IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
APRIL 2, 2013 – 3:30–5:00 P.M.
SUN ROOM, MEMORIAL UNION


Substitutes: E. Whitley for Baldwin, C.; P. Iasevoli for Eisman, A; E. Sanders for Strohbehn, C.; B. Sponseller for Ware, W.

Guests: Leath, S. (President); Wickert, J. (Senior Vice President and Provost); Holger, D. (Associate Provost); Bratsch-Prince, D. (Associate Provost); Pounds, D. (University Relations); Rippke, S. (Parliamentarian); Ferguson, D. (ISU Daily); Burrough, E. (VDPAM); Cantor, D. (SCIS)

I. Call to Order
   A. Seating of Substitute Senators
   President Hendrich called the meeting to order at 3:32 PM and seated the substitute senators.

II. Consent Agenda
   A. Minutes of Faculty Senate March 12, 2013- [S12/M/7]
   B. Agenda for April 2, 2013 – [S12/A/8]
   C. Calendar – [S12/C/8]
   D. Proposed Policy on Copyright of Software—FEEDBACK REQUESTED BY APRIL 19, 2013 -- http://policy.iastate.edu/news/have-you-developed-software-while-isu-who-owns-it
   Senator Wallace moved the consent agenda; Senator Smiley-Oyen seconded. Passed without dissension

III. Announcements and Remarks
   A. Faculty Senate President
      1. Provost’s Budget Advisory Committee (PBAC) and University Budget Advisory Committee (UBAC)
         No report. No meetings have taken place since the last FS meeting.
2. **Wellness Consultant**  
President Hendrich expects a near final version of the report in April. The ad hoc committee, Healthiest ISU, has been meeting regularly and includes significant faculty membership.

3. **Implementation of Iowa Senate File 2284, Section 27**  
The Iowa legislature passed a bill to require a continuous improvement plan to be developed and implemented for any undergraduate course that enrolls over 300 students in a given year beginning in Fall 2013. In 2014, courses that enroll 200 or more will be included; and in Fall 2015, courses that enroll 100 or more will be included. FS is working closely with the Provost’s Office, CELT, and the Undergraduate Programs Council.

B. **Faculty Senate President-Elect**  
No remarks.

C. **Provost**  
No remarks.

V. **Special Order – FS Representative to the Athletic Council Election**  
There were two candidates, Eric Burrough and David Cantor. Each spoke in favor of his candidacy. By secret ballot, Eric Burrough was elected.

IV. **President Steven Leath**  
President Leath said that it’s been a good year, with “some bumps” (mentioning the Harkin Institute).

A. **Athletics**  
Athletics has been a “bright spot” with several teams going to tournaments and finishing strong. ISU scholar-athletes are performing better academically than comparable groups in the country.

President Leath has instituted a new way to negotiate athletics contracts. They are no longer tied only to performance on the field or court; they are more directly tied to academic performance of scholar-athletes. Coach Hoiberg was the first to agree and his contract became the model for new contracts. Agents have protested that this is not how contracts are negotiated; President Leath has replied that this is how ISU handles contracts.

B. **Budget**  
It appears that there will be an increase in the bottom budget line for ISU. President Leath is also confident that we will see increases in general appropriations this year too. Unfortunately, we are not where we were three to four years ago, but we are trending upwards.
C. **Regents Appointments**
   President Leath wants to stay out of this issue and let the process take its “natural course.”

D. **Federal Relations**
   Sophia Magill (alumna and former GSB president) has been hired as the assistant director of federal relations. With the current federal budget situation, there is not a lot of federal money available for higher education, although Pell Grants continue to be directly important to the academy.

E. **Record Enrollment, Faculty Hires and Salary**
   Over the past ten years, enrollment has grown nearly 25% without much gain in faculty numbers. There will be increased enrollment next year too. President Leath acknowledged the burden this places on faculty, and their efforts to maintain quality and morale. Provost Wickert and President Leath are working to hire 200 new faculty in the coming years to deal with student growth, but President Leath expressed doubt that the number would be reached in 24 months. President Leath added that he is sensitive to the salary issue. There was a modest increase last year and there will be a similar increase this year, but not as large as he hoped for. It has been many years since there was a salary bill in the legislature. President Leath was encouraged that the issue is being discussed.

F. **Fundraising**
   Last year’s fundraising exceeded goals for private gifts. This year, the goal was for $100 million for the general fund, and we are over 80% complete. There is an agreement with the legislature for funding the scholarship initiative too.

G. **Enhancing Institutional Excellence**
   President Leath said that his push for institutional excellence is to raise the profile of ISU’s excellent faculty, with the hope that this will lead to successful grants, private works, and increased visibility in the minds of state legislators. President Leath wants to increase Ph.D. enrollment and the number of degrees conferred, with aspirations of increasing up to 40%.

   One specific recommendation from a task force is to develop a central unit for writing proposals for large grants.

   President Leath is concerned about how to raise the profile of arts and humanities faculty. Provost Wickert has committed to filling the funding gap in cases where faculty would turn down high-profile grants due to insufficient funding. President Leath challenged faculty to come up with other specific recommendations on how to assist arts and humanities faculty.
H. Interdisciplinary Research Initiative
Fourteen proposals were received for three spots for up to $500,000 for three years. President Leath was really pleased to see the diverse groups of faculty working together.

I. Questions
Senator Sturm expressed gratitude for the support of arts and humanities faculty, and vowed to ask his constituents to provide feedback. President Leath replied that resources are not unlimited, but we are gaining new resources.

Senator Zarecor asked how arts and humanities faculty are supposed to contribute to ISU’s AAU status. There are 293 awards, most of which are virtually impossible to get. Nevertheless, many faculty serve as editors or publish in prestigious venues. What does President Leath mean by “success” and “visibility” with respect to faculty in the arts and humanities? President Leath replied that he tried carefully to frame the issue in terms of institutional excellence, rather than AAU status. He wants ISU to become the best that it can be, and he is confident that this will be reflected in AAU status.

Senator Amidon expressed concern about a tension in faculty obligations to undergraduate curriculum and to pursue competitive grants. In some departments, if a faculty member leaves for a fellowship, there is no one to offer his or her courses. Although he would like to pursue fellowships, the yield rates have fallen precipitously. President Leath speculated that there will be greater appreciation soon. Business leaders are expressing a desire for specialized knowledge coupled with fluency in languages and communication skills.

Senator Beattie asked about the strategies to hire 200 new faculty. President Leath replied that one goal is to make a difference in an area of science to make a critical mass or fill in gaps, so that we can compete better. A second goal is to support areas that have the heaviest teaching loads and student needs. Provost Wickert added that we had very strong hiring last year with little turnover. While it is too early to predict, this year looks to be similar to last year. He added that there are some exciting collaborations between academic departments, and across colleges for joint appointments.

Senator Herman asked where we should be with respect to online education. President Leath replied that there has been a lot of press about online education (e.g., concerning MOOCs). He stressed that he won’t let people outside of ISU drive our priorities about educational delivery systems. Will there be more blended learning? Yes. Will residents be able to take online courses? Absolutely. But one of the draws for students to ISU is the residential experience (including clubs, leadership positions, etc.). 90% of our graduates get jobs, and that is because of experiences they had on campus. So we will not push away from that. On the other hand, President Leath and Provost Wickert have discussed positively approaches, such as “flagship groups.” For example, ISU might partner with Texas, where ISU delivers an online chemistry
course to Texas students, and ISU students receive an online course from Texas in biology. This would differ from a MOOC because it would be in deliberate conjunction with another university, rather than massively open. President Leath added that he expects that there will be more coordinated development of online degrees beyond the BA.

Senator Smiley-Oyen asked about support for innovative teaching, such as team-based learning. President Leath did not have a reply, and suggested that FS identify needs and bring specific proposals forward to him and Provost Wickert.

Senator Horwitz asked about how masters professional programs (e.g., M.Art) fit with the goal of institutional excellence. In some cases, the pressure to develop a professional degree has placed a strain on resources. President Leath replied that student demand will tell us whether these should continue to be offered.

President Hendrich asked, in reviewing dossiers for promotion and tenure, has President Leath seen things that he thinks faculty should be doing more of? What challenges do faculty face? President Leath replied that the richness and complexity of resumes show that most faculty are doing great work. His worry is not about faculty productivity, but how to spread out workloads and demands. The P&T process overall is very good. Letters from external references, department chairs, and deans are appropriately thoughtful.

President Hendrich pointed out that senators are typically especially civic-minded. What steps might the university take to encourage or foster more of that kind of faculty sensibility? President Leath agreed that there is not as much citizenship in the campus community as one might like. But he thinks that this is a faculty issue: how much citizenship should count towards P&T?

Senator Zarecor was pleased at the suggestion that some of the new faculty hires might be in areas where there are high teaching demands. Is this a shift in priorities? President Leath replied that the emphasis had been on creating critical masses in the sciences to make the proposal more obviously agreeable to the legislature.

Senator Amidon asked what the take-home lessons were from the Harkin Institute “dust-up.” President Leath said that the creation of the new institute should have been more thoughtful and careful. It should not have been named after a sitting politician. He added that the process should be transparent. Once it was discovered that the new institute would overlap with an existing entity, it was a mistake not to tell the other group, because it fostered distrust. Creating a memorandum of agreement forbidding the Harkin Institute to work in agriculture was equally bad, because it generated distrust on the other side. Everyone became disenfranchised. The original proposal said that there would be no overlap with existing programs. That was a mistake. Any proposal should begin with the faculty, to arrest any concerns about academic freedom.
VI. Unfinished Business

A. Revision to FH 5.2.4.1 Voting Procedures [S12-3]

Senator Butler pointed out that there are different practices among different college-level P&T committees. Some colleges allow for representatives from the same department as candidates to advocate for the candidate’s promotion. She argued that this practice is unfair because of differences in composition of college-level P&T committees. In LAS, it is impracticable for there to be representatives from every program or department. She asked senators to reflect on the principle of one person-one vote and consider whether this practice violates that principle.

Senator Selby replied that Senator Butler’s example could be solved within LAS without changing the good system in other colleges. LAS could put procedures in place to ensure that a representative from the department is on the LAS committee.

Past President Freeman countered that CALS similarly does not have representatives from every department. Representatives serve terms in order to ensure continuity from one year to the next. Senator Selby responded that there could be a procedure to make an advocate available, just not necessarily a voting member of the committee.

Senator Beattie said that the P&T dossier is supposed to provide all of the supporting documentation for the candidacy. Having an advocate makes the process unfair. The candidate is not guaranteed that the colleague will be a good advocate. Just as in grant panels, such representatives should be required to leave the room.

Senator Amidon understood Senator Butler’s concern. But he contended that the language in FH 5.2.4.3 is satisfactory. A person who has voted at the department level does not have a vote at the college level.

Past President Freeman agreed that Senator Amidon is correct that the representative does not have an additional vote at the college level. The concern is whether advocacy is the equivalent of a vote and therefore threatens the fundamental principle of one person, one vote.

Senator Butler moved to amend the motion to require that representatives from the candidate’s department remove themselves from the room when the college-level P&T committee discusses the candidate’s case. Senator Beattie seconded. The amendment failed, with 22 in favor, 25 opposed.

Senator Smiley-Oyen called the question. The motion passed with some dissent.

B. Revision to FH 2.8 Policy for Renaming Academic Units [S12-14]

Senator Selby moved her amendment. Senator Anderson seconded.

Senator Selby said that the proposed policy distinguishes two ways for academic units to be renamed. In the first case, when a unit is renamed for academic reasons, an affirmative
vote of the affected department is required. In the second case, when a unit is renamed because of a gift, no departmental vote is required. Senator Selby argued that a vote should be required whether or not money is involved. She pointed out that her amendment includes provisions to address concerns about confidentiality and timing. In both her amendment and the original motion, the faculty are informed. The difference is that in her amendment, the faculty also vote. She did not see new problems created for confidentiality or timeliness. She added that the motivation for the amendment is not distrust of administration. Instead it is commitment to shared governance: faculty set the rules for faculty governance. Finally, she said that some senators have reported that administrators would not approve the policy if it were modified to require a faculty vote. She replied that she would argue for the principles that she thinks are right.

Senator Cunnally warned FS not to make the perfect the enemy of the good. Senator Selby’s amendment is perfect – exactly what faculty should want – but the administration does not support it. The original motion is supported by administration and ensure that faculty are informed and that faculty advice is solicited. He thought that this was a sufficient safeguard against hasty or unwise renaming of an academic unit. BOR has vested in ISU President Leath the power to renamed academic units for philanthropic reasons, so the commitment to solicit advice from faculty is a tremendous concession.

Senator Amidon spoke in favor of Senator Selby’s amendment.

President-Elect Dark opposed the amendment. She said that the administration has indicated that it is opposed to requiring a faculty vote out of concern for possible insult to donors. Because we share governance with the administration, she contended that shared governance requires us not to approve the amendment.

The amendment failed.

Senator Amidon moved to postpone the motion until the next FS meeting. That motion failed.

Senator Butler recommended that FS consider adding a two-person faculty standing committee to work with ISU Foundation and ISU President Leath in discussions with donors. These disinterested faculty would ensure that concerns about academic freedom are addressed.

Senator Amidon moved to amend the motion with the language of Senator Selby’s amendment, minus the requirement of a faculty vote. This amendment was deemed to be substantially different from Senator Selby’s amendment and was allowed to be considered.

Senator Zarecor pointed out that the first sentence says that renaming because of gifts is entirely the purview of ISU President Leath. She asked whether FS could place limitations on that. Senator Selby replied that it is a shared governance issue.
Senator Sturm asked for clarification about the differences between the amendment and the original motion. He observed that the amendment requires a written document of the will of the affected faculty. Other than that, what were the differences?

Senator Amidon replied that advice solicited in a single closed meeting is insufficient faculty involvement. There is nothing in the original motion that stipulates the confidentiality or time sensitive nature of the process. He added that the advice should be part of a written public record.

President Hendrich pointed out that the original motion did have language concerning the confidential and time sensitive nature of the process.

Senator Selby replied that the original motion did not specify how faculty would be involved, just that they are informed.

Provost Wickert said that he had sent President Hendrich and President-Elect Dark the BOR policy on renaming. The policy is available on BOR website. If a donor falls into disrepute, there is a policy for rescission of names. There are also policies concerning corporate naming, conflicts of interest, and commercial interests. The policy stipulates that there must be BOR approval. The renaming has to reflect positively on the academic unit. There must be due diligence to ensure that there is no conflict of interest with respect to the donor. He sought to reassure senators that there are no obstacles with respect to academic freedom and research autonomy will be preserved. All of this is covered in BOR policy. Provost Wickert said that he would not object to requiring that the faculty advice be written. The goal is to inform faculty in advance, consult them and have them provide advice to the president.

The amendment failed.

Senator Smiley-Oyen called the question. Senator Horwitz seconded. The motion passed with some dissent.

VII. New Business
    A. Revision to FH 6.2 Honorary Degrees [S12-15]
    President Hendrich said that the policy was modified to introduce a process for rescission of honorary degrees.

    B. Revision to FH 5.7 Evaluation of Central Administrators [S12-16]
    President Hendrich said that changes were made to reflect changes to administrative structure.

VIII. Good of the Order
    None.
IX. Adjournment

Senator Wallace moved; seconded by Senator Smiley-Oyen. Meeting adjourned at 5:08 PM.

NEXT MEETING, TUESDAY, APRIL 23, 2013 – 3:30-5:00 PM, GREAT HALL, MU

Respectfully submitted April 17, 2013,

Annemarie Butler
Faculty Senate Secretary