

S08/A/9

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
FACULTY SENATE MEETING minutes
APRIL 21, 2009 -- 3:30–5:00 P.M.
GREAT HALL, MEMORIAL UNION**

Present: Anderson, D.; Anderson, P.; Baker, R.; Baldwin, C.; Beell, T.; Beetham, J.; Beresnev, I.; Butler, A.; Chaudhuri, S.; Clough, M.; Crase, S.; Dell, B.; Doran, M.; Ford, C.; Geske, J.; Haddad, M.; Hargrove, M.; Haynes, J.; Herrmann, P.; Hillier, A.; Katz, A.; Keren, N.; Korsching, P.; Kushkowski, J.; Loy, D.; Luecke, G.; Manu, A.; Martin, M.; Mayfield, J.; Muench, J.; Napolitano, R.; Niday, D.; Osweiler, G.; Owen, M.; Pleasants, J.; Porter, M.; Porter, S.; Pruetz, J.; Rosenbusch, R.; Ruben, R.; Sadosky, L.; Sapp, T.; Selby, M.; Smiley-Oyen, A.; Torrie, M.; Tuckness, A.; van der Valk, A.; VanderZanden, A. M.; Wallace, R.; Walter, S.; Windus, T.

Absent: Bracha, V.; Cooper, E.; Daniels, T.; Day, T.; Freeman, S.; Grudens-Schuck, N.; Hendrich, S.; Hochstetler, A.; Jackman, J.; Larkin, B.; Larsen, M.; Larson, S.; Long, L.; Love, M.; Maze, T.; McQueeney, R.; Moschini, G.C.; Nutter, F.; Rule, L.; Schmerr, L.; Strohbahn, C.; Vander Lugt, K.; Wong, J.

Substitutes: V. Dark for Cross, S.; K. Zarecor for Palermo, G.

Guests: Carlson, S. (Provost's Office); Hoffman, E. (Provost); Girton, J. (BBMB); Hanson, K. (Ames Trib); Mumm, L. (P&S Council); Rasmussen, E. (Provost Office); Rosacker, E. (University Relations); Sager, W. (ISU Daily).

I. Call to Order

A. Seating of Substitute Senators

(See above for substitutions)

II. Consent Agenda

A. Minutes of Faculty Senate, April 7, 2009 - [S08/M/8]

B. Agenda for April 21, 2009 – [S08/A/9]

C. Calendar – [S08/C/9]

Motion to accept agenda by Beell, seconded by Crase; motion carried.

III. Special Order: Panel Discussion on University Budget – Provost Betsy Hoffman; Arnold van der Valk, President-Elect; Mike Owen, Ag Caucus Chair; Skip Walter, Business Caucus Chair; Paul Anderson, Design Caucus Chair; Martha Selby, Engineering Caucus Chair; Margaret Torrie, Human Sciences Caucus Chair; Robert Wallace, Liberal Arts and Science Caucus Chair; and Gary Osweiler, Veterinary Medicine Caucus Chair

Ford introduced panel members. Hoffman opened by framing “where we are/where we are going” in budget terms. She noted that an April 2 memo to faculty had noted a budget reduction of \$40.2M; a recent Iowa Senate bill alleviated this slightly by reducing the figure to \$38.7M. Hoffman described the process by which the UBAC (University Budget Advisory Committee) and the provost's office consulted at length to define differential cuts for colleges and academic units. The Colleges of Agriculture and Life Sciences and the

College of Engineering, together with the science and social science departments/programs within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences would be cut 7.5%; The College of Veterinary Medicine would be cut 8.25%, and “all others” cut 8.5%. Administrative units would be cut 9%. Hoffman also noted that federal “stimulus” money remained the wild card in budget determinations, since neither the amount nor duration of funding is known.

Van der Valk, representing the RPA Council, advocated for maintaining or even increasing the percentage of tenured/tenure-eligible faculty, with an eye towards keeping academic units strong. He noted that ISU has lost about 200 tenured/tenure-eligible positions (through attrition) since the 1990s. Crase, representing the budget advisory committee (advisory to the provost and the president), noted that her committee attempted to identify concerns and achieve consensus on budget-cutting principles. Owen, representing the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences caucus, affirmed the long history of a good working relationship between his college and the provost’s office, and reported that his college had worked effectively as a unit to resolve internal budget-cutting decisions. Walter, representing the College of Business caucus, noted that his college was cutting entertainment budgets for interviewees. He noted further that his college intends to cut salaries across the board, if necessary, rather than eliminate jobs. Anderson, representing the College of Design caucus, noted that several levels of governance had dealt with budget reconciliation with his college. He noted that the college had conducted a college-wide forum two weeks prior, with over 200 faculty, staff and students attending. Anderson then listed ten primary points of concern regarding budget cuts, developed from the recent forum and consolidated by the caucus. Selby, representing the College of Engineering caucus, noted that her college had recently established a budget committee, but that the committee was just beginning to accomplish strategic planning. One proposal currently under consideration is differential tuition. Torrie, representing the College of Human Sciences caucus, noted that her college had both a new dean and a newly revised governance document. The document clarifies how faculty can be involved in budgety-strategy things. She noted that faculty had offered input in recent college-wide meetings, but that there had not been much student involvement as yet. Wallace, representing the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, noted that the college had recently re-activated the moribund BAG (Budget Advisory Group). He noted the plethora of departments within LAS, and noted that the intention was to do the least damage to faculty and faculty lines while maintaining academic quality. He anticipated hiring challenges, increased teaching loads, and a trend toward larger classes. Osweiler, representing the College of Veterinary Medicine caucus, noted that his college maintains a budget committee advisory to the dean, and that the committee includes four sub-committees, one of which deals with strategic planning. He noted that his college had cut one associate dean position (now two instead of three), and that an external chair search was now an internal search, as a cost-saving measure.

Mayfield opened the comments period, asking why not raise tuition? Hoffman answered that the Regents set tuition, and they follow a higher-education price index in order to remain competitive. She noted further that tuition discussions occur in the fall; last year the increase was 4.2%. Mid-term increases by the Regents are theoretically possible, but she said this was very unlikely. Mayfield continued by proposing that the university may be in

budget difficulties because it's trying to do too much, and wondered whether ISU should "decrease the scope of what we do"; Hoffman responded that there had been discussions about this, but that such considerations are premature without knowing actual budget figures. She noted further that the primary institutional concern was to meet student needs, and that shrinking the university would undermine this goal. She noted further that since ISU increasingly relies on tuition as a percentage of its operating costs, a decrease in student body population would be problematic. Van der Valk cited a study that compared public-university faculty work conditions and productivity in 1993 and 2004; the study indicated that the number of hours worked had remained constant, but that teaching loads had increased and publication output had correspondingly decreased. Dell noted that some costs would inevitably rise, such as utility costs and mandated increases to AFSCME employees, and that these would presumably be passed on to academic units in the form of further program cuts. Katz asked about furloughs as a cost-saving measure, since they would by definition be temporary; Hoffman replied that furloughs were not contractually possible in the case of AFSCME, and that only voluntary furloughs were currently feasible. There was a clarification (identity of speaker not recorded) that it is possible to cut AFSCME pay or positions, but that doing so would be very disruptive because union rules stipulate (for example) that first to go are all part-timers, including graduate students, before any full-time positions can be touched. S. Porter concluded the comments/question session by asking whether less-favored units such as the College of Human Sciences could be "whacked" as a cost saving measure, Hoffman replied that cutting some colleges (and preserving others) was more on the level of a "thought experiment".

IV. Announcements and Remarks

A. Faculty Senate President

Ford noted that the NTE teaching % report was currently under review by the FDAR Council, and that it would be available to all by fall semester.

B. Faculty Senate President-Elect

Van der Valk had no announcements, but used this opportunity to make an argument on principle against the use of furloughs as a cost-saving measure.

C. Provost

Hoffman made no further announcements or comments.

V. Old Business

A. Export Controls Policy – [S08-21]

Girton noted that the policy was necessary in order to comply with federal law, but that the law created problems for any research institution. In some cases, the law restricts what some students can do in labs. Girton noted that there is a fundamental research exemption for anything meant for public distribution, but proprietary research was not exempted. On the question of the law's effects on teaching, Girton noted that whatever a course syllabus stipulates would apply to all enrolled students. In cases where proprietary or otherwise restricted research is involved, faculty must create a plan for dealing with the law's limitations. Girton noted that the Senate needed to do two things: approve the policy now (because the absence of a policy could jeopardize research funding), and decide where

the policy should go (faculty handbook, for example). Porter noted that Engineering has a memorandum of understanding with China for a program involving 28 students, and assumes that ISU administration will be involved in review of the program for compliance with the law. Hoffman concurred, and noted further that this was yet another cost-increase issue. Beresnev wondered whether all research should be exempt because all of it is “fundamental”; Girton noted that quite a bit of what ISU does is not meant for public consumption. Beresnev then asked about implications for ISU faculty members who themselves are foreign nationals; Girton said this was a complicating factor, the dimensions of which are unknown. Hillier asked about the publication restriction in paragraph two, which could be at odds with the terms of publication within existing contracts. Girton said such conflicts would have to be negotiated on an individual basis. As to the location of the policy, Selby proposed that it go to the policy library, and be linked from the faculty handbook and other sites. Ford then asked for a show of hands to indicate support or opposition to the adoption of the policy; It appeared that most of those present raised a hand in support; two senators raised a hand in opposition. The motion before the Senate to adopt the policy carried.

The bell tower then tolled five times; Wallace moved to extend 15 minutes in order to finish agenda, and Owen seconded; motion carried.

B. Admissions Requirements Handbook editing: obsolete requirements removed from Handbook, replaced by link to Regents website

Mayfield asked whether the faculty still had any involvement in establishing ISU admissions policy. Holger replied that the faculty continues in its advisory role to the Regents, and that the Handbook would link to the Regents only so that the most current information would be available. The process for revising admission standards, which involves ISU faculty and administrators (such as the Academic Standards Committee) would continue. Ford asked for a show of hands for support of the handbook change; support appeared to be unanimous.

VI. New Business

A. Faculty Handbook: Section 10.8

Walter noted that the change intended to allow for the possibility of Senate votes using electronic balloting (such as “clickers”).

B. Ph.D. Program – Greenlee School of Journalism – Communication of Science, Technology and Risk

Abbott described the rationale for the new program.

VII. Good of the Order

Nothing offered.

VIII. Adjournment

Beell moved for adjournment, Wallace (reliably) seconded; motion carried by voice vote.

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 fourth day of May in the year two thousand and nine *Anno Domini*.

NEXT MEETING

TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2009 -- 3:30-5:00 P.M.

GREAT HALL, MU