

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
January 17, 2006**

Attendance: Agarwal, S.; Alekel, L.; Anderson, P.; Babcock, B.; Bado-Fralick, N.; Bailey, T.; Baldwin, C.; Bracha, V.; Bradbury, S.; Braun, E.; Butler, L.; Cai, Y.; Carter-Lewis, D.; Chacko, T.; Courteau, J.; Crase, S.; Engler, M.; Fiore, A.M.; Girton, J.; Gregorac, R.; Hargrove, M.; Heising, C.; Hoffman, P.; Jolls, K.; Kurtenbach, J.; Laanan, F.S; Madon, S.; Mansbach, R.; Manu, A.; Martin, C.; Mayfield, J.; Nutter, F.; Olsen, M.; Owen, M.; Palermo, G.; Paschke, T.; Phye, G.; Porter, M.; Post, C.; Robinson, B.; Rosenbusch, R.; Rule, L.; Sadosky, L.; Sundararajan, S.; Thacker, Eileen; Thompson, J.; Tim, S.; Townsend, A.; Trahanovsky, W.; VanDerZanden, A.M.; Van Leeuwen, H.; Vrchota, D.; Woodman, B.; Zanish-Belcher, T.

Absent: Beetham, J.; Chen, M.; Cooper, E.; F. Dark; T. Day; C. Fehr; J. Haynes; K. Kline; S. Larson; B. Mack; B. Mennecke; M. Ambar; A. Murdoch; D. Russell; S. Russell; M. Selby; R. Stone; Van Der Valk, A.; R. Wallace; J. Wong; B. Yang

Substitutes: S. Russell for M. Chang; C. Cardinal-Pett for M. Ghandour; P. Teig for N. Grudens-Schuck; M. Hill for J. Pruetz; M. Torrie for C. Roskey; M. Al-Kaisi for J. Sawyer;

Guests: B. Allen (Provost); S. Carlson (Provost's Office); D. Holger (Provost's Office); E. Arentson (GSB); K. Kruempel (Curriculum Committee Chair); T. Polito (Task Force Chair)

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

The meeting was called to order at 3:31 p.m., and the substitute Senators were seated.

**II. Consent Agenda – 3:32 p.m.
A. Minutes of Faculty Senate, December 6, 2005 - [S05/M/4]
B. Agenda for January 17, 2006 – [S05/A/5]
C. Calendar – [S05/C/5]**

There was a minor correction for the minutes. Palermo moved, Rosenbusch seconded, and the consent agenda was approved.

**III. Announcements and Remarks – 3:35 p.m.
A. Faculty Senate President**

Baldwin updated the Faculty Senate on the following:

Ombuds Search Committee: S. Crase has been asked to serve on this committee for the Senate.

Strategic Planning University Life Task Force: Vrchota will be representing the Senate.

The DMACC/ISU Joint Admission Program has been renamed the Partnership Program. Baldwin gave some additional background in regards to the draft document based on discussions within the Senate's Academic Standards and Curriculum Committee. This program proposal was presented to the Senate for knowledge and support. There were some concerns over some of the language and potential changes in admission standards brought up by the Senate's Executive Board. Baldwin then appointed a work group consisting of Roskey (chair), Kruempel, Courteau, Girton, and Palermo. They identified problem areas and suggested revised language. This has been accepted by D. Holger.

The proposal will be reviewed by DMACC, and will be available online at the Senate web page for further review.

This is an important example of shared governance. The Senate must provide this advice and guidance.

B. Faculty Senate President-Elect

Palermo made the following announcement in regards to available positions for the Faculty Senate:

Departmental Leadership Award

There will be a review committee that meets in March to recognize outstanding leadership (based on nominations).

Athletic Council Seat

There is a 3 year term (out of 4 seats) appointment available and begins in April.

Senate Leadership Participation: all five Council Chairs are open as is the Secretary position.

C. Provost

There were no announcements by the Provost.

IV. Special Order – Election of President-Elect

Baldwin announced the following candidates for Senate President: S. Crase, C. Heising, and C. Post, and asked for nominations from the floor. B. Woodman nominated M. Porter, and Porter accepted.

Rosenbusch moved, Girton seconded, and the nominations were closed.

Each candidate then spoke briefly:

Post described her participation and experience in the Faculty Senate and her involvement with the arrival of children policy and part-time faculty appointments. She feels that it is important to continue the university's efforts at international partnership and

interdisciplinary programs. She would also like to focus on quality of life issues, as well as the percentages of NTT faculty and improving the campus climate. Finally, she should like to evaluate the connections between departments, centers, and the Board of Regents, as well as the erosion of faculty lines.

M. Porter described his different experiences in the Faculty Senate. He would like to focus on the following issues: family policies, the partnership with DMACC, the governance of the Senate, and shared governance with the University administration.

C. Heising described her background and her experience in the Faculty Senate. She sees two major issues for the Senate: faculty salaries and support and increased faculty input/control of the budget model process

S. Crase described her background in the Faculty Senate. Her priorities for the Senate include the Ombuds proposal and maintaining oversight, monitoring the PRS guidelines, examining the faculty leave policy, and maintaining cordial relationships with the administration

Three Senators were selected as tellers: E. Braun, S. Bradbury, and J. Thompson

Vrchota agreed to serve as Parliamentarian during the election. The election commenced.

V. Old Business – 4:00 p.m.

There was no old business.

VI. New Business – 4:00 p.m.

A. J&A Council – Amendments to Faculty Handbook regarding appeals – [S05-11]

B. Robinson, chair of Judiciary & Appeals introduced proposed amendments to the Faculty Handbook regard appeals. He noted two distinct motions for the Senate to consider.

Motion Ia: Add a new section to the Faculty Handbook, with the following number and two-paragraph text.

9.3.6.3 A decision may be appealed to the Board of Regents only once. Therefore, if the administrative appeal channel is used and the president denies the relief sought, appellants must decide whether (a) to appeal directly to the Board of Regents or (b) to avail themselves of the opportunity to use the Faculty Senate Committee on Appeals (FSCA). Election of alternative (a) will preclude subsequent use of alternative (b). If the FSCA is used, its recommendation will go to the provost. If the provost denies the relief sought, the case may be appealed to the president or to the Board of Regents. If an appeal is made to the president and the president denies the relief sought, appellants may appeal to the Board of Regents.

This section is not to be construed as implying that the administrative channel must be pursued to the presidential level before using the FSCA. Instead, faculty

members may pursue the administrative appeal channel to any level up to and including the president before turning to the FSCA. But faculty members may decide to turn to the FSCA either as a first recourse or in response to denials of relief sought at lower administrative levels.

Motion Ib: Add the following sentence to the end of the first paragraph of FH 9.2.

Regarding appeals to the Board of Regents, see section 9.3.6.3.

Motion Ic: Replace the last two sentences of the first paragraph of FH 9.3.1 with the following three sentences:

These recommendations are sent to the provost. If the provost's decision at this point is not acceptable to the appellant, it may be appealed to the president and, ultimately, to the Board of Regents. (See also section 9.3.6.3.)

Motion II: Delete the last 10 words (i.e., "and provide current copies of the FSCA Rules of Procedure") from the second sentence of FH 9.3.2.1

Courteau questioned the language in 9.3.1., in particular, the wording, "at this point."

Gregorac suggested deleting the language. Robinson will check on this.

Vrchota reported on the status of the Senate presidential election, based on the constitution, Article 2, Section 4: if there are more than 2 candidates and none receive a majority of the vote, fewest votes will be removed from the ballot, will continue until one is elected.

The second slate consists of Crase, Porter, and Post

B. Governance Council – Proposed Changes to Senate Constitution – [S05-12]

Vrchota reported on the following: The Council on Governance reviews senate governance documents every five years. The first document reviewed is the Faculty Senate Constitution.

The Governance Council proposes these changes to the constitution:

1. Lines 3-4: revise the definition of "general faculty" to include non-tenure eligible appointments;
2. Line 6: change "educational" to "academic" to reflect the breadth of faculty responsibilities
3. Line 6-7: insert: "These include but are not limited to faculty promotion and tenure policies and procedures,"

4. Line 29: delete “and educational”
5. Line 43: delete “educational and”
6. Line 44-45: insert “These include but are not limited to those for faculty promotion and tenure policies and procedures,”
7. Line 49-50: delete “educational and” and “educational and”
8. Line 64: delete “and educational”
9. Lines 69-72: inserting a resolution of differences procedure for the advisory function
10. Lines 73-74: deleting the first line of the charge of the conflict resolution function to achieve editorial clarity;
11. Lines 78-81: inserting a resolution of differences procedure for the conflict resolution function
12. Other changes of a non-substantive nature were made in lines 97-98, 139, and 156-159 to ensure internal consistency, to update titles and names of organizations, and to make editorial corrections.

Porter asked about all faculty voting online?

Vrchota responded that once the Faculty Senate votes, it must be submitted to all faculty and yes, the voting can take place online. It is then sent to the Board of Regents.

Courteau asked about administrative officers, don't they all have faculty appointments, and if so, can vote as faculty?

Carlson responded that there are administrative officers who are not faculty such as the Vice President for Business and Finance.

Vrchota referred to the Senate By-laws and the definition of faculty. Administrative officers are not considered part of the Faculty Senate. Administrators who have faculty appointments will be allowed to vote.

Election update: The third slate will consist of Crase and Post.

C. FDAR Council – PRS Mediation Guidelines – [S05-13]

5.5.1.5 Current handbook statement

Crase, Chair of the FDAR Council reported on the Council's recommendations, particularly in regards to resolving disagreements:

**Procedure (Mediation Guidelines) to Handle Disagreements Related to the Position
Responsibility Statement**

When both parties (the faculty member and the department chair) agree to the Position Responsibility Statement, it will be signed by both parties and dated. If however one of the parties disagrees with a proposed change to the faculty member's PRS, either party may refer the matter to the PRS Mediation Panel, which will be in place in each department. This panel will consist of one tenured faculty member selected by the faculty member involved in the disagreement and one tenured faculty member selected by the department chair. A third tenured faculty member will also serve, and unless the department decides otherwise, the default policy for obtaining that member will be by faculty election in the department at the beginning of each year.¹ The elected faculty member must be in place as soon as possible following passage of this change and no later than the end of the following semester. The faculty members selected by the two parties will be selected at the time of the disagreement between those two parties.

The party referring the matter to the PRS Mediation Panel will submit to the panel the faculty member's existing PRS, the text of the proposed PRS, an explanation of why the change is being sought/or is not acceptable, and the faculty member's curriculum vita. The other party should provide a written explanation of why the proposed change is not acceptable/is being sought. The PRS Mediation Panel will review the materials that have been submitted, meet with both parties, deliberate on the issue, and deliver a written opinion in a timely fashion (not more than two months) on how the disagreement should be resolved. The faculty member and the department chair should then reconsider the matter to see if an agreement can now be reached based on the panel's recommendation. If an agreement between the faculty member and the department chair does not then emerge within ten working days, the matter will be forwarded by the party disagreeing with the proposed change to the faculty member's college where a mechanism, which will be fair and equitable to both parties (e.g., elected group) will be in place for further consideration and resolution. If the issue is not resolved at this level, the matter will be taken to the dean of the college by the party disagreeing with the proposed change.

During the time of this mediation process, the existing signed and dated Position Responsibility Statement will remain in effect.

D. AA Council – Certificate Criteria – [S05-14]

¹ Departments who desire another method of obtaining the third member may choose one of the following: a) a tenured faculty member who is chair of an elected departmental council; b) a tenured faculty member who has been elected by the department to the promotion and tenure review committee and who chairs that committee. c) a tenured faculty member who has been elected by the department to the post-tenure review committee and who chairs that committee.

K. Kruempel, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, presented on behalf of C. Roskey, chair of Academic Affairs Council in regards to a request to create an undergraduate certificate.

An undergraduate certificate has the following requirements and understandings:

- *a minimum of 20 credits, with at least 12 credits taken at ISU*
- *at least 9 of the credits taken at Iowa State University must be in courses numbered 300 or above*
- *at least 9 credits used for a certificate may not be used to meet any other department, college, or university requirement for the baccalaureate degree except to satisfy the total credit requirement for graduation and to meet credit requirements in courses numbered 300 or above*
- *a student may not receive both an undergraduate major and a certificate of the same name*
- *for students earning an ISU baccalaureate degree, a certificate is awarded concurrent with or after the ISU baccalaureate degree*
- *a certificate is not awarded if the baccalaureate requirements are not finished*
- *after receiving a baccalaureate degree from any accredited institution, a student may enroll at ISU to earn a certificate*
- *courses taken for a certificate may not be taken on a pass-not pass basis*
- *a cumulative grade point average of at least 2.00 is required in courses taken at ISU for a certificate*
- *a notation of a completed certificate will be made on a student's transcript*
- *an advisor for the certificate program needs to be available to students*

Gregorac asked who proposed the certificate program?

Kruempel responded that there was a request for a certificate in Latin American Studies.

Woodman asked if this was not a solution in search of a problem.

Fiore asked about certificates available in the College of Business?

Kruempel responded that at this point, there is no approval process while the other Regents have a policy. This certificate program will be generated by the Registrar and will try and work with the College of Business.

Courteau asked who administers the certificate, the department and an advisor?

Kruempel responded that programs will create certificates, and will provide an individual to guide the students. These are considered interdisciplinary in nature. There should be a governance document describing the procedures.

D. AA Council – New Policy for Academic Standards – [S05-15]

T. Polito introduced the new policy for academic standards. From their report:

“To develop its recommendations the Task Force on Academic Probation used the guiding philosophy that the function of academic probation is 1) to identify, warn, and provide assistance for students who are not making satisfactory academic progress, and 2) to maintain the integrity of Iowa State University baccalaureate degrees. With that philosophy in mind, the Task Force recommends the following changes to the existing policies on academic probation. The cumulative grade point average (on which the old policies were based) remains the base for making probation decisions for students who have attempted or earned ≥ 75 credits (previously 90 credits). A new “Warning” status is recommended for students who earn between a 1.00 and 1.99 in a single semester. Also new, students who earn less than a 1.00 in any semester or between 1.00 and 1.99 for any two consecutive semesters will be placed on academic probation if the Task Force Recommendations are adopted. A flow chart summary for the recommended policies is in Appendix A and a draft of proposed catalog copy that inserts recommended policies into the unchanged policies is in Appendix B. Appendix C projects the impact of the recommended policies and Appendix D summarizes the Task Force perceived benefits of these recommendations to the University.

The report includes recommendations for active interventions for students placed on Warning or Probation status. Failure to implement effective intervention activities will result in significantly higher numbers of students dismissed from Iowa State University if the recommended academic standards policies are adopted.”

Porter questioned what happens when a student is in a two-part course?

Polito responded that this issue was not addressed by the Task Force.

Palermo requested that the Faculty Senate members review the documents in detail in order to make suggested revisions.

The election results were announced, and Crase was elected as President of the Faculty Senate.

VII. Good of the Order – 4:40 p.m.

VIII. Adjournment – 5:00 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:01.