

**Iowa State University
FACULTY SENATE
Session XV, Meeting 6
MINUTES
February 11, 2003**

I. Call to Order

The meeting at the Gateway Center, North Room was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Faculty Senate President Max Wortman.

II. Introduction of Substitute Members**Attendance:**

Present: S. Agarwal; M. Al-Kaisi; D. Anderson; I. Anderson; C. Baldwin; D. Bullen; D. Carter-Lewis; T. Chacko; M. Chen; E. Cooper; B. Coree; J. Cunnally; F. Dark; C. Fehr; A.M. Fiore; C. Ford; S. Freeman; C. Fritz; S. Gilmore; J. Girton; R. Gregorac; B. Hand; C. Heising; J. Herwig; G. Hightshoe; P. Hoffman; W. Huffman; H. Ilahiane; K. Jolls; D. Jones; P. Korsching; R. Kottman; A. Kyber; J. Lamont; G. Leavens; R. Lowry; C. Martin; P. Martin; G. Mattson; J. Maves; B. Mennecke; M. Mook; D. Morrival; A. Murdoch; M. Olsen; G. Phye; C. Pope; C. Post; P. Premkumar; J. Raich; B. Robinson; J. Robyt; S. Russell; K. Schilling; J. Schuh; W. Tavanapong; E. Thacker; J. Thompson; S. Tim; W. Trahanovsky; H. van Leeuwen; D. Vrchota; M. Wortman; B. Yang; T. Zanish-Belcher.

Absent: D. Bazylnski; C. Drewes; C. Mize; J. Opsomer; M. Owen; C. Thoen; J. Tollefson; B. Woodman; P. Wray.

Substitutes: R. Rosenbusch for M. Holland; V. Dark for S. Madon; F. Chavez for G. Rajagopalan; K. Bryden for D. Simonson; J. Duffy for D. Smith.

Guests: D. Hopper, Chair Non-Tenure-Track Transition Task Force; S. Carlson, Provost Office; R. Heer, P&S Council; B. Allen, Provost; M. Porter, Parliamentarian; H. Shapiro, Vice Provost; D. Finnemore, Retiree's Committee; K. Kane, V.P. P&S Council.

III. Consent Items

Motion to pass the following consent items was approved.

- A. Agenda for February 11, 2003 - [S02/A/6]
- B. Minutes of Faculty Senate meeting on January 14, 2003 - [S02/M/5]
- C. Calendar - [S02/C/6]

IV. Announcements and Remarks**A. President - Faculty Senate**

President Wortman announced that he appointed a new Task Force on University Reorganizations.

B. President-Elect, Faculty Senate

President-Elect Girton discussed the changes the senate made in the bylaws regarding staggered terms of office for council chairs. He suggested that the senate elect council chair for all council as it has done in the past and the Executive Board will come up with a proposal of how to stagger the terms for the following year.

President-Elect Girton also updated the Senate on the Spring Faculty Conference which will be held April 18-19 at the Gateway Center.

V. Old Business

A. Policies and Procedures for Annual Review, Reappointment, and Advancement of Non-Tenure-Track faculty - [S02-23]

David Hopper, Chair of the FS Non-tenure Track Policy Task Force led the discussion and began with pointing out 8 main changes in the Task Force proposed document [Changes to the current (2002) Faculty Handbook resulting from the proposed NTTTP policy] from the original policy S0030. (Overhead: Attachment 1.)

Item 7 on the attachment addressed the limits on number of non-tenure track positions (NTTPs). Sanjeev Agarwal (Chair of Academic Affairs Council) proposed a friendly amendment from the task force to *strike, under section 3.3.2.1, in the first paragraph of page 2 of the document, the underlined portion of that paragraph beginning with: "In order to broaden this criterion to encompass other areas of faculty responsibility for which non-tenure-eligible appointments may be made (such as research and professional practice..."* This essentially will return the document to only place limits on NTTPs that contribute to teaching and therefore, release caps on research and professional practice.

Hopper opened the floor to discussion.

Michael Olsen (Engineering At-Large) proposed a motion to amend section 3.3.2.1, on page 1, 2nd section, which begins with: "The types of non-tenure-eligible appointments include the following:" The amendment was to insert, following the title Clinician and in the next bulleted item, Senior Clinician, an asterisk. The asterisk footnote would read: Colleges and other administrative units may substitute other descriptors in place of Lecturer and Clinician and Senior Lecturer and Senior Clinician to reflect the usages and norms of their disciplines.

John Robyt (Biochemistry and Biophysics) asked for examples. Olsen responded that research engineer or research scientist were examples. Robyt asked if these examples could be added to the motion as a friendly amendment. Olsen agreed.

Max Wortman (President of the Faculty Senate) called for the Parliamentarian, Max Porter. Porter responded that these two amendments (one from committee, one from a caucus delivered from the floor) were not germane. The committee's amendment did not require a second but Olsen's (Engineering) does. Bill Robinson (Philosophy At-Large

LAS) seconded Olsen's motion. The Parliamentarian suggested the body should discuss the committee's amendment first. Hopper asked for discussion.

Veronica Dark, substituting for Stephanie Madon (Psychology), commented on *section 3.3.2.5, the first paragraph, located on page 5*. Dark proposed the caps covering teaching or instruction should stand for P&S but caps for professional practice and research should be eliminated for P&S as was just proposed for NTTPs. Dark offered this as a friendly amendment. *The change would read, 4th line of 1st paragraph: "their total work responsibilities assigned as non-tenure-eligible faculty responsibilities (teaching)."*

Wally Huffman (Economics) asked what would happen to those individuals in P&S that have greater than 30% of total duties as teaching now. Using a grandfather clause was discussed for individuals currently in this situation. New appointments would adhere to the new guidelines.

There was a call for the question by Wortman regarding Dark's amendment. ***The amendment passed.***

Discussion went back to the amendment by Olsen. Van Leeuwen (Civil & Construction Engineering) asked to add other titles to the amendment, such as research assistant, associate, and full professor. Clark Ford (Council Chair J&A) questioned the use of research in the titles of NTTPs as this document is about teaching. Jim Raich (Botany) thought that allowing colleges to use any title designation would be problematic. He spoke for more structure in the titles. Hopper informed the body that the task force had chosen not to address titles at this time but this would be taken up later. Olsen suggested that we add "with approval of the Faculty Senate". Robert Gregorac (Mathematics) objected to the removal of Lecturer and Senior Lecturer, as these are standard titles. John Cunnally (Art & Design) respects the need to have leeway in titles but felt "approval of the Faculty Senate" was appropriate. Hopper suggested the Provost Office may also want some say over this. Christy Pope (Past President) mentioned that a lot of Universities are tackling this right now. Many are trying to look at this and retain professor titles for only tenure track lines. If clinician and lecturer are retained we avoid this problem. Clear separation of titles will help to retain the status of tenure track. Brian Coree (Engineering At-Large) asked why, if these titles (clinician and lecturer) originated from the Faculty Senate, we couldn't change them now. Hopper reminded the body that these titles were original to S0030, the task force wanted to consider this issue later, but added that we can address this now. Claudia Baldwin (Vet Clin Sciences) stated that the title used in veterinary and human medicine in our peer 11 schools was clinical professor. None use Clinician. Professorial titles for individuals we entrust with teaching are appropriate and should not be threatening to the tenure line. Gary Leavens (Computer Science) asked to limit the footnote to just Clinician and Senior Clinician, as a friendly amendment. Olsen accepted. Hsain Ilahaine (Anthropology) added that professor titles speak to dignity. This would be so when publishing.

Baldwin read the Olsen motion back to the body on Hopper's request. After clarification, *the modified amendment to section 3.3.2.1, on page 1, 2nd section, was to insert, in the first bulleted item following the title Clinician and in the next bulleted item, Senior Clinician, an asterisk. The asterisk footnote would read: Colleges and other administrative units may substitute other descriptors in place of Clinician and Senior*

*Clinician to reflect the usages and norms of their disciplines with approval of the faculty senate and provost. **The amendment was passed.***

Coree questioned section 3.3.2.4, the last sentence on page 4. “The title of adjunct instructor should be reserved for persons with DVMs or the equivalent degree who are performing faculty work as part of a PhD or specialty training program.” Was there a need to be so specific? Susan Carlson (Provost’s Office) indicated that this was a special situation when the individual is acting as a faculty member and student at the same time. Doug Jones (Vet Path) agreed and indicated it is necessary for recruitment.

Robinson asked for clarification in 3.3.2.4, 3rd sentence from the bottom of page 4 which reads: “Whenever possible, these individuals should be considered for tenure-track positions.” Carlson responded that we need to consider, before we hire, whether this is the appropriate rank or not. Robinson said that perhaps we shouldn’t consider change to these positions. Carlson suggested we should be talking about positions, not individuals. Dean Anderson (Health and Human Performance) suggested it might read better “employed by department” as these individuals may be in another department.

Iver Anderson (Materials Science and Engineering) questioned section 3.3.2.4, 2nd sentence from the bottom of page 4 which reads: “Adjunct faculty in such positions are not tenure-track faculty, and have term appointments, similar to those of clinicians and lecturers”. He suggested we insert “and their term shall be as previously specified or for a renewable term not to exceed 5 years” so it is exactly the same as the P&S description. Gary Mattson (CRP) suggested that we say “adjunct faculty are not faculty within that specific department”. More discussion followed. Hopper suggested Adjunct Faculty in such positions are not tenure-track faculty within that department. *Agarwal pointed out that the first page of the document (line 14 from the bottom) defines the position as “limited renewable term full or part-time appointments not to exceed five years for each appointment,…”* He suggested we change that sentence to “Adjunct Faculty and such positions are not tenure-track faculty and have term appointments as specified earlier”. **Agarwal’s suggestion was accepted as a friendly amendment.** There was more discussion. Ford saw a discrepancy between 3.3.2.3 and 3.3.2.4. Robinson offered that the key is adjuncts, described in 3.3.2.3, are employed elsewhere.

Huffman called attention to the 15 and 25% rule. He was concerned that some departments already surpass the 25% rule and this may not change due to the economic climate. Hopper indicated the rule was not binding, a five-year phase in period is available and exceptions can be made by request of the Faculty Senate, by way of the Provost.

Under 3.3.2.1, found on page 2, 3rd paragraph, Dark questioned the sentence: “In addition, non-tenure-eligible faculty can also serve in the Faculty Senate, with the exception of persons employed in a P&S position, their representation being the P&S Council.” Dark wondered how this applied to part-time NTTPs. Hopper replied that part-time NTTPs would be eligible to be Senators. Departments should consider the period in which they are NTTPs (one semester vs. full academic year and length of appointment) before election. Hopper explained, in reference to the above statement in the document, it was anticipated that P&S appointees use P&S as their representative body. But in

departmental curriculum issues for example, if they participate in teaching, they could or should contribute.

Coree spoke on two issues. In section 3.3.2.6, Continuous Adjunct Appointments, Coree asked about “termination only for cause”, found on the last line of page 5, without mention of a period of notice. Hopper indicated this was current policy for continuous adjuncts, and that these individual appointments were limited in number and decreasing, having been grandfather situations some years ago. He indicated these individuals are in a tenure-like status. Provost Allen and Associate Provost Carlson indicated there would be something about notice in the contracts of continuous adjuncts. Hopper suggested the task force could look into this.

Coree continued with section 3.3.2.1 Appointment Policies. On page 2, 4th paragraph from the top reads: “*No changes to the status, title, and privileges of persons already holding continuing adjunct non-tenure-eligible faculty positions shall be made unless requested by such a person. See section 3.3.2.6 on continuous adjunct appointments for a definition of a continuous adjunct.*” Coree asked for further comment. Hopper indicated that this statement is specific to the thirty or so continuous adjuncts currently employed.

Pope made a motion to extend the meeting by 10 minutes as the hour was 9:00 p.m. This was seconded and passed.

Hopper clarified by pointing out that the underlined portion in this statement refers to those grandfathered in. (“See section 3.3.2.6 on continuous adjunct appointments for a definition of a continuous adjunct.”) *Cunnally suggested changing the word continuing, in that 1st sentence, to continuous, to avoid confusion. **This was accepted as a friendly amendment.***

Wortman called for a vote. **A motion to accept the document, as amended, was seconded and passed unanimously.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Claudia J. Baldwin
Senator, Vet Clin Sci

Attachment 1

POLICY FORMAT

The policy is drafted in format compatible with the language in the current Faculty Handbook (Section 3.3.2) and new text is underlined.

ISSUES THE PROPOSED SEEKS TO ADDRESS:

- 1. The lack of a uniform policy for the current (2) types of NTT appointment.**
 - Lecturer, Clinician, Senior Lecturer, Senior Clinician
 - Adjunct positions
- 2. Differences in the length and renewal of NTT appointments**
- 3. Differences in the appointment process and authority for NTT appointments.**
- 4. Differences in appointment review for NTT appointments.**
- 5. The issue of the appointment of P&S personnel to NTT faculty appointments.**
- 6. Differences in responsibilities for NTT appointments.**
- 7. The limitation on the number of NTT positions and the criteria for the limitation of NTT appointments.**
- 8. The issue of titles for NTT positions.**