

**Iowa State University
FACULTY SENATE
Session XIV, Meeting 7
March 5, 2002**

[Approved minutes]

I. Call to Order:

The meeting of the Faculty Senate in 260 Scheman was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Christie Pope, President, who welcomed President Geoffroy. Substitute senators were seated.

Attendance:

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

II. Consent Items: *Motion to pass the following consent items was passed.*

- A. Minutes of December 11, 2002 [01/M/4] and February 19, 2002 [01/M/6]
- B. Agenda [01/A/7]
- C. Calendar [01/C/7]
- D. Salary Report, January 25, 2002
- E. The University Budget: Overview and Issues

III. Announcements

A. Faculty Senate President Pope

Christie Pope noted that most of the announcements were included in the packet sent out electronically to all senators, but added the following:

1. At the next meeting, March 26, the Faculty Senate will elect a secretary and chairs of councils. Nominations for council chairs thus far include Tony Hendrickson for Academic Affairs, Connie Post for FDAR, Denise Vrchota for Governance, and Bill Woodman for RPA. Pope said she would like more persons to run for these positions and welcomed self-nominations. Those interested should call Sherri Angstrom to get their names on the list.
2. The Board of Regents meets in Ames March 13-14, said Pope, who reminded senators that the meetings are open and hence they are welcome to drop by. Pope, who also announced that the Faculty Senate Executive Board will host a luncheon for the Board of Regents on Thursday, 3/14, requested that senators let members of the Faculty Senate Executive Board know what they would like them to say to the Board of Regents at the luncheon.
3. The attempt to get a faculty regent has only gotten so far, reported Pope, who said that the groundwork has been laid for moving forward in the future on the matter. The matter is being pursued in other places, including Indiana, said Pope, where the attempt to get a faculty regent failed, 8-7, to get out of legislative committee. Pope said that having a faculty regent is an important part of shared governance and that putting someone on the board who knows something about higher education is vital.
4. President Geoffroy has accepted the nontenure-track proposal and is studying the ambitious office proposal. He will let us know about the latter after he consults with his advisors.

B. Provost Richmond

Rollin Richmond, who noted that he received no questions for this evening, announced that President Geoffroy asked for one half of one percent as a response to the state's passage of a bill to balance the budget. These cuts, said the Provost, will be assigned in a proportional way. The Provost stated that the President has exempted the library and summer session from these cuts.

IV. Special Orders

- A. MGT-America and Response to Budget Crisis Task Force Motion [S01-17]:**
Max Wortman, Chair, presented the following motion:

Whereas it appears that there will be further cuts to the ISU budget in the 2002 fiscal year, be it resolved that two areas be removed from the table so that there are no further budget cuts in (1) the total number of faculty positions; and (2) library acquisitions.

According to Wortman, block budgeting is what is wrong with the system. He also noted that the title of this task force is impossibly long and that task force members have tried to shorten it. Wortman introduced David Hopper, who began his presentation by asking everyone to stand and greet the person on his or her right and left, Hopper stated that the group in attendance tonight is approximately the same size as the number of faculty ISU lost last year. Four times the number of persons here tonight is the number of faculty ISU has lost since 1986. Although ISU now has 225 fewer faculty than it did in 1986, it is teaching more students than ever before with the highest enrollment in its history of 28,000 students. If everyone stands again, said Hopper, the number would be approximately the same as the number ISU will lose next year.

These points were graphically represented by Hopper in several tables. Table 1, which shows the percent change in tenured faculty at UNI, SUI, and ISU since 1985, reveals an increase of less than 10% for UNI and SUI but a decrease of more than 20% for ISU. A second table, which plots the percent change in tenure-line faculty at the three institutions since 1985, shows little change: UNI increased tenure-line faculty by roughly 20%, SUI, ended the period with a gain of 4%; and ISU, in a consistently downward turn, had a 15% decrease by the end of 2001. These two graphs suggest that ISU has the same financial situation as the other two regents, said Hopper, so how can the difference be accounted for? Are there basic philosophical differences between the way those two universities face budget cuts, and the way we handled them?

A third graph, depicting the percent change in faculty and P&S at ISU since 1985, reveals that during this period the faculty lost about 15% of its positions (-225) while P&S gained 40% (+890). Hopper, emphasizing that he was not bringing this up to cause conflict, nevertheless pointed out that other segments have experienced significant growth.

Hopper made several observations:

1. The loss of faculty is endemic and is clearly a result of a long-term policy.
2. The importance of maintaining a quality faculty clearly is less a priority at ISU than at SUI and UNI.
3. The less essential segments of the institution are growing at the expense of the core in the institution, namely its faculty and academic resources (which are seriously declining).
4. The policy of not filling open faculty positions to meet budget reductions is seriously flawed in that it:
 - ? Is based upon a random process;
 - ? Is widely accepted as poor personnel management policy;

3/5/02 Faculty Senate Minutes

- ? Destroys the very core of the university;
 - ? Places unreasonable burdens upon students and faculty, such as increased teaching loads, diminution in the quality of instruction, and longer times to graduation;
 - ? Lowers morale;
 - ? Causes faculty to leave the institution;
 - ? Makes the hiring of excellent faculty extremely difficult.
5. The institution cannot continue to do everything that it has been doing.
 6. The institution cannot sustain excellence while severely reducing the size of the faculty and significantly increasing enrollment.
 7. The consequence of the current policy is the continuing decline of the institution and its programs.

Clearly, said Hopper, ISU must support the stated goal of President Geoffroy, which is “to recruit (and retain) more top faculty to Iowa State, and ensure that more students graduate in a ‘timely fashion.’” To do this, Hopper said, ISU must work to make this a matter of policy at all levels of administration. Hopper added that the faculty must actively resist any further erosion of its ranks and proactively work to make the hiring of new faculty the highest priority. Moreover, said Hopper, how the new administration addresses the current budget crisis bears close watching. Hopper also referred to a letter from Dean Olivia Madison today that notes a 25% decline in serials purchased by ISU in the last four to five years.

Using a linear regression model, Hopper projected that by 2068 ISU will have no serials and that by 2077 it may have become the premier land-grant university but will no longer have any faculty. He concluded his presentation by urging senators to support the following motion introduced by Wortman.

After a hearty round of applause for Hopper, Pope opened the floor for comments. James Hill said he would like to see data on the ratio of students to faculty at the three institutions, James Hutter said ISU must be released from the obligation not to participate in activities that generate revenue, and John Robyt said he wished Hopper had offered some suggestions.

The resolution, which did not require a second because it came from a Faculty Senate task force, was passed unanimously.

B. Motion on Morrill Hall [S01-18]

Several senators inquired about the cost of restoring Morrill Hall, wondering if the phrase, “any efforts,” in the motion means regardless of cost. Pope, who said students and faculty perhaps might start a drive, acknowledged that large donors do not want to give to something that already has a name on it.

John Cunnally questioned the source and the validity of the figures: \$9 million to renovate yet only \$5 for a spanking new building. Given a range of estimates from \$4,000 to \$12,000 for a new roof on his house, Cunnally wondered if the same person with the \$12,000 bid made the estimate for renovating the building and the person with the \$4,000 bid made the estimate for the cost of erecting a new building. Here, said Cunnally, is a building where Carver studied and worked. It is neo-Romanesque in Richardsonian style. It is also the building commemorating the Morrill Act that established institutions of higher learning for ordinary citizens, said Girton, and the first of these land-grant universities was Iowa State. To put the sum in perspective, Girton said, the cost of renovating Morrill Hall is roughly the same amount as building an indoor football practice field.

Motion stating that the Faculty Senate strongly endorses any efforts to save Morrill Hall as a historic structure was passed.

V. Old Business:

A. Rescinding the name for the Honors Building [S01-16] (Hall, Mize, Robyt)

Carl Mize, placing a substitute motion on the overhead, stated that the resolution brought forward by the Faculty Senate Executive Board is so weak that the Board of Regents may disregard it. The substitute motion reads as follows:

Whereas, the Honors Building at Iowa State University, presently under construction, is to be named the Martin C. Jischke Honors Buildng, and

Whereas, Martin Jischke, past president of Iowa State University, was a controversial president, and the manner in which the building was named is controversial, and

Whereas, the policy of Iowa State University is that buildings not be named after an ex-university official for at least five years after the official leaves the university, and Martin Jischke enforced that rule in the naming of the Student Health Building,

Therefore, be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate opposes the naming of the Honors Building after Martin Jischke, and

Further, that the Faculty Senate supports naming the honors building the "Honors Building," which some time in the future could be renamed, and

Further, that the Faculty Senate request that the Board of Regents allow Christie Pope, President of the Faculty Senate, and other faculty members to address the Regents concerning this matter as soon as possible.

Richard Hall said he has been both a student and a faculty member in the ISU Honors Program. He has also been a contributor, but not to the tune of having the building named for himself, said Hall, who remarked that he was not approaching it from standpoint of Jischke himself, but from the nature of the program the building is intended to serve. Quoting Bill Larson, an emeritus professor in engineering, Hall said it should not be named after a single person. If it were, said Mize, there are any number of names to put forward, including that of Liz Beck.

Pope stated her wish to alternate the pro and con in the discussion that followed.

Tony Hendrickson defended his colleagues' right to rescind the name but said he wished to offer several comments, noting that he has spoken against the resolution. One reason he has done so, said Hendrickson, is that it has been 18 months since this was decided, so it is rather late in the process to rescind. Hendrickson also discussed the matter of the five-year rule. According to Hendrickson, Jim McElroy assured him that a committee conducted due diligence and process in coming up with the name, and that in the minutes of their meeting committee members realized the name would be an exception to the rule in the procedures guide. Hendrickson also pointed out that there have been exceptions to this rule in the past. In 1984, for example, Lagomarcino named the library after Parks when Parks was still President; Parks served until 1986. Another example is that in 1986 the College of Education was renamed after Lagomarcino while he was still Dean of the college. In February 2001, to cite another example, the Student Health Center was named after Thielen, even though he had only been retired for four years. Hendrickson also noted that in polling the faculty in his college, there were 47 responses with 30 in favor of the name and 17 against.

The motion originally brought to the Executive Board criticized Jischke for his fundraising, said Hendrickson, who noted that \$508 million facility improvements were done while Jischke was here. He noted, too, that Jischke led the initiative to grant full scholarships for Honors students and helped to establish the Hixson scholarships, as well as championing learning communities and conducting a freshmen leadership class at the Knoll. Hendrickson concluded by saying that he did not agree with everything Jischke did, but that Jischke did the best he could for this university. Hendrickson added that the Honors Building was not built by one person, but neither were the other buildings that bear a single name.

Palmer Holden and John Robyt reported results of polls done in their departments on the issue. Hutter raised a point of order, stating that what the Senate had before it by way of the motion placed on the overhead by Mize is not what the Senate had before it by way of the original motion. Pope

placed the original motion on the overhead:

Whereas, the Honors Building at Iowa State University, presently under construction, is to be named the Martin Jischke Honors Building, and

Whereas, the policy of Iowa State University is that buildings not be named after an ex-university official for at least five years after the official leaves the university,

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate opposes the naming of the Honors Building after Martin Jischke at this time.

Stating that she assumed Mize was asking to amend the original motion, Pope said that it needed a second. Palmer Holden seconded the substitute motion. Hutter moved to strike the second paragraph, which contained the first new language, and his motion was seconded. Hutter stated that the paragraph does not further the cause of removing Jischke's name from the building. In building an argument, said Mize, to say that the five-year rule has been violated understates the case you are making. Citing memos from Murray Blackwelder and Robert Mukerjea, Mize acknowledged there was no proof of a quid pro quo but noted that the two men primarily responsible for the naming of the building are now at Purdue. Hutter said that he did not disagree with Mize's statements but that he did disagree that these would help Mize.

Ganesh Rajapolan suggested that the clause "was a controversial president" be removed, which Pope said would be an amendment to the amendment. Max Porter recommended that the Senate vote only on the underlined part. Hutter, pointing out that those making the motion had underlined the old material rather than the new, said his motion was to strike. Pope said there was also an amendment on the floor to remove the clause, "Martin Jischke, past president of Iowa State University, was a controversial president." Hill said Hutter's amendment was out of order because it negated the one on the floor, and Pope responded that there was only one amendment on the floor. Mize stated that the parts not underlined are what he, Hall, and Robyt added.

Hendrickson stated that he had a document from Mukerjea to Richard Seagrave in which Mukherjee says he discussed the matter with members of the committee who agreed to suspend the five-year rule. [Hendrickson reads from the memo.] Hall said the Honors Program found out about the name at the same time as others did, that they were not consulted. Hendrickson asked Howard Shapiro for clarification, and he said he talked to the Faculty Director of the Honors Program and with the Director, and that both said it was acceptable. To Robyt's question about whether a committee meeting was held where it was discussed, Shapiro said he was not on the committee. He noted, though, that Hill told him what was being proposed and asked him to check with the Faculty Director of the Honors Program and with the Director.

Bill Robinson stated ISU has a five-year rule for this very reason. The fact that the rule was violated in the past does not make it right to do it now, said Robinson, who said that the Executive Board had a good motion and the Senate ought to pass it. Pope said that Hutter was willing to accept a friendly amendment, and Hutter said he agreed because Mize also accepts it as such. Hutter stated that the motion on the floor is to drop to the material in paragraph two of the substitute motion, reminding senators that if they voted yes, the whole paragraph goes; if not, then the paragraph as amended stays.

Motion to amend the substitute motion by striking the following paragraph fails to pass:

Whereas, Martin Jischke, past president of Iowa State University, was a controversial president and the manner in which the building was named is controversial, and

Pope stated that the paragraph therefore remains as marked on the overhead, which is as follows:

Whereas, the manner in which the building was named is controversial, and

Hutter posed a question to Mize about the third paragraph in the substitute motion that says Jischke enforced the five-year rule. Mize, who responded that he was told that Jischke said the student health building could not be named for Thielen because of the five-year rule, said that Jischke left ISU before the decision was made. Then would you not agree, asked Hutter, that this language is now problematic? The statement does not help your motion, he said, asking Mize if he wants to go before the regents and have them say, this is not true. Pope asked Mize if he would like to withdraw the clause, and Mize said that since the makers of motion do not have the documentation -- although Mize said he suspects it is out there -- that they would be willing to drop the clause.

Pope stated that the clause not underlined in paragraph three therefore should be dropped:

and Martin Jischke enforced that rule in the naming of the Student Health Building.

and that paragraph three would read as follows on the substitute motion:

Whereas, the policy of Iowa State University is that buildings not be named after an ex-university official for at least five years after the official leaves the university,

Hutter stated that the fourth paragraph is inaccurate because it does not retain the

3/5/02 Faculty Senate Minutes

phrase, “at this time,” which was in the Executive Board motion. He noted, however, that Mize, Hall, and Robyt might wish to delete it. Mize said it was an oversight and that the phrase would be restored to the motion.

Asked if the motion would have any impact on whether or not the name remains, Pope said probably not and that if the Senate passed the motion, she would have to ask President Geoffroy to let her speak before the Board of Regents about this.

[Ballots were distributed.]

Hutter, expressing concern about the language in the very last paragraph that specifically refers to Christie Pope as President of the Faculty Senate, said this might be on the agenda of the Board of Regents when there a new president of the Faculty Senate. Pope said she would accept Hutter’s suggestion as a friendly amendment.

Mize said he remains hopeful that if the vote of the Senate is strong, it may persuade the Board of Regents to reconsider the matter. Noting that other groups have weighed in against this, he stated that eighteen months ago some students registered their disapproval. Tollefson said that the majority of his colleagues were in favor of approving the original motion, although many thought it looked like a spiteful bit of business.

Bullen raised a point of order about what the Senate would be voting on, and Pope said the vote would be on an amendment to the original Executive Board amendment. The Senate is voting on it, said Pope, because it is not a friendly amendment to the original motion. Therefore the vote is whether the Senate wants to accept this motion as a substitute for the one brought forward by the Executive Board.

[Meeting continues as the votes are tallied.]

David Hopper’s “Motion Concerning the Naming of Buildings and Streets”:

Hopper introduced a motion that addresses what may happen in the future rather than what has happened in the past and said he wanted to ask ISU’s new president to reaffirm this language, taken off the university website, and to add a new paragraph stating that the university must inform the community about the reasons for granting an exception to the five-year rule. The motion was seconded. Hutter suggested that the motion be sent to the Executive Board for discussion and recommended that the Senate not vote on it tonight. Pope noted that anything presented to the Senate must be voted on that same night or at the following meeting. Porter noted that someone can move to change the docketing order, thereby moving the motion up. What the chair must rule on, he said, is whether this motion is related to the motion on the agenda. Pope said the Senate can consider it introduced and then take it up at the next meeting.

[Announcement of ballot results]

Motion to amend the substitute motion by deleting the clause not underlined in paragraph three (“and Martin Jischke enforced that rule in the naming of the Student Health Building”) was passed by a 47-19 vote. Paragraph 3 now reads as follows:

Whereas, the policy of Iowa State University is that buildings not be named after an ex-university official for at least five years after the official leaves the university,

Pope announced that the Senate would now vote on the entire amended, or substitute, motion.

B. Fundamental Principles for Student Evaluation of Teaching [S01-15] (Hendrickson)

Pope stated that while the votes on the motion to rescind were being counted, the Senate would consider the matter of fundamental principles for student evaluation of teaching and that Howard Shapiro was here to discuss it.

[Question arose about the color of the ballot for the vote on the substitute motion to rescind the name. Blue was used for the first vote, and green for the second.]

Hutter asked if a comma is needed between “limited” and “based” in #7, which reads: “The dissemination of feedback information should be limited based on the purposes for which it is used.” Hendrickson said, yes. Faculty should get student evaluations from one term before the next term begins, but they don’t, said Gary Phye, who suggested that this would be helpful as a fundamental principle. Jim Raitch stressed that students should be absolutely certain their responses will not influence their grade.

Mattson wondered if this in anyway is connected to the publication of student evaluations reported in the paper. If so, she said, students need to be held accountable for their comments and understand they cannot issue them anonymously. Pope noted that this came up when the GSB President approached the faculty about the matter. A task force put into place by Howard Shapiro worked last year -- mostly this year, actually-- and added people from student affairs and CTE, said Pope, who suggested that it might be helpful for Shapiro to explain how this got going. Shapiro, who responded that these principles are those under which the task force would proceed to develop appropriate forms of evaluation and feedback, said this is part of a process for enhancing learning. The task force will develop something that will come back to this body at a later date for approval, and it will also go to the GSB. Shapiro noted that three senators serve on the task force and, at the request of John Robyt, supplied their names: Niki Davis, Tony Hendrickson, and Gary Phye. Shapiro pointed out that there should be

3/5/02 Faculty Senate Minutes

some way for students to find out something more than just the catalog description of a course. Learning styles for the way course is taught was one example cited by Shapiro, who said that outcomes is not the same thing. Bill Summers wondered how it will be possible to keep track of this in a meaningful way.

Wortman raised a point of order and moved to extend the meeting for five minutes.

Motion to extend the minute for five minutes was passed.

Pope announced the outcome of the vote to amend the original Executive Board motion to rescind the name of the Honors Building by replacing it with the substitute motion, as amended, of Mize, Hall, and Robyt. The motion was passed by a vote of 55-10.

Roy Johnson, who sought clarification about Shapiro's response to the question raised by Michelle Mattson, asked if what is out there on the Internet now is just temporary. GSB put something on the web, said Shapiro, but it has not been sanctioned by the task force. He noted, however, that after this was mentioned in the paper, the task force checked to see if it would satisfy these principles. Shapiro said the faculty are welcome to look at the site, noting that GSB was anxious to do something and went ahead and did so.

To give senators an overview of this process, Hendrickson said his committee has been working on it for over a year. In doing so, the committee found that faculty from different colleges need to come together and agree philosophically on principles. Clearly, said Hendrickson, there is not complete agreement on implementation. Robinson inquired about the third principle, which states that "Assessing the effectiveness of pedagogical techniques in promoting learning is a legitimate form of scholarly inquiry." Shapiro responded that assessing effectiveness is a scholarly matter, and noted that some people publish about this. This principle therefore is intended to provide a framework for a whole system that provides feedback on formative and summative stages to enhance learning, said Shapiro.

Pope stated that the Senate must move toward a vote on the matter and that the details would be worked out later. Palermo asked if the vote would be on the fine print text or the bold text of the Fundamental Principles. Hendrickson said the Executive Board amended the original #9, so the Task Force on Student Evaluation of Teaching is proposing the amended #9 at the very end in addition to principles stated earlier.

Motion to approve the Fundamental Principles from the Report of the Task Force on Student Evaluation of Teaching, with #9 as amended by the Executive Board on 2/5/02, was passed.

Pope stated that the meeting would end with a brief introduction by Max Porter

3/5/02 Faculty Senate Minutes

of a governance matter.

Wortman's motion to extend the meeting another five minutes failed.

Porter quickly explained that the Faculty Senate by-laws require that a matter be introduced at one meeting and voted on at the next. He then introduced the proposed changes in the by-laws on behalf of the Governance Council, so that they can be placed on the docket for the next meeting.

Motion to put the proposed changes to the Faculty Senate by-laws on the docket for the next meeting was passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:07 p.m.