions and Regents universities:

Peer 11 institutions

University of California at Davis	Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies
University of Minnesota	Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education
North Carolina State University	Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs
University of Wisconsin	Associate Provost for Academic Affairs
University of Arizona	Vice President for Undergraduate Education
Ohio State University	Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Stds.
University of Illinois	Various Associate Provosts have responsibility
Michigan State University	Assistant Provost
Texas A&M	Associate Provost for Undergraduate Programs
Purdue University	Various Associate Provosts have responsibility

Regents universities

University of Iowa	Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education
University of Northern Iowa	Associate Provost

According to Provost Richmond, all of these institutions have central units comparable to the ISU Center for Teaching Excellence.

Questions for the Provost also arose during the meeting:

Q: Hopper: We will continue our debate tonight on the Non-Tenure Track policy. There are two issues here: One, the AAUP looks at continuing NNT positions as tenure like. Do you share that view? Second, in terms of those positions, we may have faculty who want to move to a clinical position, but the President has said he does not approve of that.

A: This is a very important policy and one that we badly need for a number of reasons. I do not believe you are fully on the right track, though, because your current proposal will create a shadow tenure system. People should have renewable appointments, yes, but departments should be allowed not to reappoint if the person is no longer needed. There is also an issue of whether tenure-track or tenured faculty should be permitted to move to clinician status. This is true now in Vet Med. The President is concerned lest persons who are not yet tenured will decide to shift to NNT to avoid some of the rigors of the tenure review. I fully agree with him on that point. It is also true that there may be some who have met the standards but want to shift because they no longer want to be responsible for research.

Q: Woodman: I have a comment and a question. As a person involved in passing the promotion and tenure document, we believed that it would make people better teachers. Unfortunately, the way it has been put into operation emphasizes research on teaching, not teaching itself.

A: My interpretation of the document is that individuals who choose to emphasize teaching and learning must demonstrate not only that they are good teachers but that they disseminate that information in two ways: internally, not just in the classroom but in helping colleagues; and externally, by engaging in scholarship that allows your approaches to be disseminated elsewhere. There will be many ways of assessing that, one of which is to have your report accepted by a journal. A faculty member who simply does a good job in the classroom but makes no effort to disseminate that would not be considered to have met acceptable criteria for promotion.

Q: Woodman: In many departments, including my own, a frequent comment is that scholarship on teaching is only publications.

A: I don't think so.

Q: Hutter: Many are asking why we should care about the AAUP in the matter of non-tenure track faculty. Do you have any problem with the two statements together?

A: As a member of the AAUP at Indiana University, I generally supported it because it represents faculty quite well at the national level. The current AAUP president is an old colleague of mine at Indiana. If you can put in your motion that people can be non-tenure track, with exceptions in math and English, then I can be supportive of it. We need to be able to terminate people for two reasons: unsatisfactory performance and no longer a need.

V. Old Business

A. Continuing discussion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty Report [S00-30]

President Pope, noting that she has been moving this forward slowly because one-third of

the senators are new, announced that the December meeting of the Faculty Senate will be devoted almost entirely to the issue and said that perhaps we can complete it at that time. Pope then turned the meeting over to Denise Vrchota, who reminded the senators that at the October 9 meeting they approved the first amendment with an amendment. When asked by Vrchota to comment on the matter, David Hopper emphasized that the recommendations are not his but those of the Task Force, adding that he personally disagrees with some of them. Hopper then displayed the Revised Motions on the overhead, noting that we got through the first revised motion at the last meeting and are now on the second, which replaces the original #5.

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.”

Noting that Vet-Med has residents and interns for whom teaching is part of their training program, Brad Thacker said the statement should be clearer. Jim Hutter, who affirmed that they will be included in institutional structures of faculty governance of which the Faculty Senate is one, said that the entire sentence came out of the AAUP document.

Motion to pass Revised Motion #2 was adopted.

Revised motion #3 was then displayed on the overhead along with the non-tenure track designations on the second page of the “Revised Motions to Amend the Task Force Report”.

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 scholarship 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.”

“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.”

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.”

In considering these revisions, Hutter wondered if we had enough time for #3 and #4 because the discussion moved immediately to #4. Hopper stated that #4 allows for exceptions in such departments as English, given the concern that departments may come back saying they need this. Revised Motion #4 provides a degree of flexibility while maintaining this kind of appointment. At this point, Hutter reminded the senators that last year the caps were lower, that we thought those caps were too harsh. The 15/25 percentage is an AAUP guideline. Ideally, he noted, we would like for all of these positions to be tenure-track. Revised Motion #4 acknowledges that there are legitimate reasons for saying it doesn’t work for us. Palmer Holden raised the issue of who will monitor the matter. Surely, he said, the Faculty Senate as a body will not do it, so will it be a senate committee or someone in central administration? According to Hopper, it would probably fall under FDAR or the academic affairs council.

Motion to accept Revised Motion #4 was adopted.

B. Faculty Senate Priorities [S01-4]

The list of senate priorities was sent back to the Executive Board, which decided that #7 should just be advisory. Below is the revised list of Priorities for the Faculty Senate 01/02 (Proposed by the Executive Board):

1. Respond to the Regents’ Areas for Further Study

Since the Senate passed a resolution last time on protecting faculty lines, Pope announced that she has gone forward in setting up a task force to deal with the budget crisis; however, additional measures may need to be taken by the Senate.

2. Move forward on the Hiring of an Ombudsperson
The Council on Judiciary and Appeals has been working on this for several years and feels that it is in a position to move forward.
3. Increase Day Care Facilities
We need a more family friendly campus to meet today's challenges. There are currently about 300 families on the waiting list.
4. Pursue a Family Leave Policy
ISU has no up-to-date policy. For example, childbirth is treated like an illness, so mothers only get the sick days they have accumulated. There is no policy for fathers or families coping with illness or elderly parents.
5. Refine our Basic Documents
Periodically, a need is discovered that is not met in the documents. It is time to do some tweaking.
6. Ensure a Faculty Senate voice in the development of student evaluations of faculty and in the Electronic Learning Task Force
7. Institute advisory committees to review the Knight Commission Report on Athletics and review ways in which faculty can have a greater voice selecting areas to be funded by Foundation capital campaigns

Motion to approve priorities was adopted.

VI. New Business

A. New Master's Degree Program in Veterinary Diagnostic and Production Animal Medicine [S01-5]

Pope announced that a new master's degree program in Veterinary Diagnostic and Production Animal Medicine will be considered for action at the December meeting of the Senate and said that Ken Kruempel will be glad to answer any questions about it this evening. Kruempel explained that this will be a program leading to a Master of Science degree in a department that did not have a master's program in a college that underwent organization. Robert Pollen, Chair of the Department, was also present at the meeting.

Pope noted that the remaining pieces of business are advisory to the President.

B. Free Speech on Campus [S01-6]

Pope stated that the Executive Board has examined the free speech proposal and is passing it on to the Faculty Senate for its endorsement. In the discussion that followed, Palmer

Holden expressed his concern that approval is not needed for gathering in atria. Harris, a sophomore and president of the ACLU at ISU, gave her enthusiastic endorsement to the proposal but noted that the hours seem restrictive when it comes to outdoor use, which only requires that notice be given. She expressed the desire that the time frame be removed. Daniel Bullen pointed out that the issue is scheduling, not restricting. To the objection voiced by Hutter concerning disruptions in teaching areas, Pope said that President Geoffroy has stated that teaching areas will be preserved. A related issue was raised by Mike Doran, who said he spends about ten minutes every morning putting things back in order in an open classroom used by students who do not clean up from having pizza.

Holden amended the President's free speech proposal by moving that groups be required to schedule indoor events in atria in advance. After the amendment was adopted, the motion that the President's free speech proposal be approved was passed.

C. Taser Guns [S01-7]

Motion to accept the recommendation on taser guns was made by Holden. Max Wortman, stating that he has strong personal feelings about this proposal, raised issues about taser guns:

Will our public safety personnel be safe if the tasers are in the shape of guns? Will subjects shoot real guns at our public safety personnel, which would ultimately lead to guns on the campus?

What accuracy will our public safety personnel have in shooting the tasers and possibly hitting innocents (e.g., children, pregnant women, cardiac patients)?

Has there been sufficient research into the effects of the tasers in such matters as: Injury thresholds? Effects of tasers on nerves? Risk of respiratory or cardiac arrest? Degree of blood-gas correction needed to minimize risk? Comparison of mechanisms of physical and chemical constraint?

Motion to extend for five minutes was passed.

Should the taser be adopted, Wortman wondered if it can be a color other than black. Duffy, who said he concurs on the recommendation regarding the color of the taser, reported that some of the faculty in his college favor the use of the taser, some strongly oppose it, and the rest are indifferent. To Tom Tallis's question, Deisinger responded that stun weapons have been around for thirty years. He also noted that several hundred law enforcement agencies use Model 26, including city, county, and federal agencies as well as some airline security firms and pilots; moreover, 25 universities nationwide have adopted it or are considering it. Several others use older versions. Some universities, added Deisinger, have firearms as well. In case deadly force is needed, Tallis wondered if DPS would call the Ames Police; Deisinger said yes. Hutter questioned the need for a collapsible baton and voiced his concern that approval of the taser will do nothing to deter the efforts of the DPS to arm itself. The DPS has not used the baton in part, said Deisinger, because of the

damage it inflicts.

Motion to extend another five minutes was passed.

In response to a question about why the Faculty Senate should vote on the measure this evening, Pope commented that President Geoffroy is going to move on this right away. A final question concerned the stand-off distance afforded by the taser. According to Deisinger, there is a significant advantage: pepper spray provides only 2-8 feet while the taser can be used up to 21 feet away.

Motion to accept the recommendation on taser guns was defeated first by a voice vote and then by a show of hands with 25 in favor, 36 opposed.

D. Changing Name of Department of Public Safety [S01-07]

No action was taken on this matter at the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Constance Post,
Faculty Senate Secretary