

**2: Iowa State University  
FACULTY SENATE  
Session XIV, Meeting 9  
April 9, 2002**

**I. Call to Order**

The meeting of the Faculty Senate on April 9, 2002 in 260 Scheman was called to order at 7:45 p.m. by Christie Pope, President. Substitute senators were seated.

**Attendance:**

- a) Members Present: S. Agarwal; C. Baldwin; D. Bullen; D. Coffey; G. Colver; H. Cravens; J. Cunnally; J. Dana; F. Dark; R. Dearin; M. Doran; M. Duffy; T. Emmerson; A.M. Fiore; C. Ford; D. Fowles; W. Franke; S. Freeman; J. Girton; R. Gregorac; R. Hall; B. Hand; C. Heising; J. Herwig; G. Hightshoe; J. Hill; P. Hoffman; P. Holden; D. Hopper; J. Hutter; H. Ilahiane; D. Jones; P. Korsching; J. Lamont; G. Leavens; P. Martin; M. Mattson; J. Maves; F. Nutter; J. Opsomer; G. Phye; C. Pope; C. Post; J. Raich; G. Rajagopalan; S. Russell; K. Schilling; J. Schuh; D. Simonson; L. Stephens; B. Summers; B. Thacker; A. Thieman; J. Tollefson; C. Trexler; D. Vrchota; W. Ware; T. Weber; W. Woodman; M. Wortman; M. Yaeger; B. Yang.
- b) Substitute Members: A. Murdoch for D. Anderson; S. Madon for D. Epperson; M. Rectanus for C. Gasta; F. Owusu for G. Mattson; T. Brumm for S. Tim; K. Woo for W. Trahanovsky.
- c) Absent Members: I. Anderson; D. Bazylnski; M. Chen; E. Cooper; B. Coree; C. Drewes; C. Fehr; A. Hendrickson; R. Johnson; C. Mize; J. Moses; J. Opsomer; M. Owen; M. Porter; P. Premkumar; J. Robyt; C. Thoen; J. Tollefson; C. Trexler; W. Ware; B. Woodman; B. Yang.
- d) Guests and Visitors: R. Richmond, Provost Office; S. Carlson, Provost Office; L. Charles, University Relations; L. Allen, Ames Tribune; K. Kruempel, FS Curriculum Committee; R. Heer, P&S Council; J. Christensen, GSS; K. Jolls, Chemical Engineering; W. Tavanapong, Computer Science; T. Loynachan, Chair, Calendar Committee; B. Kunerth; T.J. Schneider, GSB; A. Tofilon, GSB; L. Anderson, Chair, Committee on Committees; M. Holland, Vet Med; K. Bovenmyer, Preparing Future Faculty.

**II. Consent Items**

**A. Minutes of March 26, 2002 [01/M/8]**

**B. Agenda [01/A/9]**

**C. Calendar [01/C/9]**

**D. Council Reports**

**E. Discontinue the B. S. In Professional Agricultural [S01-30]**

**F. Proposal for an Undergraduate Minor in Chinese Studies [S01-31]**

**G. Proposal for an Undergraduate Minor in Food Safety [S)1-32]**

**H. Report of Faculty Handbook Committee**

James Hutter said that Tom Emmerson would like to present a motion under New Business on the ISU Foundation. The motion was seconded.

4/9/02 Faculty Senate Minutes

*Motion to add ISU Foundation to the agenda under New Business was approved, and the consent agenda was approved.*

### **III. Announcements**

#### **A. Faculty Senate President Christie Pope**

President Pope will meet with the Board of Regents and President Gregory Geoffroy tomorrow.

#### **B. Provost Rollin Richmond**

Provost Richmond presented a report on academic plan funding, which reviewed the following: (1) the funding history of a base allocation of \$292,592 in FY01, \$634,447 in FY02 (including an internal reallocation of funds of \$341,555 to increase the base allocation), and \$222,000 in FY03; (2) the award history of the grand total of \$1,448.3K (as of 4/5/02) from FY01 through FY05; (3) the awards over multiple years made to colleges, the amounts granted, the number of requests submitted, and the number of requests funded; and (4) a summary of uses to which the funding has been put: diversity hires (\$92.4K), faculty recruitment (\$129.8K), faculty retention (\$442.8K), faculty start-up (\$150.0K), partner accommodation (\$483.4K), and research support (\$149.9K).

### **Questions/Answers:**

Q1: Hutter asked about the issue of having to pay back funds that were allocated. Richmond said that when a unit requests resources, it is told that the maximum is \$60,000 over a three-year period at the end of which the unit must pick up the cost. The unit, however, is not asked to return the \$60,000 to the pool.

Q2: Palmer Holden inquired about the new title of chair, and Richmond explained that it will now be used instead of DEO or Head. Four individuals called Heads do not have responsibilities different from those called DEO so the same title will apply to both.

### **IV. Old Business**

#### **A. Dead Week [S01-29] (Hendrickson)**

President Pope reminded senators that Anthony Hendrickson, Academic Affairs Council Chair, introduced the Dead Week resolution at the last meeting of the Faculty Senate at March 26. In the meantime, said Pope, a meeting with the GSB has resulted in a more detailed resolution coming out of the Academic Affairs Council. Pope then turned to Max Wortman, who introduced a substitute motion in place of the one on the agenda, noting that the substitute motion is not what was sent electronically but a new handout distributed at tonight's meeting. Motion to consider the substitute motion was seconded.

Wortman introduced Andy Tofilon, the current GSB President, and T. J. Schneider, the

#### 4/9/02 Faculty Senate Minutes

incoming President. Noting that the substitute motion is the 25th version of this motion, Wortman acknowledged the input of many persons in crafting it and said he hopes new faculty especially will make use of this. Schneider illustrated why the matter is being pursued, citing the case of Zack, a senior with five papers and two finals during Dead Week who found it very hard to manage the workload. Schneider also said that at the last GSB meeting senators were asked whether they had had finals during Dead Week and that 26 reported, yes; 3, no. To the question about major assignments having been given during Dead Week, 23 said yes; 6, no. Hutter asked what happened to items that appeared in earlier versions of the motion such as no classes on the last two days of Dead Week and no new material during Dead Week. Tofilon said they listened to their professors and emphasized that they were not coming to the Faculty Senate because they wanted that body to rubber stamp the GSB motion. Hutter said he was delighted to see the penultimate paragraph, which underscores the responsibilities of students.

Pointing out that the GSB says this is not a policy but a guideline, Woodman asked about the use of the word "mandatory" under A. That does not sound like a guideline, said Woodman, who said it sounds instead as though what the GSB calls Dead Week should be Final Exam Week. Tofilon asked Woodman to look at the material under C, which makes an exception for semester-long projects, etc., to help out Design and Architecture students who said they desperately need that extra week. Schneider said a professor can also give a final during Dead Week but only if it is optional.

Woodman countered that his real point is two parts: one, there already is a policy in the Faculty Handbook, and this does not improve on it; and two, it impinges on academic freedom. Schneider stated that the GSB does not want to do that in any way, which is why it has worked with so many groups. Woodman said he assumes that assignments due during Dead Week were assigned long before, to which Schneider replied that it would not be anyone here, of course, but said he knows that students sometimes get new assignments that week. Woodman emphasized that starting an assignment 72 hours before it is due when the student knew about it weeks in advance is no reason for the assignment not to be due.

***Motion to strike material under C of the Dead Week Proposal is made by Gary Leavens.***

***Motion to consider the substitute motion was passed.***

Provost Richmond, who spoke in favor of the substitute motion as it is, said what the GSB has at heart here is a good idea. These two men have worked very hard in refining this proposal, said Richmond, and they have no intention of infringing on academic freedom. Richard Hall said that it seems as though legitimate exceptions are covered in the second paragraph, to which Stephanie Madon responded that she finds only one exception there really. Schneider said the GSB does not want to infringe on academic freedom but to set forth that when professors do their syllabi they should take into account that larger assignments, except for semester-long projects, should be due the week before Dead Week. The intention, said Schneider, is not to dilute coursework, just to spread it out more evenly. Tifilon explained that under C of the proposal the

#### 4/9/02 Faculty Senate Minutes

GSB hoped, for example, that instead of making a five-page paper due during Dead Week it would be due the week before.

Hamilton Cravens pointed out, first, that different disciplines are taught differently; and second, that the way to solve this problem is to extend the semester and provide a reading week to prepare for exams. Tifilon said this was their original idea, and Cravens said they should have stuck with it. Emmerson said this is a double-edged sword, noting that many times his students clap when he grants an extension, so not being able to do that may actually be detrimental to students. These “shalls” and “shoulds” are confusing, he added. Hsain Ilahiane recommended that the first paragraph about Dead Week being a normal week should state what faculty might do. Carolyn Heising wondered if it would be possible to have each of the colleges look into this and come up with its own proposal, that the caucuses be given this proposal to review. Hutter agreed with Cravens that under C it is true that there are different concerns for different faculty with different disciplines. Surely, said Hutter, a term paper should be due before Dead Week, yet one way or another Dead Week is a time when a lot gets done. The material under C, he said, does provide for students to ask for an extension, and that is all right.

Ganesh Rajagopalan asked two questions: (1) does C mean that simpler assignments are okay during Dead Week, that students could be assigned a few problems? and (2) where is the major departure from the policy that we already have? Tofilon said that the current policy is a paragraph that talks in abstract terms about what Dead Week is. It is a train of thought. The GSB, said Tofilon, wanted to put that into guidelines so that faculty -- new and old -- would have something to put their hands on. Rajagopalan then inquired about whether it is possible to say that major assignments will not be due during Dead Week, asking whether we are writing a lot of statements here to express one thought. Schneider replied that each of these areas touches on a separate aspect of the guidelines. Part of the vagueness, though, said Rajagopalan, allows for flexibility. Students, he said, always want an extension, but this doesn't permit it. Actually, said Tofilon, this is why the GSB put this in there: if a professor wants to grant an extension, he may do so. Clark Ford wondered about a major assignment falling due during Finals Week. If by that you mean a take-home, said Schneider, that would be fine. Ford said he was confused, stating that he wants examples of what people are thinking of who want to get rid of C. Stephanie Madon volunteered the example of a research paper, stating that she teaches a course in which she assigns two papers and that one is due the day of the final because she does not give an exam. The paper would have to be due the Friday before Dead Week, given C, said Madon. Tofilon, though, said her paper would be in lieu of the final.

Pope stated that the Senate would be voting on the motion to eliminate section C. ***Motion to eliminate C from the Dead Week Proposal was split, which called for a division with only 19 in favor of eliminating C and the greater number opposed. Therefore, motion to eliminate C failed to pass.***

Michelle Mattson sought clarification for whether something due during finals week would not be impacted by this document. Schneider responded that there is a separate

4/9/02 Faculty Senate Minutes

policy that governs finals week. Tom Weber said he wanted to offer a motion about A by moving to delete the sentence starting with “Finals” and the next sentence starting with “If a student”.

***Motion was seconded to delete the third and fourth sentences under A: “Finals can be offered during Dead Week when they are optional. If a student does not want to take the final exam during Dead Week he/she must be able to take it during the regularly scheduled final exam period.”***

Weber, who said there is something the matter with our educational system when 15 weeks of instruction are cut to 14 weeks by having optional exams, stated that the Provost should keep a lid on this sort of stuff. Hill wondered if B is necessary since most major assignments are not assigned after they are due. Floyd Andersen, who noted that lab courses do not have an exam during finals, said he has students make presentations during Dead Week but turn in the report during finals because there is no final in his course. Mattson said she wanted to speak against the motion because she uses interviews that have to be done during this time. According to Schneider, the reason for including the two sentences Weber wants dropped is this: if a professor wants to offer a final during that time and the students feel prepared, then it is okay. According to Weber, 15 weeks is the accepted accreditation standard. Hall said the policy is supposed to address the issue of whether the exam can only be optional.

Madon said she is trying to understand what “optional” means: if a class agrees, for example, to have an exam during Dead Week, does an exam still have to be scheduled during finals if a student changes her/his mind? Schneider responded that if it is unanimous, yes. In that case, said Madon, isn't much of this already in conflict? Doesn't the university already have a policy for a course that meets only once a week? Robert Gregorac wondered if students see the back of the finals schedule, which would help make students aware of the recourse they have. Schneider replied that the Dead Week proposal lays things out for students clearly.

Pope reminded senators that according to *Roberts' Rules of Order* a person can speak only twice.

Hutter stated that the material under C was put in probably because the GSB thought faculty would insist on it. It doesn't help to add vagueness to vagueness, said Cravens. According to Schneider, the GSB wanted to allow that possibility in case something did occur.

***Motion to delete two sentences under A was passed.***

Pope asked if senators were ready to vote on the proposal. Would the GSB agree to a friendly amendment regarding C, asked Hutter, who suggested that “assignment in lieu of a final” be added to the phrase, “design project”.

***Hutter's friendly amendment was accepted, so that the second sentence now reads as***

4/9/02 Faculty Senate Minutes

*follows: “Exceptions include class presentations by students, semester-long projects such as a design project assignment in lieu of a final, and extensions of the deadline requested by individual students.*

Hill asked whether B is necessary and moved that it be stricken because C exists. The motion was seconded.

***The vote on the motion to strike B is split with 24 in favor; 34 opposed. Therefore B remains.***

Hutter stated that he wants to add to B the following sentence: “Major course assignments should be made on the syllabus.” In the discussion that followed it was pointed out that the Board of Regents requires that a syllabus be made for every course. It was also noted that removing the sentence as it now stands would take “Dead Week” out of it and thus make B seem unrelated to the Dead Week Proposal.

***Motion to substitute “Major course assignments should be made on the syllabus” for “Major course assignments shall be assigned prior to Dead Week” under B failed to pass.***

Jerry Culver asked if the final paragraph represents a reasonable expectation: “The Provost will publicize and monitor this policy each semester. In addition, the Provost will study the impact of these guidelines on student achievement and report to the university community on the findings.” The Provost deferred to the Associate Provost on this matter but promised that his office will have a go at it.

Jack Girton said he is concerned with the last line of the first paragraph, which states that “For academic programs, the last week of classes is considered to be a normal week in the semester except that in developing their syllabi faculty shall follow the following guidelines.” He therefore recommended that “follow” be changed to “consider” so that it reads: “faculty shall consider the following guidelines”. The motion was seconded.

***Motion to replace “follow” with “consider” was passed.***

***Motion to approve the substitute motion, as amended, was passed.***

## **B. Calendar**

Pope read the calendar motion as it appears on the Faculty Senate agenda for April 9 [S01-33]: “1. Classes for Spring semester of any year shall not begin prior to the day following the Martin Luther King national holiday celebration. Spring break shall occur between the end of first half semester classes and the beginning of second half semester classes; 2. Fall semester exams shall conclude on or before December 18th unless that is a Thursday, in which case they may conclude on Friday the 19th.”

**Report by Tom Weber:** Noting that the motion was made in January, Hutter said nothing had happened since then and asked Tom Weber to comment on the motion which is really a two-and-a-half-year-old motion. As Chair of the Ad Hoc Calendar Committee of the ISU Faculty Senate, Weber said the report was submitted March 7, 2000. Weber, who said who would hit some of the high points of the report, said that a straw poll of the ISU Faculty Senate showed that 45 favored a four-week break. Those who responded represented 34 of 61 departments. Those who think this is a low response ought to remember that the committee was “working through you people,” said Weber. Most favored a four-week break to prepare for spring semester, to engage in scholarship and proposal writing, and to attend professional meetings. Another reason cited is that there are some engineering courses taught in real time that had to be dropped because of difficulties in coordinating them with sister institutions. The calendar committee has already set the calendar for 2005-2007, reported Weber, who said that 95-96 is the last time ISU had four weeks off during winter break. Most of the faculty didn't know about the change in the calendar for some time, said Weber.

**Discussion:** Ganesh Rajagopalan said that changing the calendar was discussed in FDAR five years ago, at which time there was strong support to keep the four weeks. He also noted that 80% of students wanted the longer break. Holden asked if this means people will lose a bit of their summer vacation. Yes, said Weber, although commencement will still be before May 15. Weber, who sought to clarify that many groups have input on discussions regarding the calendar but do not necessarily get to vote on it, mentioned three groups represented on the committee: the Graduate Student Senate, the GSB, and the Faculty Senate. An overriding reason for returning to three weeks, said Tom Loynachan, was because of the students who wanted an extra week in the summer for a longer internship, etc. There are also several good reasons for the four-week break, including study abroad opportunities and field courses. According to Loynachan, the Calendar Committee chose to go with three weeks because it gives more time to students. UNI has the same calendar ISU has, Loynachan stated, noting that it started on January 14th this year and that the University of Iowa started a week later, the University of Wisconsin at Madison on the 22nd, South Dakota on the 9th, and Missouri on the 22nd. Seven of the Big Twelve started on the 14th, and others began a week later or a week earlier.

**Report by Alicia Carriquiry:** Carriquiry said it is impossible to make everybody happy but said she would like to address the things Weber said. First of all, there is a contract with labor, so it must be taken into account. There are also restrictions in setting the calendar, including issues with the Registrar now that ISU has two summer sessions instead of one. Carriquiry said she is not against the four-week break -- in fact, she personally favors it -- but there are many constraints here. She stated, however, that she would be willing to look at it again.

**Discussion:** Woodman noted that Loynachan did not say what the dismissal date for all those schools is. Those schools, said Loynachan, are on the semester system. So how did the Registrar do it before when ISU did have four weeks, asked Woodman. He also wondered if ISU would not save facility costs by having an extra week in the winter,

#### 4/9/02 Faculty Senate Minutes

thereby making a four-week break fiscally prudent. Placing a chart on the overhead, Hutter reviewed 90-91 when Fall semester began on August 27, final exams ended December 21, and there were 31 days before the new term started. That year Martin Luther King Day was on Jan 21, the day the new term began; the second half of the semester started March 18; and Monday through Friday of Spring break was March 11-15 with final exams ending May 17. Hutter, who also reviewed the calendar for other years, mentioned that he is affected by the Spring calendar because of a class he teaches that starts the week before Spring break, then breaks for a week, and afterward some students show up for the first time. He also asked how the academic calendar bypassed the senate when it ought to be a senate committee, and pointed out that the Senate gets no vote.

Pope asked Carriquiry whose committee is it that makes the decision, and Carriquiry said there is a faculty representative on the committee. Forest Nutter was identified as the faculty representative. Weber, however, noted that when he attended the calendar meeting, the faculty representative abstained although someone from Engineering voted for a three-week break. Pope asked if the calendar motion is advisory to the Provost, and Hutter said it is a command. Cravens asked when the change would be in effect. Pope thanked faculty senators who have served on the calendar committee and said they have voted their conscience, which the Senate appreciates.

***Motion to change the academic calendar was passed with 36 in favor, 22 opposed.***

#### **V. New Business**

Tom Emmerson introduced a motion on the ISU Foundation and stated that it may not be a perfect resolution right now but perhaps could be sent to the Executive Board for fine-tuning. The motion was seconded, and Pope announced that it will be put under Old Business for the May meeting of the Faculty Senate. Emmerson said he had made copies of the proposal in case anyone would like one.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Constance Post,  
Faculty Senate Secretary