

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 7, 2004**

I. Call to Order – 3:30 p.m.

A. Seating of substitute Senators

The meeting was called to order at 3:34 p.m. and the substitute Senator was seated.

Attendance: Agarwal, S; Al-Khaisi, M.; Bailey, T.; Baldwin, C.; Beetham, J.; Bradbury, S.; Bruna, K.R.; Butler, L.; Carter-Lewis, D.; Chacko, T.; Chang, M.; Cann, D.; Cooper, E.; Crase, S.; Dark, F.; Engler, M.; Fehr, C.; Fiore, A.M.; Gilmore, S.; Girton, J.; Gregorac, R.; Grudens-Schuck, N.; Hargrove, M.; Haynes, J.; Heising, C.; Hoffman, P.; Holland, M.; Jolls, K.; Kline, K.; Laanan, F.S.; Larson, S.; Madon, S.; Manu, A.; Martin, C.; Martin, P.; Maves, J.; Mennecke, B.; Mook, M.; Morrival, D.; Murdoch, Al.; Olsen, M.; Palermo, G.; Phye, G.; Robinson, B.; Rosenbusch, R.; Roskey, C.; Russell, D.; Schilling, K.; Smith, D.; Stone, R.; Sundararajan, S.; Thacker, E.; Thompson, J.; Tim, S.; Townsend, A.; Trahanovsky, W.; Van Der Valk, A.; VanDerZanden, A.M.; Vrchota, D.; Wong, J.; Woodman, B.; Wray, P.; Yang, B.; Zanish-Belcher, T.

Absent: Anderson, D.; Chen, M; Coree, B; Hand, B.; Huffman, W.; Ilahiane, H.; Kottman, R.; Kyber, A.; Leavens, G.; Lowry, R.; Mack, B.; Mitra, A.; Nutter, F.; Post, C.; Russell, S.; Sawyer, J.; Tavananpong, W.; van Leeuwen, H.;

Substitutes: C. Reitmeier for L. Alekel

Guests: B. Allen (Provost); S. Carlson (Provost's Office); K. Constant (Provost's Office); D. Holger (Provost's Office); D. Finnemore; K. Kane (P & S Council); M. Porter (Parliamentarian); L. Charles (University Relations); ISU Daily.

II. Consent Agenda – 3:35 p.m.

A. Minutes of Faculty Senate, May 04, 2004 - [S03/M/09]

B. Ratification of Executive Board actions of Summer, 2004

1. Graduation List, Summer, 2004 - [S04-01]

<http://www.iastate.edu/~registrar/graduation/lists/sum04.xls>

C. Agenda for September 7, 2004 – [S04/A/01]

D. Calendar – [S04/C/01]

Girton moved, Mook seconded, and the consent agenda was passed.

11I. Announcements and Remarks – 3:40 p.m.

A. Faculty Senate President

S. Agarwal, Faculty Senate President, welcomed the Senators and thanked the past presidents of the Senate for their contributions.

He then gave an update on the summer activities of the Senate (through the Executive Board), which included:

- Approving the summer graduation list.
- Meeting with the President and Provost for a summer retreat
- Based on this retreat, Agarwal has invited President Geoffroy to come to the next meeting of the Senate to discuss the changes in the Board of Regents
- Set issues agenda for coming year
- Sponsored a picnic for Faculty Senators and campus administrators
- Formed a Task Force to monitor the proposed mergers in the University
- Filled positions on Councils and Committees and identified Senate representatives on a variety of committees

Agarwal noted the need for additional Senators as volunteers.

2. Agenda Issues for the 2004-2005 Senate

Agarwal announced the following agenda issues for the Senate:

The university is in the process of developing the first draft of the strategic plan.

The draft has been fully endorsed by the president, but suggestions will be accepted. This is an opportunity for university stakeholders to provide feedback. The Senate has a special responsibility for the strategic plan and Senators need to influence and shape the future of the university. There should be no surprises when the plan comes to the Senate in December. The Provost will provide a detailed update later in the meeting.

Agarwal briefly described the Senate's activities over the past several years. A goal has been to increase faculty governance and participation. Agarwal provided examples of the newly created Advisory Research Committee (to work with J. Bloedel) and the Resource and Policy Allocation Committee (which currently works with the Provost) as well as Faculty Senate input on the budget to the President. He again emphasized the need for more Senators to be more engaged in the life of the university.

Additional challenges for the upcoming year include VEISHEA and maintaining student enrollments.

Agarwal then introduced the Faculty Senate officers, including the President-Elect, Council Chairs, Secretary, Parliamentarian, and Office Secretary.

B. Faculty Senate President-elect

C. Baldwin, President-Elect and chair of both Task Forces, reported on the mergers the Faculty Senate is currently monitoring. This reorganization review process was passed by the Senate, FS-1-13-04 and approved by President Geoffroy in January 2004. Its purpose is to monitor the process as the mergers are brought for approval to the Senate

Task Force on the combination of Reorganization of Industrial Education and Technology with Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering: The members are C. Baldwin, M. Wortman, and C. Ford. The discussions have been ongoing for 2 years. The work groups completed discussion on mission resources and curriculum and in May 2004, both departments had a positive vote for the merger. The Executive Board voted to support, 10-0 and forwarded the merger on to the central administration. It was approved at the June Board of Regents meeting.

Task Force on the combination of the College of Education and Family and Consumer Sciences. The Senate Task Force was appointed in February, and the members are C. Baldwin (chair), M. Wortman, and C. Ford.

The appointed committee working on the merger have sponsored open forums, appointed work groups, a day long event and retreats, dealing with issues such as college governance documents and policies, college name and mission, communication and planning, culture and community, and curricular issues.

The recent convocation was held jointly and 4 work groups reported on their progress. Initial reports are due Sept. 17 and additional information is available on their website. There will also be a public forum Sept. 13, 7-8:30 p.m.

The goal is to finalize the plan by October 18. It will then be presented to the Education and Family and Consumer Sciences faculty for a vote. If approved, it will be presented to the Faculty Senate, where it will be reviewed. At that time there will be discussion, and a possible request for further information or clarification. If approved, recommendations will then be forwarded on to the President, and will be considered by the Board of Regents in Jan/Feb. 2005.

If approved, the merger will take effect July 1, 2005 and the search committee for a new Dean will be appointed at that time.

B. Provost

Provost Allen reported on changes and current issues in the Provost Office:

1. 3 new Deans—Whiteford (LAS), Thompson (Vet Med), Kushner (Eng)
2. Dave Holger is now Associate Provost
3. Susan Carlson, Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement and Diversity
4. Jim Davis has been appointed the Chief Information Office, and is currently conducting a review of the university's IT needs
5. Examining university guidelines for low enrollment classes and programs
6. Examining the creation and governance of centers and institutes

7. Development of high ability student programs
8. Examining differential tuition and alternative tuition methods
9. Looking at multi-year budgets, as well as integration and incentive budgets
10. Accreditation process

IV. Special Orders -- 4:00 p.m.

a. Strategic Plan

Provost Allen then reported on the strategic planning process. The first draft was released for commentary on August 30. The plan is required by the Board of Regents, to be submitted in January, for their February meeting.

President Geoffroy's viewpoint on the nature of the plan—it should be a good roadmap for the future, and infuse optimism. It should be shorter, specific, strategic (provide more direction), and substantive. The process should be open, inclusive, and provide several opportunities for review

The plan provide a blueprint for making choices and tradeoffs. What makes ISU different? Provost Allen, with the assistance of K. Constant (Provost's Office and Faculty member in Engineering) went over the Strategic Planning Committee members and Facilitation Committee members as well as the planning process and meeting schedule. The timeline is running from January to January.

The first draft includes Mission, Core Values, Aspiration Statement, and Priorities/Goals. The first draft will be refined and measures developed. The second draft will be released for input on October 11. Metrics will be developed to measure progress for second draft. The action plans/strategies will be developed later, but should be developed with involved constituencies with business model and evaluations.

The Provost then opened it up for questions from the Senate.

Bailey asked how it relates to the departments/colleges and what is the timeline for departmental strategic plans?

Allen responded that he would like the strategies to be developed in "real time," as opposed to a 1-2 year lag time.

Morriscal asked why the word land-grant did not appear.

Allen noted there was a lack of understanding about the concept of land-grant.

Fehr brought up issues relating to the number of patents produced by the university. This could compromise the university's commitment to intellectual property and also tie in to global patterns of injustice.

Allen acknowledged the possible negativity of patents and the Committee and campus community will need to consider this carefully.

Butler felt that some issues were left out or were more implied, such as the issue of global scholarship/citizenship and the land grant university commitment to service/community engagement .

Allen acknowledged the references might be too subtle.

Hargrove questioned how our plan is different from the other land-grant colleges considered the best and what role we play in economic development.

Girton noted that many of the things we do are the same as other universities, which can make drafting a plan difficult.

Rosenbusch noted the lack of geography—what is unique about Iowa? Natural resources; concept of land-grant university were left out. These could enhance the questions of how we are different.

Allen responded that these are issues the Committee struggled with as well.

Stone asked about cultural issues related to quality of life.

Allen noted these would fall under Priority #4.

Rosenbusch asked why the priority focusing on people were last.

Allen noted that the President did not want numbers.

Morriscal asked again about land-grant concept and what makes it difficult?

Allen noted the open forums held with 25 different groups indicated most people struggle with the concept of land-grant. Also, the Faculty Senate retreat illustrated various views of the concept of land-grant within the campus community.

Palermo raised 3 points that he felt were missing from the draft:

1. The fact that ISU offers special, accredited programs also certified by the state, such as landscape architecture, vet med, etc. The document does not reflect professional, specialized knowledge in specialized fields
2. The document does not reflect the framework of the 1999 Promotion & Tenure document.

3. The document profoundly recasts our university as a science and technology university which is in contradiction of ISU as the wider comprehensive university. He feels the impact on humanity is not included.

Woodman responded that he agrees with Palermo, and this is something the university has struggled with over the years. ISU must be a well-rounded university.

Palermo says too much is hidden in the document, but noted the hard work going into it.

Palermo also specifically questioned the phrase, “enable seamless transfer of students from community colleges to ISU.” He hopes there is a tactic to work on the quality. He also commented on the plan’s not mentioning ISUComm (Strengthening Student Communication—providing a comprehensive plan for communication curriculum framework) and WOVe (an integrated approach to written, oral, visual, and electronic communication).

The document reflects a focus on science and technology and partnering with Iowa schools. Should something be said about literacy/social realm and our working with other institutions?

Girton noted the committee did discuss these at great length, particularly the concept of land-grant university offering an education to everyone.

Mook noted in terms of 1st generation and rural students, that there are limits as to how much we can ask of them.

Morriscal noted our challenge is to give them the opportunity, not necessarily their success.

Allen agreed, citing the concept of land-grant as a ladder.

Butler noted the document focused on the undergraduate level, to be available to Iowa students, but stated it also needs to include reaching out to undergraduate students outside Iowa (especially in times of lowered enrollments).

Allen state by having high quality programs, ISU may be able to attract additional students.

Heising felt the document should discuss creating an environment that welcomes students to explore a variety of specializations and career paths, contradiction with math, science, and technology. We should not discount major areas that are not science and technology and math.

Beeton didn’t feel the plan was rigorous like a business plan.

Allen noted that the plan was actually based on several business models, and described some of supporting documenting materials (which could not be included). Constant noted the environmental scan documents available on the strategic plan website. Feedback from the campus and elsewhere will also be posted on the website.

Schilling would like to hear more about the broad university versus science and technology. Is this a core disagreement?

Allen stated we are a comprehensive university, and the listed priorities do not take away from other areas.

Girton stated that the committee did not feel the need to state the fact that we are a broad-based university, but felt it was pretty obvious.

Fehr thought the comprehensiveness of the university should be stated as it is very important for educating people outside of the university.

Agarwal noted that folks should send their comments in writing by Sept. 17.

V. New Business – 4:50 p.m.

There was no new business.

VI. Good of the Order – 4:55

VII. Adjournment – 5:00 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

<p style="text-align: center;">NEXT MEETING FACULTY SENATE ISU MEMORIAL UNION, SUN ROOM OCTOBER 12, 2004 at 3:30 p.m.</p>
--