

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES  
JANUARY 13, 2004**

**I. Call to Order – 7:30 p.m.**

Faculty Senate President, Jack Girton, called the meeting at Gateway Center, to order at 7:30 p.m. and the substitute Senators were seated.

**Attendance:**

**Present:** M. Al-Kaisi; D. Anderson; I. Anderson; C. Baldwin; D. Carter-Lewis; T. Chacko; M. Chen; S. Crase; F. Dark; A.M. Fiore; C. Ford; S. Freeman; S. Gilmore; J. Girton; R. Gregorac; B. Hand; C. Heising; G. Hightshoe; P. Hoffman; M. Holland; W. Huffman; H. Ilahiane; K. Jolls; D. Jones; P. Korsching; R. Kottman; A. Kyber; S. Larson; G. Leavens; R. Lowery; S. Madon; C. Martin; P. Martin; G. Mattson; J. Maves; B. Mennecke; A. Mitra; M. Mook; D. Morrival; A. Murdoch; F. Nutter; M. Olsen; G. Palermo; G. Phye; C. Post; P. Premkumar; J. Raich; B. Robinson; R. Rosenbusch; C. Roskey; D. Russell; J. Sawyer; J. Schuh; D. Simonson; D. Smith; P. Spike; L. Stephens; S. Sundararajan; W. Tavanapong; J. Thompson; S. Tim; W. Trahanovsky; H. van Leeuwen; D. Vrchota; B. Woodman; M. Wortman; B. Yang; T. Zanish-Belcher

**Absent:** S. Agarwal; E. Cooper; B. Coree; C. Drewes; C. Fehr; C. Fritz; M. Hargrove; M. Owen; J. Wong

**Substitutes:** J. Hill for K. Jolls; K. Kruempel for J. Lamont; T. Bailey for J. Opsomer; K. Brydon for K. Schilling; K. Kline for E. Thacker; J. Beetham for J. Tollefson

**Guests/Representatives:** B. Allen, Provost; S. Carlson, Provost Office; M. Porter, Parliamentarian; K. Kane, P & S Council; L. Charles, University Relations

**II. Consent Agenda – 7:35 p.m.**

- A. Minutes of Faculty Senate, November 11, 2003 - [S03/M/03]**
- B. Agenda for January 13, 2004 – [S03/A/04]**
- C. Calendar – [S03/C/04]**

Wortman moved, Porter seconded and the consent agenda was approved.

**III. Special Order - Memorial Resolutions – [S03-5]**

Girton presented the memorial resolutions for the following faculty members: Richard “Dick” Atkins (Agronomy), Tom Al Austin (Engineering), Kalju Eik (Agronomy), Bill Ellett (Education), Solon A. “Bud” Ewing (Animal Science), Lloyd R. Frederick (Soil Microbiology), Vernon Meyer (Agronomy), Anton Netusil (Education), Bert Nordlie (Geologic and Atmospheric Sciences), Helen Hersh Schuster (Anthropology), Hazzle Self (Animal Science),

The Senate then held a moment of silence in their memory.

5/05/02 Faculty Senate Meeting

**IV. Announcements and Remarks – 7:55 p.m.**

**A. Faculty Senate President**

Girton briefly discussed the 3% surcharge proposal, coming from the Vice President for Business and Finance. While the implementation has been delayed, the problem still exists and the university will be looking for further discussion.

On the budget process, it currently appears there may be a possible deficit of 300 million dollars, with no salary funding.

The Provost recently reported to the Senate Executive Board about the process for starting strategic planning. The Executive Board looked at the Provost's proposal to the President, and gave the Provost feedback on the implementation.

**B. Faculty Senate President-elect**

Agarwal was out of town, and therefore, had no report.

**C. Provost**

The Provost briefly reported on the following issues:

The policy on leave with children, placed before Board of Regents has been tabled. It is not rejected, but not yet accepted. There will be a forthcoming memo to university administrators asking them to focus on assisting faculty and to be "reflective in spirit" of the proposal policy. The memo will provide instructions on how departments should handle these issues, and the Provost Office also hopes to collect better institutional data in order to better determine the true costs of the program. The Provost thanked Susan Carlson for her work on the memo.

The Provost will organize the strategic planning process in order to allow as much input as possible. It must be presented to Board of Regents at beginning of 2005, and we must show progress from 1995. The Committee will be announced next week. There will also be community hearings, and he hopes this work will also be coordinated with the University's NCA review. There will be a larger committee of 40 people, and subgroup (8-9) will be coordinate (facilitate).

**IV. Election of President-Elect – 8:10**

Claudia Baldwin has been nominated for President-Elect

Wortman moved, Woodman seconded, and her nomination was accepted. Claudia spoke and described her work in Veterinary Medicine and with the Faculty Senate and University. Claudia was elected as President-Elect.

Girton reminded the Senate that there would be March elections for 3 Council Chair positions (2 year terms), and also the Secretary position.

5/05/02 Faculty Senate Meeting

**V. Old Business – 8:15 p.m.**

**A. Revised policy on reorganization of academic units – [S03-4]**

Girton briefly went over the history and background of the proposal, which has been discussed at a previous meeting. There have been changes in wording for one area:

*After completing its review the Senate will take one of two actions. It may return the proposal to the Provost with a recommendation that he/she consider revisions or reconsider rejecting the proposal. The Senate may submit the plan to the President with a recommendation that it be approved. The Senate will complete its review and take action following the normal Senate time frame of two meetings after receiving the plan.*

This is considered a motion from the Executive Board. When will it take effect? Immediately. How will it affect current reorganization? Girton responded we could discuss and be flexible, can be used if needed. There were then a number of questions from the Senate:

Anderson questioned the role of the Dean(s)? Girton noted we cannot write about every eventuality. The vote of the Senate will be sent to both the Dean and Provost.

Mook asked about the early stages of the reorganization, will we find out? Girton responded that how we deal with this would vary from case to case.

Kruempel questioned the new wording, “send back to the Provost?” The Provost responded that while the process looks linear, but he does envision lots of discussion, different perspectives. If it came back, it may be an opportunity to consider additional issues.

Another question was raised about how this policy would affect the creation of Centers and Institutes? Girton responded that he thought the policy should only tackle academic reorganizations at this time.

Mook noted the policy will affect departments and/or colleges, but leaves out programs. Girton noted that was so, there already exists a policy for programs.

Fiore asked if there was enough information to be available. She asked if something about the rationale should be articulated in the policy? Girton felt it was implied.

Spike questioned whether the Senate has to “approve” the proposal—Girton noted that it’s still a recommendation.

Another question—does the timeline work? The Provost responded that it could be an issue, especially in regards to a second round, but he thinks this has been addressed.

Rosenbusch asked if Senate councils would be working on this? Or a task force? Girton wants to give future Senate flexibility to deal with different situations.

It is important the faculty be represented in the reorganization procedure.

The motion was passed. A final draft will be sent out with the minutes of the meeting.

5/05/02 Faculty Senate Meeting

**VII. New Business – 8:45 p.m.**

**A. Resolution on the implementation of the P&T policy – [S03-7]**

Girton opened the discussion by noting the current Promotion and Tenure document has been in operation since 1999 and it set out a broader definition of scholarship as well as defining the role of the Position Responsibility Statement. He feels it is time to see how things are working and sees this as part of a regular review process.

The Senate calls for each academic department to have a discussion on how the P & T policy is being implemented in the department. Specific questions about the implementation should include:

**1. The definition and evaluation of scholarship.**

**The P&T policy presents the concept that scholarship encompasses a wide range of activities.**

**How does the department define scholarship?**

**How does the department evaluate a faculty member's scholarship?**

**What are the department's standards/expectations for scholarship for faculty members at different stages of their career?**

**2. The meaning of the PRS and proportionality of effort.**

**The P&T document establishes that each faculty member's total accomplishments will be evaluated in light of their proportion of effort, as defined in the PRS.**

**How does the department consider the PRS in the P&T process?**

**What are the department's standards and expectations for faculty with different levels of effort?**

**For example, how would the expectations of a faculty member with 70% teaching and 30% research differ from those of a faculty member with 30% teaching and 70% research?**

**3. The value of non-scholarship accomplishments.**

**Faculty do a variety of tasks which do not produce, and are not intended to produce, scholarship. These may include teaching, extension, service, and/or administrative activities that are of great importance to the institution.**

**How does the department evaluate and value non-scholarship accomplishments?**

**What are the department standards for recognizing excellence in non-scholarship activities?**

**How does the department weigh non-scholarship accomplishments in the P&T process?**

Comments from the Senate:

Porter: This process should look at the compatibility of Department documents with the Colleges, voting procedures, implementation, even the portfolio.

Baldwin: The Department policies should also be shared with College Promotion and Tenure committees.

How are emerging disciplines handled? Girton thought this might relate to the scholarship discussion.

5/05/02 Faculty Senate Meeting

Robinson summarized some of his reasons for opposing this resolution. He doesn't see a clear problem and does not believe the issues will be resolved. This would require significant time of faculty with little purpose and unclear goal. He doesn't think uniformity is attainable, due to lack of structure in the document.

Girton responded by saying, yes, it's an effort. But Promotion and Tenure is extremely important, and we ask assistant and associate professors to put forth a lot of effort and our policies drive the teaching and research patterns of the university. This is not necessarily to prove anything wrong with what the departments are doing, but to share good news too! This may serve as a possible inspiration to other departments.

Ford: While he is sympathetic to Robinson's view of the potential work, Ford does see positive outcomes: if faculty say is this really what we want, the review will then hold them accountable. This gives the faculty a chance to review and be proactive.

Girton closed by stating discussion will continue at the next meeting of the Senate.

#### **VIII. Good of the Order – 8:55**

Spike as Chair of the Computation Advisory Committee asked for CAC proposals to be submitted for consideration.

Bailey requested the Senate Executive Board re-examine the calendar issue, Girton will pass this along.

#### **IX. Adjournment – 9:00 p.m.**

Palermo moved, and Woodman seconded. The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>NEXT MEETING FACULTY SENATE THE GATEWAY HOTEL February 10, 2004 at 7:30 p.m.</b></p>
--