

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
 FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
 FEBRUARY 12, 2008 -- 3:30–5:00 P.M.
 250-252 Schemen

Present: Anderson, P.; Babcock, B.; Bado-Fralick, N.; Baldwin, C.; Beell, T.; Beresnev, I.; Bracha, V.; Braun, E.; Cai, Y.; Carter-Lewis, D.; Chacko, T.; Clough, M.; Crase, S.; Cross, S.; Day, T.; Ford, C.; Freeman, S.; Geske, J.; Ghandour, M.; Grudens-Schuck, N.; Hargrove, M.; Haynes, J.; Hendrich, S.; Hochstetler, A.; Jackman, J.; Jeffrey, C.; Jolls, K.; Korsching, P.; Langholz, K.; Larson, S.; Loy, D.; Luecke, G.; Madon, S.; Manu, A.; Martin, C.; Mayfield, J.; Mennecke, B.; Murdoch, A.; Nutter, F.; Owusu, F.; Palermo, G.; Paschke, T.; Porter, M.; Porter, S.; Rosenbusch, R.; Rule, L.; Sadosky, L.; Sapp, T.; Selby, M.; Torrie, M.; Vander Lugt, K.; VanDerValk, A.; VanDerZanden, A. M.; van Leeuwen, H.; Wallace, R.; Windus, T.; Winkiel, L.; Wong, J.

Absent: Beetham, J.; Butler, A.; Daniels, T.; Larkin, B.; Larsen, M.; Long, L.; Love, M.; Maney, A.; Martin, M.; Oh, H.; Olsen, M.; Ruben, R.; Thompson, J.

Substitutes: W. Franke for Anderson, D.; R. Elmore for Owen, M.; N. Coinman for Pruetz, J.; T. Rudolphi for Schmerr, L.; J. Kushkowski for Zanish-Belcher, T.

Guests: Beisser, A. (*ISU Daily*); Bonnet, D. (Chair - Psychology); Bloedel, J. (for VP Research); Dillon, W. (*Ames Tribune*); Guffy, I. (GSB); Girton, J. (BBMB); Hoffman, E. (telephonic) (Provost); Holger, D. (Provost's Office); Kane, K. (P&S Council); King, A. (Ames Lab); Kling, K. (Economics-CARD); Rosacker, E. (University Relations); Thompson, B.; Vrchota, D. (Chair, Gov. & Doc. Committee); Woodin, D. (P&S Council); Woodman, W. (Sociology).

I. Called to Order – 3:30 p.m.

A. Seating of Substitute Senators

President Crase asked substitute senators to announce their names, and then apprised them of their responsibilities and privileges.

II. Consent Agenda – 3:35 p.m.

- A. Minutes of Faculty Senate, January 15, 2008 - [S07/M/5]
- B. Agenda for February 12, 2008 – [S07/A/6]
- C. Calendar – [S07/C/6]
- D. Program Name Change: African American Studies to African and African American Studies – [S07-14]

Motion to approve consent agenda made by Senator Beell and seconded by Senator Bado-Fralick.

Motion carried.

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

A. Faculty Senate President – Crase

President Crase provided notice of upcoming elections, including members of the FS officer team, with secretary and other positions open. She urged senators to consider serving in these important roles.

B. Faculty Senate President-Elect – Ford

President-Elect Ford provided an update on the spring conference.

C. Provost – Hoffman

Provost Hoffman provided her report by telephonic conference. On her behalf, President Crase provided senators with a hardcopy of her remarks and other resources to supplement the presentation.¹ These minutes herein report mainly on the oral presentation. Provost Hoffman apologized for difficulties her distance attendance might present but also noted the advantage (if technology proved adequate) of being able to join Senate proceedings “on the rare occasions” in the future when she is off site. President Crase and Provost Hoffman adjusted instrumentation until all senators agreed that they could hear the Provost’s remarks—and she, their remarks. The focus of her discussion was the NTEF-R policy in front of the senate for voting, and brought to the attention of the Senate that “we are among a very few remaining that have not” adopted such. She stated that this would be “an historic step for Iowa State to take” and urged Senators, despite some who have “deep reservations,” to consider the following six points that point toward favorable voting on this issue today. Her remarks were directed toward concerns raised during deliberation of the proposal, and included, where possible, a report of future plans and current actions that would prevent the NTER-F designation from diminishing ISU’s strength as a university strong in number, as well as quality, of the tenured and tenure-eligible (T-TE) faculty.

¹ "Remarks to the Iowa State Faculty Senate, February 12, 2009(sic) [8]" (five pages); and "Survey of AAU Universities: Non-tenure Eligible Research Faculty," which provided a list of institutions which permitted or were considering NTE-F Research-type position designations. On the list were 51 with similar positions; and 11 without, including Iowa State University.

Provost Remarks and Actions²

1. *Increasing tenured and tenure-eligible faculty numbers.* The Provost stated that a “real issue” that appeared to ground both enthusiasm and caution among senators and others regarding the proposed designation was the loss, in the near past, of 223 tenured and tenure-eligible (T-TE) colleagues from ISU. She stated that passing the NTEF-R proposal was not intended to decrease the size of the T-TE faculty, and would not *de facto* result in reduction of the current size of the T-TE faculty. Restoration of numbers was foremost on the Provost’s agenda.

The Provost reviewed the loss of faculty over the last decade including this past year. She acknowledged that “despite heroic efforts to retain faculty,” paired with a large overall percentage raise in salaries last year compared to Peer 11 institutions last year, ISU nonetheless experienced a “net loss of 23 faculty members.” She has asked Institutional Research staff to gather and analyze data to understand last year’s losses, yet asserted that “given the number of retention packages put together last year, the number would have been much larger.” The loss cannot be blamed on an unusually high number of retirements because, in fact, there were fewer retirements than normal last year. Rather, the unusually-low number of new hires due to budget issues probably explains at least part of the net loss. The Provost has asked her staff to prepare a report for the Senate’s April 29th meeting, which will include a plan to rebuild faculty numbers. By fall, she hopes to have a strategic plan agreed upon with ISU President Geoffroy.

2. *Parity with peers: Focus on faculty salaries.* The Provost described the process used this year and last to raise faculty salaries for key fields by comparing salaries of colleagues in ISU’s Peer 11 institutions. Subject to available funds, a similar process will be used this coming year. First, the Provost will identify departments that are highly-ranked using externally-generated data (available in summer). Also considered will be the extent to which the unit’s work is central to the land-grant mission, and consistent with the university’s mission, especially areas by which “high impact” research may be generated. Faculty salaries are then compared, weighted by rank. The goal is to identify the amount by which the department may be underfunded with respect to peer salaries. Last year, for those departments that were selected as underfunded, one-half of the faculty salary funds (in excess of the 3 percent base) were provided to department chairs in a “block grant” format. Special increases were then awarded with these funds to specific faculty members using a process individual to the chair. In 2006, this process resulted in several departments “brought up to parity” with peers. New salary data come out in April, and at that time the Provost will see if this process can be further substantiated. The other half (of excess beyond 3 percent) was allocated by the Provost’s office on an individual faculty member basis, with priority input from the Deans, but also informed by “our own data on faculty grant and research activity.” To “qualify for a special additional raise” the faculty member had to be among those allocated a top raise in the first place by the department. For this coming year’s allocation process, the Provost expressed cautious optimism that Regents institutions would receive a modest amount above two to three percent through the salary bill.

² Reported in these minutes are both oral presentation remarks and selections from the hardcopy documents, which were distributed after the presentation.

3. *How NTEF-R would enhance rather than diminish the stature of T-TE faculty, with a focus on excellence in faculty recruitment.* Many T-TE faculty have expressed a desire to hire, and to work with, faculty members (NTEF-R) who can focus their time on securing grants and conducting research, especially in the science, social science, and engineering fields. One could reasonably expect advantages to both the T-TE and NTEF-R in securing major collaborative grants for research endeavors by having individuals serve in the proposed new position. The Provost affirmed her commitment to “not hire research faculty in place of, but only in addition to” T-TE faculty. The Provost assured senators that the NTEF-R position would not be a “dumping ground” for anyone who performed substandard work—or even less than consistently stellar work—who failed to get a position elsewhere. For example, individuals in post-doctoral positions who are not readily hired into tenure track positions elsewhere would not be priority hires for the proposed new position.

4. *Commitment to work with Faculty Senate to refine a parallel proposal for teaching and clinical work.* The Provost stated that she agreed with voices among the faculty that declared, as part of deliberating the NTEF-R proposal, that it is a longstanding problem at ISU that “we have devalued” those who are master teachers and who “only teach.” She said that she will “work with the Senate to fix the problem” should the Senate desire to address the issue next year. The Provost expressed a commitment to working to develop a “non-tenure eligible teaching faculty title and promotion process” similar to the NTEF-R position. The goal would be to recognize the contribution that great teaching brings to the university.

5. *The meaning of the recent proliferation of lecturer and clinician numbers at ISU.* The Provost began by listing positive contributions made by lecturers and clinicians to the mission and goals of ISU. Professional expertise, needed in some programs to round out student experiences, is needed especially in engineering, business, veterinary medicine, design, or the agricultural and life sciences, and other fields. Professionals from these fields in lecturer or clinician positions make highly-valued, distinct contributions but may not have completed the terminal degree for their field, or otherwise do not wish to or do not meet elements required for T-TE promotion and tenure. Such professionals currently staff the veterinary hospital and provide crucial experiences for students in associated programs at Ames’ only critical care animal facility. Lecturers are prevalent in departments where there is a “very heavy lower-division load” of teaching, or where students need smaller class sizes to learn writing, art, or laboratory skills. A very few departments, for example English and World Languages, continue to require a mix of T-TE and non TE faculty to service both core teaching content areas, but also to honor university missions in discovery, research, and extension, and to stimulate other high-quality scholarly work outside of the teaching service areas.

6. *Steps taken, and commitments for future action, to selectively and strategically reduce numbers of lecturers and clinicians in line with the university’s mission.* A key strategy would be to recruit and hire “as many new tenured and tenure-track faculty as we can afford.” The Office of the Provost has created a new policy that will provide “central support for up to 1/3 salary assistance for star hires, diversity hires, and partner accommodation.” The strategy will require, over time, building a central pool of start-up funds, and this necessitates working with the University Budget Advisory Committee (UBAC) so that the Resource Management Model (RMM) can eventually “bring some balance back.” But in the meantime, central assistance will

be needed. Since last spring, as part of this strategy, the Provost asked the deans to justify “high concentrations” of NTE requests. She also has asked the deans for a plan to move NTE position to tenure-eligible once reasonable budgets are restored. She noted that the deans have been “responsive to this approach.”

Provost Hoffman then introduced Dr. Alex King who, since 1 January 2008, is the new director of Ames Laboratory. He described procedures at Purdue, his most recent institutional home, where a similar designation was developed and formalized. He was, at the time of development of the title, a departmental head. The rank of "research professor," which Dr. King considered to be "essentially parallel" to the proposal in front of the senate at ISU, was approved and put into place one year ago. There was a great deal of discussion by the Purdue Faculty Senate regarding the adoption of the new title. At the time, there was a great deal of research activity at Purdue, and centers and institutes had generated some “300 T-TE lines,” and many were capable of providing their own salaries through external sources. During his visit to Purdue last week he asked how the positions have “come along.” He reported that he learned that there were about 18 people now with the new title; several took early retirement and so were pulled from among the existing faculty. One-third were already working in research institutes as associate scientists, etc. One-third was composed of new hires. The position appears to have allowed Purdue to be competitive in hiring with institutions such as MIT. He also spoke to spousal hires. While at Purdue, two faculty hires in particular clearly were prevented from landing at Purdue because at the time, there was no such NTEF-R title available. One was an affirmative action potential hire, and both were exceptional hires in their own right. The designation has not seemed to overwhelm the faculty. He asked for questions. There were none at this time.

IV. Special Report – 3:45

Update on Study Abroad Credit and Distance Education Credit Courses - Associate Provost Dave Holger

Associate Provost Holger’s prepared remarks emphasized the planned review of such courses; he stated that the review was not strictly driven by the RMM, although the idea of the review fit under the idea of a centralized handling of credit bearing courses, regardless of the manner of delivery. The goal was to ensure that regardless of method of delivery, that all credit-bearing courses offer the same high-quality instruction. Moreover, differences that result from delivery methods, such as less inter-student communication via “grapevine” interactions might put particular students at a disadvantage. There may, or may not be, good reasons for having different costs for distance versus face-to-face courses. The review would investigate such issues. Distance education courses are complex and a transition will take two years or more. Distance education, in brief for 2009, management will move to Academic Affairs to make such courses parallel to management of [residential] credit courses, and revenue will be aggregated by college, and not the offering department. It will take 2 years to manage this change. For 2009, revenues will still exist outside of the general fund. By 2010, we may move the courses to the general fund—or not. Diversity of college infrastructure is an issue; at least some services may need to be centralized. Constituents include the Distance Education Council, the Undergraduate Programs Council, Associate Dean for the Graduate Programs—the bulk of programs are

graduate programs, not undergrad. The deans also have been involved. It will be necessary also to work with the Registrar. Academic Affairs Council of the Faculty Senate has been briefed.

For study abroad courses, the plan is to move courses which have been outside of the general fund into the general fund for FY 2009—which begins in summer 2008—very soon. The duration, place, and costs associated with different study abroad programs can be vast. In the past we have used what is informally called the “90/10 tuition policy,” designed in a well-intentioned way to encourage students to study in another country. Changing to the new budget model, some of the specifics of the structure of fees will necessarily change. Another idea being explored is “sequestering” funds from tuition revenues for study abroad, similar to what is done for financial aid. There are discussions on this issue with the Council on International Programs, the Graduate Program Council, the Study Abroad and Exchange Advisory Committee, and the deans and college fiscal officers. Colleges are looking holistically at these issues to balance things to continue to attract students who would wish to enroll in study abroad programs. There are some unanswered questions regarding this area at this point in time. The Faculty Senate leadership and Academic Affairs Council have also been briefed.

Senator Grudens-Schuck asked about regional and cross institutional programs that are offered via distance technologies. Holder noted the Midwest Consortium was a prime model, but the present plans could still move forward.

V. Old Business – 4:00 p.m.

A. Faculty Handbook: Open Meetings Policy [S07-9] – Governance Council: Max Porter

The chair recognized Senator Porter, Chair of Governance. He provided a background of the policy and the amendment regarding Open Meeting Policy revisions. The Governance Council has been working with Senator Geske as well as University Counsel Tanaka to fashion a long-lasting policy piece; however, they did not yet arrive at a better way of putting ideas into policy language. Senator Porter respectfully asked the Senate to allow the Council to withdraw the motion before it.

Motion carried.

B. Keep Iowa State Beautiful Resolution – [S07-13]

President Crase provided background on the resolution before the Senate. The organization that proposed the resolution has been working on campus clean-up issues since last spring. It was introduced last month and will be voted upon today. Senator Rosenbusch so moved and Senator Freeman seconded.

During discussion, GSB Senator Guffy distinguished this resolution from the GSB proposal, which also addressed fences and broader access issues.

Motion carried.

D. Non-Tenure-Eligible Research Faculty [S06-22] – Gregory Palermo for Executive Board; see NTER Task Force Report and Appendices, on-line at: < <http://www.facsen.iastate.edu/> > and resolution attachments containing changes made at the December 11 Faculty Senate meeting – 4:45 p.m.

Past President Palermo noted that there were no new items associated with this proposal, and suggested that discussion begin. President Crase invited non Senators as well as Senators who wished to speak to address the senate in the order they had requested (or would now request) to speak, when possible, and asked speakers to limit comments to three minutes.

Dr. B. Thompson observed from his long history at ISU that several P&S scientists went on to be premier scientists. He supported the idea of a mechanism like the Research Professorship as "crucial." in 1980, he relayed, he was a Research Professor, approved by President Parks, and had been brought from industry. He would not have taken the job with the institution without the designation. His charge was to create the Non Destructive Evaluation Institute. His wife, Dr. A. Thompson, also became a faculty member and has been successful in this vein. He commented that the Research Professor title under which he was hired no longer exists at ISU and the current proposal is an attempt to revive the title under contemporary research and budget conditions.

Dr. J. Girton presented concerns provided to him by dint of his participation in an earlier panel on the title. He prepared further comments regarding concerns that he and others held regarding the impact of passage of the proposal. First, regarding the Ames Lab's argument that their staff is different, he proposed that the Senate could then "do something for Ames Lab" that was separate from a broadly applicable change in title. Also, there was a continuing concern that there would be a [greater] net loss of tenure-track faculty, despite a new Provost's best efforts. There may also be a desire for keep good people--but increasing the number of new tenure-eligible positions might work better for units than creating a tenure-track full institution. Girton endorsed, instead: (a) to not approve the motion, (b) to help Ames Lab or others specifically and only, if they had specific challenges in this regard; and (c) to convene a Senate task force to examine the status of T-TE faculty at ISU. Girton proclaimed that, "Something has happened to us" that was worrisome with regard to a diminished faculty. He observed, "We have been losing faculty, but SUI and UNI have not. It is time for a very significant change. Although the Provost is trying hard, the faculty need to stand up" to resolve the loss of faculty problem rather than focus on the NTEF-R as a way to address crucial issues.

Dr. B. Woodman stated that some of the problems associated with the Senate as a decision-making body with regard to the current proposal is that that most of the members were short-term. Administration may come with "urgent issues," but usually they are not urgent, and administrators rely on the turn-over to succeed with proposals that make for "hirable and fire-able" people. If needed, it seemed to Woodman that a PRS could be modified at any time to accommodate a research-only position, if needed by a unit; the current proposal was, in fact, not needed to do so.

Dr. D. Bonett spoke about individuals in his field of psychology to which he would have liked to have offered a NTEF-R title, but could not at ISU. All individuals would have been able to support themselves with external funds. He also understood that the proposed title would be filled by individuals who would surpass, and not just meet, the usual standards for excellence in research. He supported the proposal. In response to questions by individuals, Dr. Bonett declared that it was unlikely that they would be able to hire an NTEF-R at the assistant professor level because it is more difficult at that point in an individual's career to command external resources, as the title would require.

Senator Paschke asked what the "higher standards" would consist of.

Dr. K. Kling spoke about the recent loss of a highly-skilled post-doc working in her unit who was offered a tenure-track position elsewhere, but an Assistant NTEF-R position would have been appropriate for her. Kling expressed dismay at the lack of support for such positions, especially in a climate, and in units, where males still dominated the field. She noted that percentages of women have not changed; failure to make gains in this area was likely now due to lack of support for dual-career couples or spousal accommodation that "discrimination outright," for which the NTEF-R could remedy some recruitment situations. She was in favor of the proposal. She concluded, "We need to be broader and richer in the way that we think about recruiting faculty and providing them with opportunities. "

Senator Madon inquired about credits awarded to the home department, even if the new person was not secured originally by the home department. Individuals at ISU who are not currently affiliated with a home department have their grant dollars credited to the General Fund. If this proposal is approved, then these individuals will select a home department and that department will then get credit for their grant dollars, something that they did not get credit for before. Because all of this would occur after the baseline year in the new budget model, these home departments would appear to have had a substantial increase in their external funding. They would not have really had an increase, but it will look that way on paper. Based on the new budget model, resources and money flow to colleges that house departments that have had increases in productivity relative to the new budget model. Accordingly, colleges that house departments that acquired these "research professors" will get more resources because they will look like they had increased their external funding even though they didn't. In practice there is only so much money to go around – it's a zero sum game. If some colleges are getting more because their departments look better on paper by virtue of acquiring these "research professors" then other colleges will have to get less to make up the difference. Provost Hoffman responded by describing the way the new budget model would credit Resource Units.

Past President Palermo moved to extend by 15 minutes, seconded by Senator van Leeuwen.

Motion passed.

Senator van Leeuwen made observations based on experiences in academia in South Africa and Australia where he claimed that a Professor is held in higher regard than it is in the US. It is also harder to become a professor in those countries. Regardless, the greater good is the recognition of a faculty working in an economy which can only maintain growth if its "industry" continues

to prosper and that success is dependent, in part, on advanced technologies, some of which are developed at universities. The Senator concluded by noting, “There is a need for a new breed for professional researchers to enhance our efforts and to make sure a strong and prosperous state and nation.”

Senator Beresnev stated that he did not consider the NTEF-R designation as unfair competition, but part of what would make ISU better all around in the area of research.

Dr. J. Bloedel spoke in favor of the proposal. His successful experiences in academia included 14 years as a research professor at the University of Arizona. He had “to jump through the same hoops as any other faculty person in order to be accepted.” He also emphasized that “as we think about our title as professor we have to think of it in the context of the 21st century. We are competing with that entire list—almost the entire list of AAU Universities—for faculty. We have to be able to make the same kind of spousal accommodations, the same kind of offers, and have the same flexibility.” He urged Senators to vote in favor of this proposal.

Cruse: The chair recognized Gregory Palermo who moved to extend the meeting for 15 minutes.

Motion carried.

Senator VanDerValk responded to Girton’s earlier pronouncements. VanDerValk stated that the document muddled the issues, and did not resolve them. He stated his resolve to “introduce four amendments to this document to clear up for whom exactly these people are if in fact we vote in favor in this particular motion, which I’m not particularly in favor of, but at least clarify whether the individuals who would fill the position would be part of the general faculty.” He urged somebody to move to table the proposal to the next meeting.

Senator Grudens-Schuck spoke about positive experiences with individuals in NTEF-R positions at her former university, which was one of the AAU institutions which supports the designation. She thanked Dr. Kling for stating that the gender piece was important. Passing this proposal meant to her that “people who are a little bit different can get in.” She stated that she was not convinced that the NTEF-R designation would necessarily accelerate a decrease in T-TE positions.

Senator Geske relayed concerns of other faculty members. He inquired about the “qualifications and standards and procedures for rank shall be the same as tenure-track faculty” statement on page 2 of the proposal. If these criteria were used for promotion of NTEF-R, what happens to that teaching and that service that typically is required?

Dr. King addressed an earlier question of whether the proposal would be better as a “special deal” for the Ames Lab—in fact it would not. In fact, as written, it cannot benefit anybody at the Ames Lab until further discussions and negotiations with the Department of Energy. That withstanding, he still supports the proposal.

Senator van Leeuwen responded to an earlier point by Girton.

Associate Provost Holger responded to Senator Geske's question of applicability of the current P&T document to NTEF-R positions. He noted that it was possible to be 100% research tenure track person, which indicated to him that the same process could be used for a research faculty member as it is for a tenure track.

Senator VanDerValk moved to postpone until the next meeting.

There was no second.

Past Palermo called the question. Second by Senator Martin.

President Crase asked for a show of hands, and would allow voting to proceed if 2/3 agreed to call the question.

Motion to call the question carried.

Crase announced that since the question had been called that Senators would immediately vote using paper secret ballot per an earlier decision by the Executive Board. Written ballots were distributed and tallied by Senators Freeman and Hendrich, President-Elect Ford, and Ms. Angstrom.

YEAH	34
NAY	23

Motion carried.

VI. New Business

None.

VII. Good of the Order – 5:20 p.m.

None.

VIII. Adjournment – 5:21 p.m.

President Crase adjourned the meeting.

Minutes by Faculty Senate Secretary N. Grudens-Schuck

NEXT MEETING TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 2008 3:30-5:00 P.M. – GREAT HALL, MU
