

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES**

April 12, 2005

3:30 – 5:00 P.M.

The Memorial Union, Sun Room

Attendance: Agarwal, S; Alekel, D. L.; Anderson, D.; Bailey, T.; Baldwin, C.; Beetham, J.; Bradbury, S.; Butler, L.; Carter-Lewis, D.; Chang, M.; Cooper, E.; Crase, S.; Dark, F.; Fehr, C.; Fiore, A.M.; Gilmore, S.; Girton, J.; Gregorac, R.; Grudens-Schuck, N.; Hargrove, M.; Hoffman, P.; Leavens, G.; Madon, S.; Martin, C.; Martin, P.; Maves, J.; Mennecke, B.; Mook, M.; Murdoch, A.; Natrajan, B.; Palermo, G.; Robinson, B.; Rosenbusch, R.; Russell, D.; Schilling, K.; Tavanapong, W.; Thacker, E.; Thompson, J.; Tim, S.; Trahanovsky, W.; VanderZanden, A.M.; van Leeuwen, H.; Vrchota, D.; Wong, J.; Woodman, B.; Wray, P..

Absent: Al-Khaisi, M; Bruna, K.; Chacko, T.; Chen, M.; Coree, B; Engler, M.; Haynes, J.; Heising, C.; Holland, M.; Huffman, W.; Kline, K.; Kottman, R.; Kyber, A; Lanaan, F.S.; Larson, S.; Mack, B.; Maney, A.; Manu, A.; Mitra, A.; Morrical, D.; Nutter, F.; Olsen, M.; Phye, G.; Post, C.; Roskey, C.; Russell, S.; Sawyer, J.; Smith, D.; Stone, R.; Sundararajan, S.; Townsend, A.; Van Der Valk, A.; Yang, B.; Zanish-Belcher, T.

Substitutes: M. Selby for D. Cann; M. Lamm for K. Jolls.

Guests: B. Allen (Provost); S. Carlson (Provost's Office); K. Kane (P & S Council); D. Pounds (University Relations); Wemhoff, B. (GPSS); L. Sadosky (History).

I. Call to Order – 3:30 p.m.

A. Seating of Substitute Senators

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. and the substitute Senators were seated.

II. Consent Agenda – 3:33 p.m.

A. Minutes of Faculty Senate, March 29, 2005 - [S04/M/08]

B. Agenda for April 12, 2005 – [S04/A/09]

C. Calendar – [S04/C/09]

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

III. Announcements and Remarks – 3:35 p.m.

A. Faculty Senate President

Agarwal had no announcements or remarks.

B. Faculty Senate President-elect

Baldwin had no announcements or remarks.

C. Provost

The Provost reported on the following:

Departmental teaching percentages by NTT faculty:

To predicate, the Provost reported that the university has lost 21 tenure track and continuing adjunct faculty, and the non tenure track faculty have fell from 203 to 188.

A vast majority of departments are still under the 25% limitation. 18 Departments are below 18%. The medium is 17% but the total percentage of eligible teaching is 23%, which is 15% above the AAUP guidelines. Last year, the percentage rate was 24.4%, and this year, it is 23%.

There is currently 1 department at 25% and 13 above that percentage. Last year, there were at least 18 or 19. The Provost feels this is a small positive sign that the number of departments is slowly dropping, and would also like to note that the NTT faculty provide excellent teaching. He knows the budget problems over the last few years have had an impact. He then asked for comments.

Gregorac asked how the calculations are made?

The Provost responded that it is based on section credits.

Gregorac asked if this information will be posted on a website for review?

The Provost responded that yes, they will do that.

Palermo asked if it would be possible to have the actual credit hours actually being taught by NTT faculty?

The Provost responded that they would also post this information. He also stated that they would meet with the departments with the highest percentages.

Promotion and tenure percentages:

There were a total of 78 cases for the year (one adjunct). 5 were denied at the College level, and 6 were denied by the Provost. The cases recommended for approval were 41. There were 30 cases for promotion. 1 was denied by the Provost and 20 were approved.

The Provost then continued on with additional statistics for the 41 awarded tenure. 29 were mandatory cases, and 12 were non mandatory. There were 4 mandatory cases cases denied, and 2 at the Provost level. There was 1 college decision that the Provost voted yes on. The Provost feels this is a fairly typical year.

Girton asked if President Geoffroy had approved the recommendations.

The Provost responded that yes, the cases have been through his office.

Faculty Conduct Policy:

Finally, the Provost reported on the use of the Faculty Conduct Policy, which was developed by the Faculty Senate 3 years ago (March 2002). Basically, there have been 10 cases over the past 3 years, filed by students, faculty, staff, and administrators. The charges have included harassment, sexual harassment, discrimination by sex/religion/race, deception, consensual relationships, and misuse of funds. 2 went to major sanctions, there were 3 minor sanctions, 3 were dismissed, and 2 are still active. The major sanctions include letters of reprimand, training, mentoring, and counseling. Over 28 faculty have served in the pool.

IV. Special Item I—3:50 p.m. – Jim Davis, CIO

The Senate heard a presentation from the University's Chief Information Officer, Jim Davis. Davis introduced himself as a faculty member (20 years) in Electrical and Computer Engineering. He is especially interested in networks, security, and operating systems.

Davis reported on the recent IT report (December 2004), which is available on the IT website. The results recommended a series of consolidations of information technology units on campus into one major unit. There were at least 40 recommendations coming from the report, and Davis touched on the following: Combining IT units on campus; Better research connectivity; Technology in teaching and learning, including the development of new technology
Improving communication and responding to the IT needs of the university

The target date is July 1 for the consolidation of IT. Based on detailed analysis, the following groups are being created:

- Networking and Communications: campus networking infrastructure
- IT Policy, Security, and Continuity
- Systems and Operations
- University Information Systems
- Customer Service
- Instructional Collaborative Technologies
- Research Computing
- Administration and Communications

Davis also reported there is a new Faculty Senate IT committee. Finally, he noted additional needs, such as wireless access, expansion of Internet bandwidth, single sign-ons, and further collaboration.

Woodman asked how this new consolidation would impact on departmental IT structures.

Davis responded that the model will be really collaborative. The role of IT will be to coordinate all these activities and to provide a core level of service.

Agarwal thanked Davis for his presentation.

V. Special Item II—4:10 p.m. –Election of Athletic Council Member

John Schuh spoke as the Chair of the Athletic Council. He reported on the 3 functions of the Council: to advance intercollegiate athletics by recognizing and promoting it to the wider university community

to engage in oversight activities related to athletics and the production of 2 annual reports (academic progress of athletes and Title IX compliance); and to advise the President and/or the Athletic Director on various issues. Schuh then described the membership of the Council: 4 are from the Faculty Senate; Paula Morrow is the Faculty Athletics Representative and an ex-officio Council member; 2 are appointed by the President, 2 are by the Alumni Association, and 1 appointment each is from the P & S Council, GSB, and the Student Athletics Council.

There were 3 individuals who had expressed an interest in this position: Tom Baas; Tim Day; and Allen Knapp.

Only Day was present, and he made a brief presentation, introducing himself, and expressing why he is interested in the position.

The election proceeded and the results were to be reported later in the meeting.

VI. Old Business—4:15 p.m.

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

Cruse, Chair of the FDAR Council, re-introduced the proposed revised Faculty Professional Development Assignment (FPDA) policy. The major change would be that it would be reserved for tenured faculty only, who have been here at least 2 years.

Fehr responded that even though she was a Committee member, she does need to disagree with the proposed policy. She feels this unfair to junior untenured faculty as this is no guarantee for any new funding for them. For the Humanities, this is a crucial recruiting tool. There is too much inconsistency with departmental support and funding across the university.

Based on other responses from the Senate, a number of them were uncomfortable with voting on this motion, without ensuring financial support for junior faculty. While the second motion recommends this to the Provost Office, it does not officially establish any budgetary or administrative support.

Carlson provided a bit of context, noting that in their survey of departments across the university, it was determined that a lot of departments do provide reduced teaching levels and start-up packages for incoming faculty. She feels the university is providing support for these faculty, and this revised policy would redefine this program to support tenured faculty.

Robinson recommended coming forward with a double motion for the policy that would alleviate any changes to support for junior faculty.

Cruse responded that this committee does not have any power over funding, but can only make the recommendation to the Provost's Office.

Robinson stated that he wanted to move to postpone action on this till the next Senate meeting, so the Committee can go back and reconsider its motions.

Cruse responded that the Committee has held its final meeting and voted unanimously on the two motions.

Robinson responded that we need to vote on a comprehensive plan that both the tenured and junior faculty will have a competition and the resources will be separately allotted.

Agarwal responded that the second motion does propose that, but at this point, the funding for it is not specified, in terms of taking funds from the existing program and allocating it for the other.

Cruse responded that the Committee made the recommendations with the idea that there would be separate funding streams for both groups, so they would not have to compete against each other.

Robinson then moved to postpone further discussion until the April 26 meeting. The motion initially failed. After a recount, it was 22 for postponing, and 21 for not postponing.

Agarwal announced that Tim Day was elected to the Athletic Council.

B. Adjunct Instructor Title—Request from Construction Engineering & Animal Science Departments – [S04-14]

Agarwal and Cruse introduced two proposals from Construction Engineering and Animal Science, based on the revised policy passed at the last Senate meeting.

Woodman asked the following question of the Provost: how does this impact on the individuals who were grand fathered in as adjunct instructors? The Provost responded that he doesn't think this policy will have an impact on these faculty.

Woodman responded that he is concerned over the creation of these types of faculty positions, without consideration of the numbers and how everything will be vetted.

Carlson responded that these will be term appointments under the new policy, so these individuals would be ineligible to become continuous appointments.

Cruse stated that it is time to consider the two items currently on the floor.

Palermo moved to extend the meeting by 15 minutes, and the motion was passed.

Cruse then introduced Pete Hoffman from Animal Science to discuss their proposal.

He described the need in Animal Science for additional teaching help, and they would like to add people that they feel would enhance their efforts. At the same time, they would work on their PhD.

Rosenbusch stated he had a serious problem with the proposal due to the following: lack of term limits, use of the adjuncts for teaching, and that they serve as advisors for undergraduates.

Selby asked about the term limits as part of the previously approved policy. Baldwin responded that this is articulated in the Faculty Handbook and these are special appointments for specially qualified individuals. It does not have a relationship to the previous Adjunct Appointments, which were continuous.

Grudens-Schuck questioned the use of the word “young” in the proposal. How does this relate to the idea of having more experienced individuals in these positions?

Hoffman agreed to eliminate the word “young.”

Agarwal then introduced Jahren, who spoke on behalf of the Construction Engineering proposal.

He articulated what was special about the individuals who would be considered for these positions: relevant experience; 3-5 years worth of experience; supervisory experience (especially of entry-level positions) and mentoring. The term limit is one year, with a 5 year limit. These people would not only be teachers, but researchers as well.

Woodman stated that the proposal by Construction Engineering had merit, in contrast with the proposal from Animal Science. The AS proposal is focused on locating faculty help for teaching. He would like this conversation to be discussed in front of students and their parents.

Hoffman responded that he appreciated what Woodman is saying, but that Animal Science is stymied due to budgetary problems.

Palermo commented that while he appreciated their dilemma, but that he concurred with Woodman. He does see the merit in the Construction Engineering proposal, particularly in regards to the terms of progress.

The Construction Engineering proposal passed.

Hoffman read from a vacancy notice from AS which noted the individuals to be considered would have completed their MS and would be pursuing a PhD, while serving as an adjunct instructor.

Anderson noted that this still does not include the criteria aspects beyond the Master’s degree as opposed to the Construction Engineering proposal. This could result in someone completing their master’s here and then simply continuing on, which is not the purpose of the policy.

The Animal Science proposal failed.

The meeting was then extended for an additional 5 minutes for new business to be introduced.

VII. New Business--4:40 p.m.

A. Committee for Oversight of Academic Reorganization—Governance Council – [S04-19]

Vrochota, Chair of the Governance Council, introduced a charge for a new committee as requested by the Faculty Senate President. The two items which would differentiate this from other standing committees would be the following: 1) The Committee would report directly to the Executive Board; and 2) there would also be a conflict of interest clause, for those affected to recuse themselves.

B. Grade Requirement for Biology Minor – [S04-20]

Palermo, Chair of the Academic Affairs Council introduced the proposal from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences that would require a C- or better as the requirement for obtaining a minor in biology. This proposal is consistent with at least a half a dozen other special grade requirements.

C. Restructuring Graduate Degree in Nutrition – [S04-21]

The second proposal relates to the restructuring of nutritional sciences. It would combine two degrees which will be discontinued (Animal Science (AS) and Food Science and Human Nutrition (FCS)) and there would now be a single degree option called nutritional sciences (subsets: animal nutrition, human nutrition, global nutrition, molecular nutrition, and cellular nutrition).

Rosenbusch asked about the funding sources for the graduate assistantships.

Nissan responded that these are not firm financial commitments at this time.

Alekel noted that the Food Science program will not be discontinued. It is a combined program so the human nutrition portion of FSHN will be eliminated.

Trahanovsky asked about why Chemistry was not listed as secondary department?

Nissan: the program evolved from an older program called the nutrition sciences, and he doesn't think that there were any members from chemistry. They would be happy to welcome anyone from that department.

VIII. Good of the Order – 4:58

VIII. Adjournment – 5:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

**NEXT MEETING
FACULTY SENATE
ISU MEMORIAL UNION, SUN ROOM
April 26, 2005 at 3:30 p.m.**