

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
March 8, 2005**

Attendance: Agarwal, S; Alekel, D. L.; Anderson, D.; Bailey, T.; Baldwin, C.; Bentham, J.; Bradbury, S.; Butler, L.; Carter-Lewis, D.; Chacko, T.; Chang, M.; Cooper, E.; Crase, S.; Engler, M.; Fehr, C.; Fiore, A.M.; Gilmore, S.; Girton, J.; Gregorac, R.; Grudens-Schuck, N.; Hargrove, M.; Heising, C.; Hoffman, P.; Huffman, W.; Jolls, K.; Kline, K.; Kottman, R.; Kyber, A.; Lanaan, F.S.; Leavens, G.; Madon, S.; Maney, A.; Manu, A.; Martin, C.; Martin, P.; Maves, J.; Mennecke, B.; Mook, M.; Morriscal, D.; Murdoch, A.; Olsen, M.; Palermo, G.; Phye, G.; Robinson, B.; Rosenbusch, R.; Roskey, C.; Russell, D.; Smith, D.; Stone, R.; Sundararajan, S.; Tavanapong, W.; Thompson, J.; Trahanovsky, W.; VanDerZanden, A.M.; van Leeuwen, H.; Vrchota, D.; Woodman, B.; Wray, P.; Zanish-Belcher, T.

Absent: Al-Khaisi, M; Bruna, K.; Cann, D.; Chen, M.; Coree, B; Dark, F.; Haynes, J.; Holland, M.; Larson, S.; Mack, B.; Mitar, A.; Natrajan, B.; Nutter, F.; Post, C.; Russell, S.; Sawyer, J.; Schilling, K.; Thacker, E.; Townsend, A.; Van Der Valk, A.; Wong, J.; Yang, B.;

Substitutes: A. Kaleita for S. Tim

Guests: B. Allen (Provost); S. Carlson (Provost's Office); D. Holger (Provost's Office); Deal, C. (GSB); K. Kane (P & S Council); L. Charles (University Relations); ISU Daily; W. Dillon (Ames Tribune); Wemhoff, B. (GPSS)

I. Call to Order – 3:30 p.m.
A. Seating of Substitute Senators

The meeting was called to order at 3:33 p.m.

II. Consent Agenda – 3:35 p.m.
A. Minutes of Faculty Senate, February 8, 2005 - [S04/M/06]
B. Agenda for March 8, 2005 – [S04/A/07]
C. Calendar – [S04/C/07]

Baldwin moved, Rosenbusch seconded, and the consent agenda was approved.

III. Announcements and Remarks – 3:40 p.m.
A. Faculty Senate President

President Agarwal made the following announcements:

- The administration is waiting to hear about the budget from the legislature
- The Board of Regents will be meeting in Ames on March 14-15

- Upcoming speakers for the Faculty Senate, will include the following:
Jim Davis, Chief Information Officer, will provide an update on the December report
Bruce Van de Velde, Director of Athletics and Paula Morrow, NCAA representative
President Geoffroy

Finally, there will be some debate and discussion at the next meeting related to the work of the Task Force on Part-Time Tenure Positions.

B. Faculty Senate President-elect

President-elect Baldwin made the following announcements:

- There will be a Faculty Senate election for an athletic representative, as well elections for the Chair of Academic Affairs (2 year terms) and Secretary (1 year term) today.
- The at large elections are completed, except for Veterinary Medicine.
- Invitations to the Faculty Conference on April 1-2 have been sent out.

B. Provost

There were no remarks from the Provost.

IV. Special Order – 3:50 p.m.

A. Pick-A-Professor (Presentation by Chris Deal-GSB)

The Senate then listened to a presentation by Chris Deal of the Government of the Student Body (GSB). He presented on the Pick a Prof, an online evaluation system recently approved by GSB as of March 2, 2005. There are a number of options for students, including reviews (exams, homework load, lecture style, attendance policy), student government customization, schedule planner, professor information, grade histories, and professor comparisons.

There are also bar graphs of grade percentages for courses as well as the average GPA for professors. In addition, there are also a number of option for professors, such as viewing information, sharing information (personal review, profile information (bios, syllabus, links), and gathering information. Pick-a-Prof is a monitored site, and submissions are reviewed.

GSB is currently presenting this to a number of administrative groups to obtain feedback. The web site will be customized and there is no cost due to the advertising. There will be a trial period of 1-2 years, at which time everything will be evaluated.

A number of our Peer 11 institutions (9) already have Pick-a-Prof, and it has also been implemented at UI and UNI. GSB is very interested in having as many professors participate as possible.

The Faculty Senate had a number of questions.

Rosenbusch asked about who was advertising on Pick-a-Prof? Deal responded advertisers currently include Kaplan and Graduate University program operations.

Nancy Grudens-Shuck asked how the program had been received at UI and UNI? Deal answered that the program has not been there long enough for any results.

Bailey asked about efforts at evaluation? Deal answered that there will be an evaluation after the pilot project time period.

Woodman asked about the emphasis on grades? Deal responded that while some students may use it for that purpose, the goal is to help students find the best professors.

Woodman asked about administrative support and the role of faculty? Deal wants to ask for faculty support and to participate as it will impact on the success.

Kyber commented that this program would not necessarily impact small departments, where there is not a choice of professors.

Roskey commented about using this system to assist students at Georgia as an advisory tool.

Stone noted that Rate My Prof is not monitored, but feels that he will use this system since it is.

One question of particular interest was if the administration could use for evaluation? The answer was no.

Manu asked about possibly delaying the implementation. Deal agreed that they could slow it down.

Deal also noted that students having to choose among especially large classes will benefit.

Anderson asked how many students can evaluate professors, and how many times?

Pick-a-Prof does note the percentage of student reviews out of class. There is a possibility that students could review several times. But Deal noted reviews can be removed if necessary.

Woodman asked about more specifically about this issue, and noted there could be poor quality control.

Deal responded that if the faculty requested it, the GPA reporting could be removed. There might also be a way to implement verification.

Madon noted that team taught courses which could result in students logging in multiple times.

Finally, Deal said the program is to rate professors, not courses.

Agarwal thanked Deal for his presentation.

V. Elections – 4:10 p.m.

A. Secretary

B. Council Chair—Academic Affairs

Tellers distributed voting cards which were collected and tabulated.

Zanish-Belcher, candidate for Secretary, spoke briefly about the value of being involved with the Faculty Senate.

Roskey, candidate for Academic Affairs Council Chair, spoke about her experiences with the Faculty Senate and in administration.

Mennecke, candidate for Academic Affairs Council Chair, spoke about how he would like to serve as Chair.

VI. Old Business—4:20 p.m.

A. Handbook Placement of “Evaluation” of NTE appointments – [S04-15]

Agarwal and Girton presented a motion related to moving the evaluation section from recruitment to evaluation. Agarwal asked that if folks had additional editorial changes, they should submit to the Handbook Committee. But if they are policy related, then it would need to be evaluated by the appropriate Council.

Palermo stated that his concerns have been satisfied, as he had pulled this issue from the Consent Agenda at the previous Senate meeting.

Gregorac asked about his specific editorial changes, and was concerned about redundancy and title conflicts. Girton responded that this is still completely editorial.

Agarwal asked Gregorac to give his changes to the Handbook Committee and these can be incorporated.

Morrical moved and Murdoch seconded and the motion was passed by the Senate.

VII. New Business—4:30 p.m.

A. DP and UP Policy—Governance Council – [S04-16]

Vrchota, Chair of the Governance Council, presented the proposed changes to the Faculty Senate in regards to these two awards. The Handbook text was examined by the Governance Council due to difficulty in distinguishing between the 2 awards. She also met with chairs of both committees, and thus far, they are amenable to the changes.

Vrchota then went over the changes using a 2 column format showing the current policy v proposed change. There are new definitions of both awards. The 5 year requirement has been

removed. Procedural changes are also being made. Formerly, nominations were channeled to the Provost Office—now, those will be made to Executive Board. Finally, the restriction on having other titled or endowed positions has also been removed.

Both committee chairs have both received copies and Vrchota will try to have Professors Keller and Flora here at the next meeting.

Palermo felt that while the Governance Council has done a good job of clarifying the situation, there is a need for some additional changes. He would like to use the word scholarship as opposed to research and creative activities. He feels the proposed wording denies access to anyone who has had an impact on teaching, extension, or pedagogy.

Olson responded to Palermo's comments and stated that these are two different types of awards. One is to recognize a discipline impact through research, and the other recognized university service.

Huffman noted that the Distinguished Professor was initiated in the 1960s to recognize contributions to discovery, while the University Professor was to recognize other types of service to the university. He feels the wording is appropriate.

Morriscal commented that while the Distinguished recognizes external impact, and the University recognizes internal impact, he does feel they may be cutting out Extension folks who may have an international impact.

Palermo stated that recognition should be focused on scholarship.

Finally, Gregorac pointed out that since we are all university professors, maybe another title would be appropriate.

B. Changes to P&T Policy—J&A Council – [S04-17]

Robinson updated the Senate on a motion proposed by the Judiciary and Appeals Council to deal with late developed information which becomes known after the Promotion and Tenure material has left the department.

Motion I.

Add a section to the document, "Suggested Changes to Tenure Approval and Appeals Processes", with new number, title and text as follows:

5.2.4.1.7 Treatment of Late-Developed Information

Late-Developed Information is information that becomes available after the departmental P&T recommendation has been sent to the College and that either the candidate or the department chair considers to be of potential relevance (whether favorable or unfavorable) to the case. Such information shall be forwarded by the department chair to the next level in the administrative

chain that has not yet made its decision. In the case of unfavorable information, the candidate shall also be notified of its nature and the evidence on which it is based. Transmittal of late-developed information shall include an indication of when the information became available and which evaluators have had access to it. It is the responsibility of recipients of late-developed information to consider it, determine the degree of its relevance and decide upon what weight it ought to have in making their decision.

Motion II.

Delete the last paragraph (two sentences) of section “5.2.4.3.5. Appeals” in the ‘Suggested Changes’ document.

Motion III.

Accept the changes in the “Suggested Changes to Tenure Approval and Appeals Processes” after that document has been amended in accordance with Motions I and II.

Rationale

In general, the ‘Suggested Changes’ document clarifies policy concerning the difference between mandatory (penultimate year of probationary period) tenure cases and other tenure cases, and makes explicit some matters that are implicit in the present edition of the Faculty Handbook.

Treatment of late-developed information is a matter that has sometimes arisen in connection with appeals, but the question of how to handle it arises long before there is any question of appeal. For this reason, we recommend putting the policy on late-developed information earlier in the document, at the place where statements of policies for departmental procedures give way to statements of policies for college procedures. This goal will be accomplished by using the new number in Motion I and removing the matter from its present position by passing Motion II.

The text of the proposed new section embodies the principle that important decisions should be made on the most complete evidence available. It provides a procedure that will enable later decision makers to tell whether or not the late-developed information has already been available for factoring into the thinking of earlier decision makers, and it provides a safeguard for candidates in the case of unfavorable information.

Madon asked about department chairs not forwarding the information. Robinson noted the use of the word, "shall."

B. FPDA Policy—FDAR Council – [S04-18]

Cruse reported on two motions from the Faculty Development Relations Council (FDAR) in regards to the current policy in regards to professional development funding. They are recommending the following revisions:

Recommendations:

1. Changes to the FPDA program

The recommendation is to restrict FPDAs to tenured faculty who have been at Iowa State for at least two years.

Only tenured faculty who have been at Iowa State for at least two year are eligible for faculty professional development assignment. Priority may be given to persons who have not received a faculty professional development assignment in the past five years.

2. Professional development of junior (untenured, tenure-eligible) faculty

The recommendation is that consideration be given to the development of an alternative (to the FPDA) program for untenured tenure-eligible faculty members. The program we envision would be a highly selective program (similar, for example, to the SPRIG program) that would fund a limited number of one or two-semester teaching and service release grants for untenured tenure-eligible faculty. The structure of the program would be similar to the FPDA program and the evaluation apparatus currently in place for FPDAs could be used to evaluate applications to the proposed program. The proposed program would, like the current FPDA program, provide development opportunities for a small number of tenure-track junior faculty whose departments do not offer pre-tenure release time as a matter of course. However, junior faculty competing with one another rather than against themselves and senior faculty would eliminate some of the problems with the current program.

Non-Tenure Track faculty would no longer be eligible for this funding.

Gregorac asked about lecturers. As NTT faculty, they would no longer be eligible.

5/05/02 Faculty Senate Meeting

VIII. Good of the Order – 4:55

The results of the elections were announced. Zanish-Belcher was elected Secretary and Roskey was elected Chair of the Academic Affairs Council.

Morriscal requested that we take a vote on the Pick a Prof at the next meetings

IX. Adjournment – 5:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

**NEXT MEETING
FACULTY SENATE
ISU MEMORIAL UNION, SUN ROOM
March 29, 2005 at 3:30 p.m.**