

S08/A/7

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES  
MARCH 10, 2009 -- 3:30–5:00 P.M.  
GREAT HALL, MEMORIAL UNION**

**Present:** Anderson, P.; Baldwin, C.; Beell, T.; Beresnev, I.; Bracha, V.; Butler, A.; Chaudhuri, S.; Clough, M.; Cooper, E.; Dell, B.; Doran, M.; Ford, C.; Freeman, S.; Grudens-Schuck, N.; Haddad, M.; Hargrove, M.; Haynes, J.; Herrmann, P.; Hochstetler, A.; Katz, A.; Keren, N.; Korsching, P.; Kushkowsky, J.; Larsen, M.; Long, L.; Loy, D.; Luecke, G.; Martin, M.; Mayfield, J.; McQueeney, R.; Moschini, G.C.; Muench, J.; Niday, D.; Osweiler, G.; Owen, M.; Pleasants, J.; Porter, M.; Pruetz, J.; Ruben, R.; Sadosky, L.; Sapp, T.; Selby, M.; Smiley-Oyen, A.; Torrie, M.; Vander Lugt, K.; van der Valk, A.; VanderZanden, A. M.; Wallace, R.; Walter, S.

**Absent:** Anderson, D.; Baker, R.; Beetham, J.; Crase, S.; Daniels, T.; Day, T.; Geske, J.; Hendrich, S.; Hillier, A.; Jackman, J.; Larkin, B.; Larson, S.; Love, M.; Manu, A.; Maze, T.; Nutter, F.; Porter, S.; Rosenbusch, R.; Rule, L.; Schmerr, L.; Strohbahn, C.; Tuckness, A.; Windus, T.; Wong, J.

**Substitutes:** V. Dark for Cross, S.; S. Beckman for Napolitano, R.; K. Zarecor for Palermo, G.

**Guests:** Carlson, S. (Provost's Office); Hoffman, E. (Provost); Kennedy, R. (GSB); Rosacker, E. (University Relations); Hanson, K. (Ames Trib); Kane, K. (P&S Council); Sager, W. (ISU Daily).

**I. Call to Order 3:31pm**

**A. Seating of Substitute Senators**

**II. Consent Agenda**

**A. Minutes of Faculty Senate, February 10, 2009 - [S08/M/6]**

**B. Agenda for March 10, 2009 – [S08/A/7]**

**C. Calendar – [S08/C/7]**

Beall moved to accept the consent agenda; Anderson seconded. Motion carried.

**III. Announcements and Remarks**

**A. Faculty Senate President**

Ford noted that the research policy has been accepted by administration; now is being translated into faculty handbook language. The policy is online for review. Ford asked that senators look at item V (special order)—there will be a vote today—an unusual procedure, but necessary because time is of the essence regarding budgetary doings. The document is a set of guiding principles for budget trimming generated by the FDAR Council. Ford noted that the Senate will meet twice in April instead of the usual once, in order to address all urgent Senate business before the semester ends. The Senate will meet on 4/7 and 4/21, and then again on 5/5. Ford said we should expect a report soon from the NTE Teaching % task force. Ford reminded the Senate that the Policy Library Advisory Council (PLAC) includes two Senate representatives, and that PLAC welcomes comments on all policies under development; contact Max Porter as needed. Ford took an informal poll on the desirability of using clickers for electronic voting in the Senate; a show of hands seemed to indicate about a 50-50 split as to their desirability. Ford said that the Governance Council would look into the matter further, including cost estimates.

**B. Faculty Senate President-Elect**

Van der Valk verified that the NTE teaching % report would be submitted soon; one preliminary finding was that the humanities disciplines generally have no correlation between salary level and experience.

### **C. Provost**

Hoffman noted that the Design Dean search committee had a tremendous amount of feedback to sort through in the wake of the visits by the four candidates. She noted that candidates for Engineering Dean were presently on campus, and further noted that only one candidate was recommended by the Human Sciences Dean search committee (Pam White). Hoffman noted that President Geoffroy's email earlier today indicated that state revenue forecasts had been downwardly revised, such that the budget reduction now stood at \$31M (an 11% decline). Even so, this figure could still change in either direction, pending estimates completed in late March. She noted that federal "stimulus" money would be coming to the state, but there is no way to predict the amount or the distribution of such funds; also, the funds would be temporary only, and therefore should not be relied on to meet longer-term needs. During Hoffman's remarks about the budget, Porter interjected that faculty should take it upon themselves to beat the bushes for "stimulus" money—contact legislators, but also pursue "stimulus"-fueled grants with renewed (and stimulating) vigor.

Hoffman noted that the IRS is insisting that personal use of cell phones provided by employers be taxed; as this poses accountability problems, the IRS recommends that employers provide a taxable stipend and that employees use the stipend to purchase their own phones/phone plans. In such a scenario the employee could make a claim of deductibility for any phone expenses, on a case-by-case basis. Hoffman also noted that The Regents would be voting on 3/19 on new early-retirement enticements, as a way to trim the budget. She noted further that on 4/29-30, ISU administrators will be explaining to the Regents how they will make the necessary budget adjustments.

## **IV. Special Order: Election of Council Chairs**

### **A. RPA Council**

### **B. FDAR Council**

Ballots were distributed for both positions. Gregory Palermo running unopposed for RPA chair, and Ann Marie VanDerZanden running unopposed for FDAR chair. Palermo not present; VanDerZanden spoke briefly of her prior experience as chair and her interest in continuing in that role.

## **V. Special Order: Resolution for Guiding Principles for Budget Evaluation [S08-20] FOR VOTE ON MARCH 10**

Sapp spoke in Palermo's stead. Sapp noted that the document was a checklist for budget decisions that was created in order to express a faculty perspective on budget priorities. Grudens-Stuck noted that Ag+Life Sciences caucus had discussed the principles, and wondered whether there was a generally-greed-upon ideal proportion of NTE/TE faculty (since the principles address whether this proportion might be affected by a budget cut). Butler noted that parts of the document needed to be clarified—in particular the parts of the document that seemed to imply that some particular programs merited special protection. Mayfield asked what the Senate was actually voting on, since to him the document appeared to be a recycling of existing principles. Sapp replied that the new document was a direct response to anticipated budget cuts, allowing that indeed it was in part a restating of existing principles. Mayfield asked whether there were new principles, or was this a reaffirmation; Sapp said primarily it was re-affirmative. Van der Valk bolstered Sapp's point that the new document was necessary in the context of the looming cuts. Van der Lugt wondered how we maintain academic excellence when budget cuts necessarily affect the quality of teaching and learning (WebCT in lieu of TA support, e.g.). Zarecor expressed concerns similar to those of

butler's, regarding the apparent privileging of particular named programs. Freeman said fear not, because faculty would have a strong voice in determining which particular programs would be cut. Selby noted that ISU has always privileged certain programs over others, so this is nothing new. Beresnev agreed with Selby's statement, saying that everyone understood that some programs were considered more essential than others. Katz agreed, noting that technology-based disciplines/programs would always be prioritized over other types. A question emerged about how and exactly what we should vote on; Porter said we should vote up or down on the resolution before the Senate. Ford asked for a show of hands; motion to approve the resolution carried, 37 yeas and 10 nays.

Elections results for the two Council chair positions announced: Palermo and VanDerZanden both elected handily. The Senate applauded in appreciation.

## **VI. Old Business**

### **A. Policy on Content of External Letters [S08-16] – Steve Freeman**

Freeman re-introduced the policy. Butler expressed concern about allowing comment by a reviewer regarding whether the ISU candidate would likely be tenured at the reviewer's institution, since this appears to constitute standards over and above ISU's own. Freeman noted that units could decide for themselves whether to ask this question of external reviewers, and that in any case it is essential that the question be asked of all reviewers (of a particular candidate) or none. Freeman noted that the existing policy does not address this issue—neither does it condone nor forbid the practice. Some units routinely ask this question, and others do not. Hoffman stepped up to say that the question is not used by many units, but those who use it tend to be the strongest academic programs, and those programs relied on the question as a way to measure themselves against other highly-regarded programs at different institutions. Zarecor suggested that care be taken to assure that regardless of whether the question is raised to an external reviewer, that the reviewer be furnished with ISU's promotion and tenure criteria, to assure that the reviewer evaluates the candidate according to ISU standards. Korsching noted that whether or not the question is raised in the instructions to the reviewer, many reviewers will address it anyway.

Ford asked for a show-of-hands vote on the motion before the Senate; motion carried with 46 yeas and 2 nays.

### **B. Discontinuation of M.S. in VDPAM [S08-17] – Clark Ford**

Ford re-introduced the proposal, and asked for a show-of-hands vote on the motion before the Senate; motion carried unanimously.

### **C. Protection of Children in the Workplace Policy [S08-18] – Clark Ford**

Ford re-introduced the policy, and asked for a voice vote on the motion before the Senate; motion carried unanimously.

## **VII. New Business**

### **A. Faculty Grievance Procedures- [S08-19]**

Freeman explained various grievance-procedure timeline issues and pointed out various proposed changes, noting that many changes are being made to align ISU policy with Regents policy. Grudens-Stuck asked about "calendar days" vs. "working days", suggesting that "calendar days" limits may be to the appellant's advantage when working with legal representation; Freeman countered that the grievance process was internal to the university and that "working days" limits constituted a more equitable practice.

### **B. Modified By-Law Changes – [S08-13]**

Porter noted that the changes had appeared on the Senate agenda earlier this year, but had been withdrawn because Jack Girton had made a strong case to maintain one of the committees that had been suggested for elimination in the proposed changes. Van der Valk noted that the elimination of the committee in question was premature. Walter explained the name change for one committee to "Committee on Senate Documents"; the old name includes the word "governance", and since this committee did not address governance, the new name clarified its role without modifying its function.

**VII. Good of the Order**

Porter offered that the Senate, in reflecting on the question of whether to pursue "clicker" voting in Senate meetings, should consider the benefit of the ease of secret ballot-casting with clickers (faster than paper ballots).

**VIII. Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 4:57, without formal motion or vote to do so.

<p><b>NEXT MEETING</b> <b>TUESDAY, APRIL 7, 2009 -- 3:30-5:00 P.M.</b> <b>GREAT HALL, MU</b></p>
--

Minutes assiduously recorded, painstakingly typed and respectfully submitted by Michael David Martin, duly elected Recording Secretary of the Iowa State University Faculty Senate, upon this second day of April in the year two thousand and nine *Anno Domini*.