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Iowa State University Faculty Council, 1954–1988: A History

Abstract
On February 14, 1954, the General Faculty of Iowa State University approved by voice vote the following motion: "That the General Faculty of Iowa State College establish a Faculty Council in accord with the provisions set forth in a statement entitled 'Basic Document.'" With this action the Faculty Council began its thirty-four year existence.
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On February 14, 1954, the General Faculty of Iowa State University approved by voice vote the following motion: "That the General Faculty of Iowa State College establish a Faculty Council in accord with the provisions set forth in a statement entitled 'Basic Document.'"

With this action the Faculty Council began its thirty-four year existence. The basic document was brief, consisting of some fifteen sections. Beyond calling for twenty members, serving terms on a staggered basis to insure continuity in council operation, the purpose was expressed in a single sentence: "The Faculty Council is intended to facilitate communication between the faculty and the General Faculty, the President, Deans, and other administrative officers of the college." This statement was followed by four sections outlining council functions:

1) "In all its functions the Faculty Council shall be advisory rather than legislative or administrative."
2) The council shall conduct studies and make recommendations concerning matters of educational policy and faculty welfare affecting the College as a whole. Such studies may be made at the request of the President, or the General Faculty, or on the initiative of the council.
3) The council shall consider all cases involving possible injustice toward a faculty member, or members, which may be referred to it by the individual or groups concerned, by any dean, or by the provost, or the President of Iowa State College.
4) The chairman of the Faculty Council shall make an annual written report to the President of the College, General Faculty, and all members of the Divisional Faculties. Any member(s) of the council may report to any Divisional Faculty whenever invited to do so." (1)

This brief constitutional document set in motion the creation of a body, which for the first time broadly involved faculty in the college administration. Other than the ISU Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (founded in 1924), there was no truly unifying faculty body among the strong independent divisions. Prior to 1954, the college's governance structure best resembled a loose federation of divisions. The president and provost united the divisions administratively and were advised by a small committee named the Council Advisory to the President. The General Faculty, made up only of professors, associate professors, and the
upper administration, met quarterly, but its diffuse nature gave little consistency in voice and forum for faculty governance.

The following history will first describe the background of the creation of the Faculty Council and its early years and then include three final sections. The first section will give brief descriptions of the council's general activities. The last two sections will provide a history of the council's political activities and its long quest for an ISU Faculty Senate. The history is followed by an appendix, which lists the past chairs of the Faculty Council.

BACKGROUND AND EARLY YEARS

The 1954 inauguration of the Faculty Council traces its roots to an action of the ISU Chapter of AAUP. In 1949, ISU AAUP appointed a Committee on Faculty Participation in College Administration; the result was a brief report, which became the opening salvo in the discussion concerning the establishment of a Faculty Council. In a one-page report, dated April 16, 1951, this committee (W.S. Cole, Chair, Charles H. Brown, Reuben Hill, and Keith Huntress) proposed a hierarchy of councils: an all-college council, divisional councils, and for sufficiently large departments, departmental councils. By 1952, the plan was examined by a college-wide faculty committee, which worked with the Council Advisory to the President. This committee formulated the procedures which were to be used to establish a Faculty Council. These procedures included a "straw vote" of all faculty members, followed by formal approval of the divisional faculties and then the General Faculty. Once these steps had been taken, the results were to be reported to the State Board of Education as constituting the judgment of the Iowa State College Faculty. (2)

Since this process was underway just as President Friley was completing his final year and with James Hilton, Dean of Agriculture at North Carolina State, waiting in the wings to begin his presidency in June 1953, the ISU AAUP decided to inform him of the gathering momentum for the establishment of the council. In correspondence with Dr. Hilton, ISU AAUP President, Harold Davey, noted that the five divisional faculties had approved the proposal by April 1953, after an overwhelmingly favorable result in the "straw vote," with approval of the General Faculty the only remaining hurdle. Davey concluded this report by informing Hilton that the committee had decided to postpone this final vote until Hilton's arrival on campus. Hilton reported to Davey in his letter of reply that he would "be happy to discuss the matter with you sometime after I assume my responsibilities at Ames this summer. (3) As a result of these ISU AAUP initiatives, the new President was given the opportunity of reviewing the proposal for a basic modification in the college structure, rather than arriving to find the change already in place.

Ultimately, with President Hilton's support, the General Faculty established the Faculty Council in 1954, and at its first meeting, the council elected Professor Norman Graebner of the History Department its first chair. With an annual budget of $20 provided by the President's office, this
new faculty governance body began to grapple with a variety of issues relating to the welfare of Iowa State College. These early issues included modification of the policy requiring faculty ushers at commencements (a weighty issue since under the quarter system as many as five such events might occur annually), policies of class attendance, issues related to women's hours, and consideration of the Cardinal Guild's proposal that seniors with "B" course averages might be excused from final examinations at the instructor's discretion. On a broader policy scale, the first council immediately began investigating the possibility of establishing a sabbatical leave policy, standardizing travel expenses for professional faculty activities, and improving library holdings, which had diminished since the mid-1940s in comparison to library collections of comparable institutions.

FACULTY COUNCIL'S GENERAL ACTIVITIES

Throughout its history, the majority of the activities of the Faculty Council involved faculty development and welfare; nevertheless, the council gave serious attention to the general academic community and the role of faculty in budgetary and governance matters. It is interesting to note that many council issues periodically reappeared during its history, at times with little resolution.

1. Change of Name for Iowa State College
Close administration/council cooperation was particularly visible during the campaign to change Iowa State from a college to a university. In the spring of 1959, as President Hilton prepared to present that proposal to the Board of Regents, he called the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council to meet with him on Sunday morning, February 22, 1959 at 8:30 a.m. and requested that they prepare a "carefully worded resolution to present to the General Faculty in support of this change." He noted that "many legislators had suddenly become very anxious on this proposition," and he did not want to approach the regents without having obtained faculty support. With the desired council and General Faculty support, President Hilton requested the new name of Iowa State University; however, following negotiations with the legislature and Board of Regents, the name was approved as Iowa State University of Science and Technology.[4]

2. Faculty Club
Of very long duration was council discussion for establishing a faculty club. This issue peaked in the spring of 1969, when the council’s Faculty Club Committee issued the results of an extensive, elaborately statistical faculty survey. The data indicated an overwhelming majority of faculty respondents in favor of a facility which would be a jewel of modern architecture. The club would have a $100 initiation fee plus on-going dues and provide members with dining, showering, and sauna facilities. Despite this apparent surge of faculty support for the facility, nothing came of this proposal. President Parks observed in 1970 that, while acquiring the land
for such a worthwhile project would not be a problem, funding would be difficult because other needs were more pressing.

However, in 1971-72 the Faculty Club Committee appeared to be on the verge of recommending purchase of the Ames Country Club, which was then for sale. The following year the committee recommended that its membership be enlarged, a corporate body be established, and steps be taken for development of a policy and membership brochure for a club.\(^{(5)}\) A brief note in the next annual report stated that the committee had evaluated possibilities for the establishment of a club; however, nothing followed.

3. University Psychiatrist
One of the more intriguing on-going council issues involved the hiring of a full-time psychiatrist for the university. This plan was explored in 1956 by a committee established by the council. After producing an elaborate twenty-five page report, the committee recommended that the administration employ such a professional for the good of the students. A decade later, Harold Davey noted that while the university had recruited two clinical psychologists, it still had not acted to hire a psychiatrist. He urged that the council once more go on record favoring this action, noting that Iowa State now had 15,000 students with a projected rise to 25,000, making this need even more imperative. But no psychiatrist was ever hired.

4. General Faculty Membership
Since its inception in 1954, the Faculty Council represented all ranks of the faculty, both tenure-track and non-tenure-track. In context with the growing trends of egalitarianism within the broad academic community in the 1970s, the Faculty Council sought to broaden the membership of the General Faculty, "the legislative body of the university."\(^{(6)}\) Since at least 1908, the General Faculty consisted only of professors and associate professors holding regular appointments, and all major administrative officers. In 1972-73 the Faculty Council's Faculty and Administration Relations Committee reviewed whether or not to expand the General Faculty's membership. Based on the Faculty Administrative Relations Committee's recommendation, the Faculty Council recommended to expand the General Faculty membership to include assistant professors and full-time instructors holding regular appointments and adjunct faculty appointments. In the spring of 1973, the General Faculty expanded its membership to include only assistant professors with regular appointments. In 1974-75, the Faculty Council again recommended that the General Faculty be expanded to include all faculty with regular and adjunct appointments, irrespective of rank. In 1975 this recommendation was carried out. At present, the only remaining faculty group not belonging to the General Faculty are temporary faculty members, regardless of length of employment.

5. University Faculty Budgetary Advisory Committee
In 1970-71, concern of the Faculty Council over the lack of faculty participation in the university budget preparation led to its recommendation to the administration that a faculty budget review committee be formed. In 1971-72 the administration agreed to the establishment of the
Faculty Budgetary Advisory Committee. The purpose of FBAC was to "review budget requests and other matters pertaining to budget and finance procedures, to serve as the voice of the faculty to advise the administration on priorities regarding funding allocation, and to serve as a source of information on matters of budget and finance through the medium of Faculty Council." [7]

6. Faculty Handbook
Prior to 1958, the collective body of ISU faculty had no contractual document stating university-wide regulations, policies, and procedures regarding faculty employment. The impetus for the faculty request for such a compilation grew out of faculty discussion with Provost James Jensen at an ISU AAUP meeting at which the Strayer Report was discussed (for full information on the Strayer Report, see ISU Senate Section of this history). Among Strayer's many recommendations was one that policies should be clearly spelled out by statute. In the spring of 1958, Provost Jensen appointed an instructor of English, Hazel Lipa, to write with him the first Iowa State University Faculty Handbook. This handbook codified the contractual arrangements between the faculty and the then college as well as the Board of Regents. Since the first edition of the handbook in 1958, the Faculty Council functioned as the body of review for any changes prior to ratification by the General Faculty.

7. Women's Issues
In 1973-74, the council's Faculty Development and Welfare Committee conducted an extensive survey of women faculty members and among its findings reported that forty-five percent of the respondents believed that their salary levels were based on sex discrimination. Because of these disturbing findings, the council recommended that the university's Affirmative Action Office investigate possible salary discrimination on the basis of sex and that "the University Committee on Women take steps to raise the consciousness of departments as to how men faculty may unintentionally discriminate against women faculty in informal judgments and professional interaction." [8]

In 1982, the University Committee on Women sent out a survey in an attempt to obtain information on the existence of sexual harassment on campus and then developed a proposed policy on this issue. The Faculty Council (1982-83) monitored the progress of this committee through reports by Jean Adams, Chair of the University Committee on Women. When this committee developed a proposed policy on sexual harassment, it was presented to the council and discussed at length. The policy was sent on to the General Faculty in May 1983, but no agreement was reached. After changes were made, the policy was passed the next fall by a mail vote of the General Faculty.

A special report on "Women in the Workplace" was presented to the Faculty Council early in 1984. The report showed that eight of the fourteen women administrators at ISU were employed in the College of Home Economics and that the proportion of women on the teaching faculty was the same for the 1981-82 academic year as it had been in 1971-72. Discussion of
this issue in the council and around campus led to the creation of a number of assistant dean internships. Females and minorities were to have priority consideration for these positions, which were filled by the 1985-86 academic year.

8. Promotion and Tenure
In May 1985, a discussion of "service" as a requirement for promotion and tenure took place. This issue arose when a change to the service description was made by the Vice President for Academic Affairs Office in the Faculty Handbook in 1984. Although the change was viewed by that office as merely editorial without need of either the Faculty Council or the General Faculty approval, the ISU Chapter of AAUP believed the change was not minor and brought the issue to the Faculty Council. A university ad-hoc committee was appointed to try to define professional service. Its recommendations were presented to the Faculty Council in March 1986. The council's reaction was not positive, and concern was voiced that the ad-hoc committee's membership lacked representation from all colleges. The committee was expanded to include council members. This committee then reworked the promotion and tenure document which, after a number of changes, was approved by the council in March 1987 and sent on to the General Faculty in May. Discussion at this meeting centered on the procedural aspects of the document. It was sent back to the committee for further refinement and faculty input. In November 1987, the Faculty Council approved the latest version. This new document was approved by the General Faculty in January 1988.

9. Faculty Salaries
In May 1980, the Faculty Council issued a landmark study that determined the effects of current trends on faculty salaries, student enrollment, and elimination of mandatory retirement on ISU faculty in the 1980s. A major portion of this report was its "salary picture," which gave in graphic statistical form the decline over the past decade of real salary dollars. The report went on to point out that the faculty's salary dollars declined substantially not only against the standard cost of living, but also more drastically against various measures of per capita real income in Iowa (a 28% increase for Iowa's general per capita real income as opposed to a 17-22% decrease for our faculty)." (9) Following this initial report, the Faculty Council continued to issue an annual faculty salary report.

The 1980 report gave impetus for the faculty councils of the 1980s to devote much time and energy to obtaining higher salaries for faculty members. How the university could gain more support from the state was a continuing concern. Council members took their case to the state in meetings with the governor, members of state legislative committees, local state legislators, and Board of Regents members. Often the point was made that faculty salaries lagged behind inflation, resulting in difficulty in attracting and keeping high-quality faculty. Early in the 1980s a discussion took place on establishing a union to try to raise salaries through collective bargaining. The Faculty Administration Relations Committee sponsored two seminars on collective bargaining. Because only twenty persons attended the first seminar, the second was cancelled, and the issue was not raised again in the Faculty Council. Despite efforts of the
Faculty Council during this period, the salaries at ISU remained low compared with those at similar institutions, and when the new President, Gordon Eaton, addressed the council in December 1986, he declared the raising of faculty salaries his number one priority.

10. Uniform Base Appointment
In the council's May 1980 report on salaries, retirement and enrollment, the council recommended that the administration conduct a thorough examination of a single-base appointment that would affect a one-time voluntary shift of A-base to B-base faculty appointments. All salary increases that year would be applied to B-base faculty and A-base faculty who did not elect change in appointment base.

In the following year, the Faculty Council was told that the Deans' Seminar was discussing informally a plan for developing a common-base appointment. During 1981-82, Vice President George Christensen brought to the council a proposal for a uniform appointment base. After considerable discussion both in the council and around campus, the council defeated the proposal.

However, the concept of a uniform salary appointment did not end. In part due to continuing interest by David R. Boylan, Dean of the Engineering College, Christensen appointed an ad-hoc committee to devise a new proposal. The new proposed appointment became known as a U-base appointment, and the Faculty Council's Faculty Administrative Relations Committee issued a lengthy report on the ad-hoc committee's proposal. In particular, the council report indicated concern that any change be truly voluntary and gave practical observations and suggestions on a possible implementation. In 1987-88, the administration continued its pursuit of a common appointment with the appointment of a second ad-hoc committee. On February 24, 1988, the Deans' Seminar approved a description of a U-base appointment. The Faculty Council considered the proposal at its last meeting on April 12, 1988. The council had a lengthy discussion on the proposed appointment. While the council supported the concept of a single uniform appointment, it had questions on some specific procedural provisions contained in the document and was concerned that salary inequities might occur for women faculty and for male B-base faculty if the program was implemented without consideration of such ramifications. Therefore, the Faculty Council recommended that a joint administration/faculty drafting committee be set up to immediately address the council's concerns. At the time of the writing of this history, such a committee has been appointed.

11. Travel Policy
In 1984, the university's administration decided that all university-related travel arrangements were to be handled by one travel agency, which would then be obligated to return three percent of the income to ISU. Faculty not using this agency would not be reimbursed. Through the Faculty Council a compromise was reached whereby faculty could be reimbursed if they used a different agency, but tickets could not be prepaid unless faculty used the appointed agency.
Institutionalization of administrative procedures and the role of the faculty in governance have absorbed much of the attention of the Faculty Council. However, the council occasionally sought to respond to wider national and international issues.

In the mid-1950s, the Faculty Council found itself studying a report issued by Engineering Extension concerning sheltering of students in case of a nuclear attack. Faculty members were informed that only students, single and married with their families, could find shelter in campus buildings in the event of such catastrophe. Faculty members would apparently have to "duck and cover" in their own homes.

The early 1960s brought the civil rights movement to the fore and at that juncture, the Faculty Council was involved in the creation of a Human Relations Committee for the university community to handle canes of discrimination against minorities. This was the time of the Vietnam conflict and the age of protest. The guest lecturers of the All-University Lectures Committee came to campus speaking a startling new language: short, direct, and monosyllabic. The wider Ames community reacted in bewilderment, bringing the complaints before the Story County Grand Jury. After collecting excerpts of the new language by speakers like Dick Gregory and Don Smith, a "radical" student body president, that jury issued its report on the deterioration of Iowa State as a safe place to send the state's sons and daughters and implied that it was time to curtail such behavior, an issue seized upon by many academics. With the Faculty Council as its vanguard, the faculty raised the banner of academic freedom. The regents responded affirmatively to the cause of academic freedom. in time for the upheavals associated with the Vietnam War. Now the students moved beyond speech to action. The Faculty Council expressed support for free speech but abhorrence of violence. All of this activity was a prelude to the spring of 1970, when after the massacre of the Kent State students, U.S. campuses reached new levels of political consciousness. At a noon meeting in May 1970, with hundreds of students and faculty members present, the council met to consider the request of the Student Government to release students from finals so that they might go off to work for political change in America. A resolution passed which allowed students to negotiate with individual faculty members on a course-by-course basis to be excused from finals and remaining course work, with special, non-injuring arrangements established for finishing the remaining work at a later date.

In spring 1972, the Faculty Council itself stepped outside the walls of academe and entered the turbulent political arena of war. A Faculty Council action encouraging faculty members to take stands on world politics ultimately ended in a vote by the General Faculty to restrict council power. The violence at Kent State University and Jackson State University had heightened throughout academia tensions and outrage over the controversial war. Some faculty here and elsewhere found a blurring distinction between their need to voice their outrage over the war and their role in academe. In other words, for some, academe became part of the real world,
not merely a remote outpost of intellectual learning and research. Other faculty here and elsewhere strongly disagreed. Then in the late spring of 1972, news broke that American forces had mined North Vietnamese harbors.

By this point, general opposition to the war was at its highest, and at its May 9, 1972 meeting the council considered three controversial motions regarding this undeclared war. The first motion "would have placed the Faculty Council on record as opposing the mining of the North Vietnamese harbors by American forces." (10) Discussion was heated. The motion failed due to the majority's view that "Faculty Council, as a body representing many individual faculty members, should not take sides on such issues." (11) The second motion urged the Faculty Council to circulate among the faculty petitions which allowed faculty members, as individuals, to indicate their opposition to the mining of the North Vietnamese harbors. This motion passed. The third motion urged the council to circulate among the faculty petitions condemning North Vietnam and to send these petitions to the governments of the United States and North Vietnam. During the discussion of the third motion, it was "noted that faculty members at Iowa State University do not participate in the election of the government of North Vietnam; therefore, the standing of United States citizens in relation to that government did not lend itself to petitioning." (12) This third motion failed.

The controversy over the Faculty Council's actions did not end the evening of May 9, 1972. The new council chair, Neil Harl, called a special meeting on June 6, 1972 to hear a motion to rescind the council action on the second motion. The council refused to rescind its action but decided to attach to the petition a cover letter carefully explaining the role of the Faculty Council and the May 9 council action. The cover letter was later written by two professors involved with the petitioning drive. For some faculty the agreement to append this cover letter to the petitions did not resolve the issue regarding their disagreement with the Faculty Council's apparent role in the petition drive or even perhaps more importantly, the issue of the legitimacy of the council to discuss and take action on such political matters.

Dissatisfaction with the council action regarding the petition grew, although no faculty member was willing to initiate a vote of censure against the council. Instead, a group of professors, headed by Professor Charles A. Black of the Agronomy Department, chose to write a memorandum to the General Faculty with two different amendments to the "Basic Document" and requested that the Faculty Council forward them to the General Faculty. In their memorandum to the General Faculty, they stated that their purpose was a clarification of the authority of the Faculty Council. In an attempt to prove that the Faculty Council had exceeded its authority granted to it by the General Faculty, they gave two examples. The first referred to a previous council's resolution that deplored "the verbal abusive attack of Coach John Majors upon Professor Donald Hadwiger." (13) The second example was the petition.

The first amendment suggested expanding the advisory functions of the Faculty Council to that of a legislative body, an amendment the authors clearly did not endorse. The second
amendment required that "the Faculty Council shall confine itself to matters internal to the University and shall not attempt to speak or otherwise communicate for itself, the General Faculty, or the University, either directly or indirectly, on legal religious, commercial, private or public policy matters outside the University." (14)

The Faculty Council went on record as opposing both amendments. The council believed that the "Basic Document" was clear and appropriate in the description of the council's advisory role. In a memorandum to the General Faculty the council stated that "if the proposed amendment that would place additional limitations on Faculty Council were adopted, the effects would be damaging to long-term effectiveness of Faculty Council. ... The amendment would place in jeopardy or preclude consideration of a wide array of items which relate to 'matters of educational policy and faculty welfare affecting the university as a whole' but which fall 'outside' the university under the terms of the restrictive amendment." (15) The council went on to say that responsible faculty need more, rather than less, opportunity to openly discuss matters related to academic life. In its concluding remarks, the council stated that the appropriate response to dissatisfaction with a representative body's action is not to "mute" its voice but rather to communicate its specific displeasure. On March 19, 1973, Vice President Christensen sent to the General Faculty a mail ballot containing the broadening and the limiting amendments. The General Faculty chose to limit the scope of the Faculty Council.

According to some, this limiting amendment served to stifle to the point of powerlessness the subsequent council agendas and debate. In 1976-77, the council 's interpretation of its role led it to refuse the request of several state legislators to provide them with needed information. In March 1979, the council moved to form a task force to assess "the role and function of Faculty Council and to recommend possible directions for expanding its (Faculty Council) role and function." (16)

**ISU FACULTY SENATE**

The ISU Faculty, through its Faculty Council, made three major attempts to institute a faculty senate. Roughly, this council activity happened once a decade, in the late 1950s and early 1960s, in the mid-1970s and again in the mid-1980s and may be seen as the leitmotif of the council since its inception in 1954. In large part the endurance of this issue was due to the obvious inefficiencies of the General Faculty to serve as the duly constituted legislative body of the university and the inadequacies of the purely advisory role of the Faculty Council. Also, perhaps even a greater issue during this period was the growing faculty need to establish formally its role in the governance of the university. After two failed attempts to create a senate, the third effort in 1987-88 was a success. But the process was long and difficult.

**1. Strayer Report**

The role of the faculty in the creation of university policy is the one faculty issue that most clearly links the past to the present. In its broadest context, the issue can trace its impetus back
to the report by George D. Strayer (subsequently referred to in the documentation as the "Strayer Report"), who had been hired by the Board of Education in 1950 (for the handsome sum of $25,000) to study the three state universities and write an evaluation of individual needs and changes for each institution as well as a collective evaluation of the entire system. Among the various recommendations that most attracted the attention of the Faculty Council was Strayer’s recommendation that the policies of Iowa State and the other two institutions should be clearly spelled out in statutes. Moreover, he recommended that each of the three units should establish faculty senates to insure that faculty members played a direct role in the formulation of those policies. (17)

In conclusion, for many ISU faculty the Strayer Report gave the faculty the legitimate right to assume that they had a degree of authority to determine the operation of their institution in addition to those areas pertaining to educational and academic policies such as promotion and tenure, academic freedom, curricula decisions, and standards for admission and graduation. This assumption paved the way for subsequent discussions on the need for a more efficient form of faculty governance than the Faculty Council and the General Faculty.

2. 1955-61 Senate Study
With the recommendation of the Strayer Report clearly in focus, the Faculty Council from the beginning explored ways in which the council could be transformed into a faculty senate. In the fall of 1955, a little over a year into its existence, a subcommittee of the Faculty Council made up of Professors Harold Davey, George Town, and Nelle Thompson presented a report which outlined three possible options by which the faculty of Iowa State could participate in its own educational governance. Option 1 proposed essentially the same makeup of the twenty-member Faculty Council responsible to the General Faculty. Option 2 enlarged the General Faculty to include all instructors and higher ranks. Most importantly, it recommended electing a Faculty Senate of sixty to seventy members representing faculty and administration. This body would have increased authority over the former Faculty Council, allowing the senate to take part in deliberations on faculty-related policies. Option 3 retained a twenty-member Faculty Council with General Faculty meetings on call at the request of the council or college president.

The Faculty Council responded to these three options by moving that the committee "draft [a] more detailed version of option 2." (18) This motion clearly suggests that the council members preferred option 2. Thus a discussion and process began that extended over the period of the next three years. The process seemed drawing close to a faculty decision by the spring of 1959. At that point, a new Committee on the Organization of the Faculty, chaired by Ellis Hicks, presented an elaborate report on the 1) rationale for a Faculty Senate, and 2) the model such a senate might have. It is noteworthy that this proposal called for a senate made up of representatives from the rank of assistant professor and above, not just associate and full professors, which at that time composed the classification of faculty as members of the General Faculty. Moreover, the new senate would be comprised of a body of sixty faculty members distributed among the five colleges, with college proportions determined by the square root of
eligible staff within the respective colleges. In addition, the administrative staff would have ten representatives. Twelve areas of responsibility for such a senate were identified. This senate would act on these concerns to formulate policies, with the understanding that those policies were subject to final approval by the Board of Regents and the legislature until at least those agencies might "deem it advisable to grant autonomy to the senate." The report concluded with the recommendation that the 1959-60 Faculty Council Committee on the organization of the Faculty undertake the task of informing the faculty on the senate proposal and arrange an election on this issue by the end of the 1959-60 academic year."

Thus it appeared that the question would be placed before the General Faculty for its advice and consent within the next year. In the first meeting of the Faculty Council for the fall 1959, this issue was on the agenda. The committee, now chaired by Donald Boles, reported that it had met three times over the course of the summer and was currently engaged in refining the representation formula that had been discussed during the spring. However, by the spring of 1960, instead of the Faculty Council preparing an expected proposal on a Faculty Senate, they discussed a modification of the "Basic Document" of the Faculty Council to enlarge the size of the Faculty Council to forty members.

Something had obviously occurred in the course of the year to slow the momentum which clearly seemed to be building towards the creation of a Faculty Senate. Boles believes that Provost James Jensen had brought to the council a clear message of at least his opposition to the establishment of a senate. In the fall of 1960, the Faculty Council discussed expanding the council to forty members. The minutes of the meeting contained a statement hinting at the reasons for this result: "The Faculty Council is an advisory committee. It does not and cannot formulate policies." In November 1960, the Faculty Council forwarded to the General Faculty a document containing the spring proposals for changes and an added note stating that Faculty Council members had reservations, even about changing the already extant council. They noted that it was the opinion of many faculty that the present plan has worked reasonably well and that to enlarge membership of the council to forty members would limit discussion, impede the free expression of ideas, and even tamper with the intimate atmosphere of the small meeting rooms a smaller membership permitted. (21)

With this sentiment in the air, it is not surprising that the General Faculty sent back the proposal for an enlarged Faculty Council to the council or that in response the Faculty Council came up with a new proposal that called for a Faculty Council of not less than twenty or more than thirty members.

For whatever reasons, it was clear in the Annual Report of the Faculty Council for 1961-62 that the issue of a Faculty Senate was dead. Ultimately it would remain so until the next decade. In a two sentence paragraph unsupported by any evidence or analysis, this report stated:
"The Faculty Organization Committee reported to the council that no action be initiated by the council in regard to the possible formation of a faculty senate. Administration and staff reaction is presently not in favor of such an organization." (22)

3. 1973-75 Senate Study
In the mid-1970s, the Faculty Council continued its historical interest in establishing an ISU Faculty Senate. In 1973-74, the council established its Faculty Senates Committee to investigate and report to the council what faculty senates are, how they operate, and what their advantages and disadvantages are relative to Iowa State University. The committee worked for two years and wrote a final summary report for council consideration in February 1975. The committee chose to recommend a university senate which would represent the broader university with the faculty as a major component. Probably it was due to its recommendation of this broader body that the committee could not find majority council support. The council then dissolved the Faculty Senates Committee, discontinued any further study, and did not bring the issue to the General Faculty.

4. 1985-88 Senate Study
Just as the Faculty Council came into being during the transition of authority to a new President, the Faculty Council in 1985-86 initiated the process to establish a Faculty Senate as President W. Robert Parks prepared to retire in June 1986.

The 1982-83 Faculty Council charged the Internal Affairs Committee with looking into the possibility of changing the rules governing the make-up of the council so that every department might be represented. The issue of representation for temporary faculty was also discussed. No vote was taken on the issue of expanding representation on the council, but in February 1984, President Parks attended a Faculty Council meeting and was asked what differences he saw between a council and a senate. Responding that a senate would have power in and of itself, while a council was purely advisory, Parks agreed to consider a senate. By May of that year a motion was made to establish a committee to study faculty governance. Discussion centered on the make-up of the committee: should it be the Faculty Council's Internal Affairs Committee, a committee appointed by the President, or one elected by the colleges? The motion was tabled until the next September, but little was done until May 1985, when a motion was approved to establish a Committee to Review Faculty Governance and report to the General Faculty in May 1986. A recommendation either to keep the Faculty Council system or institute a new form of faculty governance would be the outcome. The next fall 's Faculty Council members caucused to name college representatives to this committee, and Associate Dean Richard Van Iten was selected as chair. In May, the committee recommended that the functions of the General Faculty and the Faculty Council be combined in a single unit that had equitable representation of colleges and departments.
Among the first agenda items for the 1986-87 Faculty Council was the creation of a committee made up of Faculty Council members to work out the details for a senate form of faculty governance. The new President, Gordon Eaton, spoke to the Faculty Council in December 1986 and supported the establishment of a legislative Faculty Senate. By spring of 1987 the Special Committee on Faculty Governance made its report to the Faculty Council. After lengthy discussion by and approval of the council, the proposal was presented to the General Faculty, and in May 1987 it was easily passed. An important part of this process was the creation and approval by both faculty and administration of the notion of shared governance. It is this understanding that allowed the transfer of the General Faculty's responsibilities as stated in the Faculty Handbook to the new senate.

As events unfolded, it became clear that establishing an ISU Faculty Senate was not as simple as was thought in May 1987. During the fall of 1987, the Faculty Council put into motion the steps to create the new senate and in November departmental and college senate elections were held. However, unexpectedly the new President of the State Board of Regents, Marvin Pomerantz, announced that no senate could be established without Board approval, approval which President Eaton the preceding spring had not believed necessary. The council chair, Jeffrey Huston, then appointed a working group to prepare a presentation to the January 1988 Regents meeting (Jeffrey Huston, chair, David Countryman, Robert Holtinger, Olivia Madison, Martin Miller and Terry Pickett). This, of course, meant that the senate could not convene in January 1988 as planned. Nevertheless, the council went ahead and conducted its orientation and training sessions with the new senators. The working group received word in December 1987 that the Board's Executive Secretary, Wayne Richey, believed it highly doubtful that the Board would affirm the senate's "Basic Document" and reported five concerns, all regarding the functional responsibilities of the senate. The most serious of the concerns involved the legislative section and the senate's relationship to the university president found in Section 3. The working group then drafted a revision of Section 3, which it hoped would meet the concerns of the Regents as well as be acceptable to the General Faculty and the university administration. The working group met several times with the university administration's representatives, and finally both parties agreed to a final version to be presented to the General Faculty and the Board of Regents. Throughout the deliberations, the working group was extremely concerned that the language of the "Basic Document" would not increase or decrease the authority of the Faculty Senate as transferred from the General Faculty.

On April 5, 1988, the General Faculty agreed by mail ballot to the revisions proposed by the working group. At the April 21, 1988 meeting of the State Board of Regents Huston presented the proposal for the ISU Faculty Senate, which then was finally approved by the Board.
CONCLUSION

The spring of 1954 held a variety of faculty expectations for what role the Faculty Council would play in college-wide governance. Some faculty saw the new council as a unifying faculty agent that would advise the General Faculty and the new presidential administration on matters of academic and educational affairs. Other faculty members saw the new council as nothing more than an institutionalized forum to air faculty grievances. Regardless of the variety of expectations, the Faculty Council did serve to unify administratively the existing divisions.

During its thirty-four year existence, many issues came before the Faculty Council; some issues were resolved while others came and went without resolution. The council's activities ran the full gamut of issues, such as admission standards, plus/minus grading, professional ethics, role of temporary faculty, faculty code of conduct, promotion and tenure criteria, evaluation of deans, low faculty salaries, faculty improvement leaves, faculty dismissal procedures, and above all, the establishment of a Faculty Senate. Hundreds of faculty councilors spent long hours and considerable effort on council business, at times with little or no rewards.

Opinion, no doubt, has varied over time as to the effectiveness of Faculty Council, but the true measure of its success may be found by its proven ability to unify the faculty and provide a respected avenue for faculty advice to the General Faculty and the university administration. The ISU faculty should take pride in the past contributions of the Faculty Council as well as the groundwork the council has laid for the future of faculty governance through the Iowa State University Faculty Senate.
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