

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
FACULTY SENATE MEETING minutes
MARCH 9, 2010 -- 3:30–5:00 P.M.
GREAT HALL, MEMORIAL UNION**

Present: Agarwal, S.; Anderson, D.; Anderson, P.; Arndt, G.; Baldwin, C.; Beattie, G.; Beell, T.; Beresnev, I.; Blevins, J.; Bracha, V.; Butler, A.; Byars, J.; Chaudhuri, S.; Clough, M.; Dell, B.; Doran, M.; Ford, C.; Freeman, S.; Hargrove, M.; Haynes, J.; Hendrich, S.; Herrmann, P.; Hillier, A.; Hochstetler, A.; Huffman, W.; Kushkowsky, J.; Loy, D.; Luecke, G.; Manu, A.; Maitra, R.; Martin, M.; Martin, R.; Matzavinos, T.; Mayfield, J.; Minion, C.; Muench, J.; Napolitano, R.; Niday, D.; Osweiler, G.; Owen, M.; Pleasants, J.; Porter, M.; Porter, S.; Prieto, L.; Rule, L.; Schalinske, K.; Selby, M.; Smiley-Oyen, A.; Stalder, K.; Strohbehn, C.; Torrie, M.; Townsend, T.; Tuckness, A.; Vander Lugt, K.; van der Valk, A.; VanderZanden, A. M.; Wallace, R.; Walter, S.

Absent: Baker, R.; Beetham, J.; Cooper, E.; Daniels, T.; Day, T.; Jackman, J.; Keren, N.; Korsching, P.; McQueeney, R.; Owusu, F.; Palermo, G.; Sapp, T.; van Leeuwen, H.; Wang, Z.J.; Windus, T.

Substitutes: E. Abbott for Geske, J.; B. Caldwell for Katz, A.; S. Giles for Sturm, J.

Guests: Carlson, S. (Provost Office); Holger, D. (Provost Office); Peiffer, G. (GPSS); Rosacker, E. (University Relations); Kane, K. (P&S Council); J. Pusey (Ames Trib); K. Kerns (EH&S); J. Koziel (ABE); T. Murtaugh (ISU Daily); J. Opoien (ISU Daily); B. Smith (ISU Daily)

I Call to Order

A Seating of Substitute Senators

See above for substitutes.

II Consent Agenda

A Minutes of Faculty Senate, February 9, 2010 - [S09/M/5]

B Agenda for March 9, 2010 – [S09/A/6]

C Withdrawal of Handbook Section 3.4 and MOU by Governance Council

D Calendar – [S09/C/6]

Beell moved to accept consent agenda, Walter seconded; motion carried.

III Announcements and Remarks

A Faculty Senate President

Van der Valk noted that four council chair positions are coming open and called for nominations prior to next Senate meeting. Noted vacancies for Athletic Council as well. Thanked Max Porter and Governance Council for continued work on section 3.4. Noted that the MOU was withdrawn, and that latest section 3.4 revisions had incorporated necessary elements of MOU. Noted that Section 3.4.1 (nonrenewal of term appointments) contained no substantial changes. Asked (rhetorically) about Section 3.4.2 (termination): Do we need 3.4.2.2 (termination of appointment due to elimination

of academic programs)? Asked (rhetorically) the same of 3.4.2.3 (termination due to financial exigency)? Van der Valk suggested we do need both, because they are linked policies. Noted that the term “tenure” has never meant a “job for life”, because it has always been true that positions can be eliminated, for various reasons. Noted that we need a way to deal with the elimination of academic programs, and the Handbook failed to address this in the past. Noted that the AAUP recognizes this need, and does advocate certain policies for such circumstances (1. Cause 2. Financial exigency 3. Program elimination)

B Faculty Senate President-Elect

Owen noted that the spring conference (April 30, 10:30-1:00) would address “refocusing the academy in light of current budget constraints”, with Provost Tom Sullivan from the U. of Minnesota as the featured speaker. Other speakers to include Provost Hoffman and John Schuh. Noted a need for senators and other faculty to participate as members of Senate councils and committees; chair positions must be senators, but committee/council members do not need to be senators.

C Provost

Hoffman was not present due to being stranded at the Kansas City airport by weather conditions. Carlson spoke in her place. Carlson thanked the Governance Council for their recent work. Apologized on behalf of Hoffman for her absence, who welcomes comments and suggestions sent to her before the April 6 Senate meeting.

IV Special order: VEISHEA co-chairs (Satre and Cortum) announce events

Satre and Cortum noted that Veishea planning included 30 committee members as well as 150-200 volunteer assistants. Noted that VEISHEA brings colleges together, as well as clubs and organizations, and that this was the original intent of the celebration. Asked for support from the faculty. Noted the departure from tradition in that there would be no Monday BBQ. Noted that the headlining band, Motion City Soundtrack, was less head-bangy than other recent headlining bands for VEISHEA.

V Old Business

A Withdraw previous versions of FH Section 3.4 Nonrenewal or Termination of Appointments [S09-11] and Memorandum of Understanding – Governance Council (Porter)

Porter reiterated that the previous revision for Section 3.4 (submitted earlier by the Governance Council to the Senate) had been withdrawn, along with the separate MOU; a new version of 3.4, incorporating some of the MOU’s conditions, was now offered for consideration under New Business.

VI New Business

A Engineering Sales Minor – [S09-20] Hendrich

Hendrich noted the proposed minor. Wallace noted he was disturbed by the idea of a Business minor being offered by the College of Engineering. Wondered whether this was appropriate, and whether this was “poaching”, a way to chase credits. Noted we are likely to see more of this what with the budget model. Townsend applauded the

interdisciplinarity of the venture but was concerned that the Business College would not get credit for supporting the minor. Holdger reiterated that it was a minor rather than a major; all of the students involved are already Engineering majors, so no loss to Business. Townsend noted that his concern was not about budget money, but rather that Business would not get recognition for making the minor possible. Hendrich noted that most minors do involve courses from outside programs. Smiley-Owen agreed. Walter noted that he was reassured by the Business College dean that appropriate procedures had been followed in approving the minor, with appropriate input sought from Business. Van der Lugt wondered whether the minor was vulnerable or sustainable, since courses within the minor would be taught by a single NTE faculty member. Selby noted that the minor was useful because Engineering students are not eligible for a Marketing minor; only option available at this point is a minor in Entrepreneurial Studies. Townsend noted that the minor seemed like a special focus that was useful for Engineering students, and that he had no objections. Prito noted that it seemed that objections were out of order at this point, assuming appropriate procedures had been followed. Suggested we need to be vigilant about establishing minors that could be seen as “poaching”, to make sure everyone is satisfied with the approvals process.

B Proposed revised version of FH Section 3.4 Nonrenewal or Termination of Appointment – Governance Council (Porter) [S09-11]

Porter reiterated that the previous revision for Section 3.4 (submitted earlier by the Governance Council to the Senate) had been withdrawn, along with the separate MOU; a new version of 3.4, incorporating some of the MOU’s conditions, was now offered for consideration. Noted that van der Valk had outlined the major issues clearly earlier during his remarks. Invited questions and comments. Also asked that minor edit suggestions be sent to him, and to limit discussion today to substantive issues. Abbot noted concern with unintended consequences of the document’s wording. Wondered whether, for instance, if Journalism discontinued their masters program, would faculty members who teach solely in that program have to be let go, or could they be re-absorbed into the undergraduate Journalism degree?

Abbot expressed concern that linking elimination of programs to the cutting of faculty positions would discourage units from eliminating any programs. Suggested that the U of I document that we say we want to emulate is in fact more flexible than the document under consideration here at ISU. Hendrich noted that she was perplexed by a statement at the end of the first paragraph in Section 3.4.4.2, referring to alternatives to elimination of a program; isn’t this really about eliminating positions? Van der Valk said no, that this is just a way to consider how to downsize without elimination, perhaps short of eliminating any tenured positions. Carlson noted that these were complex issues, and that the intent is to develop policies so that units have a way to respond to budget cuts and administrative fiats. Freeman noted that if we approve the policy under consideration, then faculty are protected, because they could only be let go in cases of financial exigency or program elimination; noted that under present conditions, no such limitations are in place.

Beresnev expressed concern that “good faith effort” (with respect to relocation of faculty whose positions have been eliminated) is not defined. Asked whether money would follow the hopefully-to-be-relocated faculty member, and if not, where would the money come from? M. Porter noted that “good faith effort” is an AAUP term. S. Porter noted that the Governance Council had suggested the alternative phrase “make every effort” be used, and wondered why the change had been made back to “good faith”. Selby noted that “every effort” is problematic, and Tanaka agreed, cautioning that it is an impossible standard to meet. He suggested that “good faith” was a term that could be argued or challenged. Van der Valk suggested that the terms were not really substantially different. Beresnev maintained that the document falls flat if the term is not defined. Van der Valk countered that “good faith effort” was a challenge-able condition that would allow recourse by formal appeal.

Pleasance offered an AAUP perspective. Noted that this was a generally good document containing good things, but that there remained some issues. Noted that we need faculty to be actively involved in program elimination considerations, and to not allow decisions to be handed down by administration. Thus far, it appears the faculty are defining how they deal with the aftermath of program eliminations imposed by administration. Van der Valk countered that a program cannot be eliminated without an “academic” reason; Pleasance noted that administrators can withdraw support for a program, and asked how a program could possibly deal with that? M. Porter noted that our Handbook Section 10.8 provides a role for faculty in program elimination. Pleasance allowed that 10.8 provides a faculty “veto”, perhaps, but that in his opinion the faculty need to be more pro-active, to be involved strategically rather than merely reactively. S. Porter noted that he was increasingly uneasy with the topic of program elimination, because it seemed the underlying issue and motive has a financial basis rather than an academic basis. Van der Valk noted that resources are always an issue, and that there were many layers of review by faculty for any restructuring, and that safeguards are in place to prevent administration from making draconian or arbitrary cuts. S. Porter countered that administrators can effectively “starve” a program, even a viable one, by withholding resources, and suggested there was no faculty recourse for such a move. Van der Valk noted that we don’t intend to leave all decision-making on program elimination to administrators, so therefore we need a policy for faculty involvement, which is what the revision to Section 3.4 represents. Owen noted that there were many universities across the fruited plain that were run much more top-down, cutting programs and faculty with pitiless ruthlessness, and that relative to those institutions, ISU’s governance is much more of a cooperative venture.

Dell noted that the proposed Section 3.4 was not addressing tenure-track positions. Van der Valk agreed, noting that tenured faculty have in effect “property rights” that untenured faculty (including tenure-track members, as well as lecturers and clinicians) do not have. Dell noted that some departments and program relied very heavily on lecturers. Hendrich asked for reassurance that there were still only three grounds for position elimination (1. Cause 2. Financial exigency 3. Program elimination); Carlson said this was true. Townsend suggested that a tenured position is a social contract, and noted that administration could stipulate that any tenured faculty member whose

position was eliminated could be guaranteed a placement somewhere at a minimum of 75% of pay. Discussion continued briefly, and van der Valk suggested that senators could propose amendments to proposed Section 3.4, submitting them in advance of the next Senate meeting, for consideration by the Executive Board.

VI Good of the Order

None offered.

VII Adjournment

Motion to adjourn not recorded.

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

<p style="text-align: center;">NEXT MEETING TUESDAY, APRIL 6, 2010 -- 3:30-5:00 P.M. GREAT HALL, MU</p>
--