



IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY  
Faculty Senate

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES  
APRIL 20, 2021 – 3:30–5:00 P.M.  
WEBEX Meeting

**Present:** Al Shihabi, D.; Anderson, M.; Andreasen, C.; Armstrong, P.; Behnken, B.; Beitz, D.; Bennett-George, S.; Beresnev, I.; Berger, D.; Bolser, K.; Boyles, J.; Burrough, E.; Butler, A.; Campbell, C.; Cardoso, C.; Cook, K.; Cowan, A.; Day, T.; Dekkers, J.; Dewell, G.; Dollisso, A.; Dubisar, A.; Faber, C.; Frank, M.; Freeman, S.; Gassmann, A.; Gillette, M.; Gomes, C.; Hernandez, B.; Hornbuckle, B.; Johnson, D.; Kang, S.; Kreider, B.; Kushkowski, J.; Lonergan, E.; Lutz, R.; Mackiewicz, J.; Martin, M.; McGrail, M.; Morgan, E.; Muecke, M.; Nair, A.; Napolitano, R.; Oberhauser, A.; Padgett-Walsh, C.; Parsa, R.; Perkins, J.; Peterson, D.; Quam, A.; Rayburn, C.; Roe, K.; Rosentrater, K.; Royston, N.; Schaal, M.; Schieltz, J.; Schrier, T.; Smalley, S.; Smiley, A.; Stevens, J.; St. Germain, A.; Sturm, J.; Tener, J.; Tootle, D.; Townsend, T.; Vary, J.; Wade, N.; Wallace, R.; Watanabe, O.; Wheeler, A.; Winer, E.; Winter, A.; Wood, A.; Wu, H.; Zerbib, S.

**Absent:** Bratlie, K.; Cochran, E.; Daniels, T.; Davis, R.; Swalwell, K.; Williams, C.

**Substitutes:** Wensheng, Z. for Chang, C.; Sternberg, H. for Chen, H.; Robertson, A. for Munkvold, G.; Mao, H. for Rosa, J.

**Guests:** Wickert, J. (SVPP); Bratsch-Prince, D. (Assoc. Prov.); VanDerZanden, A.M. (Assoc. Provost); Rippke, S. (Parliamentarian); Knief, A. (SVPP); Boyne, S.M. (SVPP); Jordan, T. (Asst. Prov.); Budlong, J. (University Relations); Iennarella-Servantez, C. (GPSS); Deaton, M. (Registrar Office); Johnson, C. (GPSS); Reddy-Best, K. (AEHM); Boylston, T. (ASA Chair); Campbell, J. (SG); Lonergan, S. (An. Sci); Hurst, J. (OA Chair)

### 1. Call to Order

President Faber called the meeting to order at 3:31 and seated substitute senators through the Chat function.

### 2. Consent Agenda

FS Agenda April 20, 2021 – [20/A/9]

FS Minutes April 6, 2021 – [20/M/8]

FS Docket Calendar – [20/C/9]

The consent agenda was adopted.

### **3. Special Order: Council Chair Election**

There were two nominees for FDAR Chair: Senator Al Shihabi and Senator Smiley. Senator Day was nominated for J&A Chair and Senator Oberhauser was nominated for RPA Chair. No further nominations were made on the floor.

Later in the meeting, after the Qualtrics election results were collected, President Faber announced that Senator Al Shihabi was elected FDAR Chair; Senator Day was elected J&A Chair; and Senator Oberhauser was elected RPA Chair.

### **4. Special Order: Annual Report on Faculty Advancement – Jonathan Wickert, SVPP**

Provost Wickert said that the decisions this year are more meaningful than in a typical year, because many people are questioning the value of tenure.

There were 72 promotion and tenure cases reviewed by the Provost this year: 19 for promotion to professor; 51 for promotion to associate professor with tenure; and one for tenure as associate professor. Of those 72 cases, there were 69 favorable decisions, two negative decisions, and one extension of the tenure clock. Extending the clock is a discretionary decision made by the Provost when the candidacy does not meet the bar for promotion at this time, but there is merit to the case, merit to the trajectory of the individual's work, and extenuating circumstances. The offer to extend the clock was made, and the individual faculty member accepted it. The two negative cases were for promotion to professor.

There were 44 white or Caucasian faculty members up for promotion (23 male and 21 female, of which one male did not receive a promotion); one Black or African-American female, whose clock was extended; 24 Asian or Asian-American faculty members (13 male and 11 female, of which one male did not receive a promotion); one Latino or Hispanic male, who was promoted; and two faculty members of two or more races (one male and one female), both of whom were promoted.

This promotion class hails from the FY15 tenure-eligible cohort of 101 faculty members. 53 faculty members from that cohort has received tenure at ISU. 25 faculty members have received some kind of tenure-clock extension: 15 during the probationary period; eight due to COVID; and two due to a combination of COVID and some other reason. Although this is about 8% higher than usual, Provost Wickert said that he is proud of ISU's tenure-clock extension policy, and thought that it was the right response to COVID. One shifted to a term faculty position. 22 left ISU, one of whom left with tenure.

The tenure cases were approved by BOR last week, and the promoted faculty received letters of congratulations from Provost Wickert.

Term faculty advancement does not require BOR approval. There were 46 cases for advancement, of which 45 were successful. There were two adjunct promotions, one to adjunct professor and one to adjunct associate professor. There were 40 cases for teaching ranks, with 23 to associate teaching professor, and 17 to teaching professor (one of which was unsuccessful). There were two cases in the clinical ranks, one to clinical professor and one to clinical associate

professor. And there was one promotion to affiliate associate professor. Provost Wickert did not have a slide showing the demographic distribution of candidates, but noted that 57% of cases were for female faculty and 11% were for multicultural faculty.

In general, Provost Wickert commented that the quality of dossiers was very high, with impressive work. He added that the rigorous tenure process ensures strong academic programs at the university. He expressed appreciation for the work that colleges and departments, chairs and deans put into the process. He recommended that we continue to communicate expectations for teaching, research, and service. Annual reviews need to give pre-tenure faculty accurate feedback: helpful and honest. It is important to take Third Year Review seriously, because it is an important source of feedback, contributing to strong P&T cases.

Provost Wickert thanked FS for continued work to clarify advancement processes and policies at the university. These changes have clarified, redefined, and simplified the process, making it more accessible.

This was the first year with mandatory training for all college P&T committees on equity, diversity, and inclusion issues. Provost Wickert thanked college equity advisors, Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince, and Assistant Provost Jordan for their work on this successful example of continuous improvement.

Senator Day said that his college is still working on ironing out issues with respect to term faculty advancement. Will the Provost's Office provide more guidance, or are colleges supposed to work things out? Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince replied that most term faculty in CVM are clinical faculty, and the issues may not be applicable to the rest of the university. FH provides general parameters, but colleges need to have conversations about how those apply to them.

Senator Oberhauser observed that Iowa legislature has focused on tenure this session. How can this report be used to make a strong case for tenure in BOR universities? Provost Wickert replied that the tenure bill was defeated, and did not make it through the second funnel. Although that is good, it has come up each year for several years in a row. ISU administrators and lobbyists work hard to talk with elected officials, friends of the university, and BOR about the rigor of the tenure process and the entire faculty career cycle (hiring process, annual review, Third Year Review, Post-Tenure Review). There is a misperception that faculty are not reviewed annually, or that once faculty are tenured, they never undergo rigorous review. Once people understand the rigor of regular reviews, the conversations change. As new members are appointed to BOR, they undergo orientation, in which we show them how the review processes work. Every year when BOR approves P&T cases, associate provosts give presentations to the Academic Affairs committees on faculty review and accountability. This is the tenth year of the Post-Tenure Review policy.

In the chat, Senator Zerbib asked, "Can you please elaborate on the reasons for 20% tenure-track faculty leaving ISU before making tenure?" Provost Wickert said that people leave for all kinds of reasons. When faculty do leave, they are asked to complete a survey and are offered an exit interview. Some people find that they did not want an academic career; some people leave because they were not successful; some find Ames to be too small or insufficiently welcoming to

faculty of color; some faculty are hired away. There is no single root cause. Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince added that a Faculty Resignation Report is submitted to BOR every year. 20% attrition rate is typical.

**5. Unfinished Business**

**5.1. Beef Cattle Production Management Certificate [20-25] – Bennett-George**

No comments. The motion was adopted, 67-1.

**5.2. Equine Science and Management Certificate [20-26] – Bennett-George**

No comments. The motion was adopted, 67-1.

**5.3. Swine Production Management Certificate [20-27] – Bennett-George**

No comments. The motion was adopted, 65-1.

**5.4. Preservation and Cultural Heritage Minor [20-28] – Bennett-George**

No comments. The motion was adopted, 62-2.

**5.5. Discontinuation – Masters of School Mathematics Program [20-29] – Bennett-George**

No comments. The motion was adopted, 63-1.

**5.6. Fashion Culture, History, and Social Justice Minor [20-30] – Bennett-George**

No comments. The motion was adopted, 59-3.

**5.7. FH 10.7.2 Student Outcomes Assessment [20-31] – Bennett-George**

Senator Bennett-George pointed out that two items were highlighted in blue, because of concerns raised by senators: “in conjunction with stakeholders” and “Quality.”

Senator Morgan spoke about the first highlighted item. Who are the stakeholders? What power do we have? Outcomes assessment should be kept entirely in the hands of faculty who know their programs and students best.

Chair of Outcomes Assessment Committee Hurst said that that line was included specifically for programs whose accreditation requires that they list their stakeholders. Accreditation Liaison Officer Boyne said that at no point did she contemplate a process of assessment that is not run by faculty. This accords with other Big 12 schools. The language in this document is intended to satisfy HLC and prevent them from imposing some particular process (which she has witnessed HLC do, when she has conducted HLC reviews). The goal is to protect ourselves and our faculty governance.

President Faber asked whether “Quality” was needed. Dr. Boyne said that she had no problem striking it.

Senator Wallace suggested modifying the stakeholders passage with “(i.e., any accrediting agencies, if required).” This would clarify that it is not just any stakeholder whatsoever. In the

Chat Senator Wood suggested, “...in conjunction with stakeholders as identified by program faculty...”

Senator Morgan moved to amend with Senator Wood’s proposed wording. Senator Bennett-George seconded.

Secretary Butler spoke against the amendment. It supports the presumption that all programs will identify stakeholders, when only certain programs have stakeholders.

Senator Roe asked why any statement about stakeholders was needed at all. Faculty understand who their accrediting bodies are. It is a foregone conclusion that they would include stakeholders in their outcomes assessment, as required by their accrediting bodies.

Professor Hurst said that lots of programs on campus have accrediting bodies and work together with them. That’s why this proposal’s language says that they will work in conjunction with stakeholders.

Senator Peterson supported Senator Roe’s comment. Striking the phrase from the proposal could not ban inclusion of stakeholders. But including it could be read as requiring stakeholders for programs that do not have any.

Senator Roe added that including the phrase could cause requirement creep.

Professor Hurst asked Dr. Boyne whether deleting the phrase would create concern from HLC’s perspective. Dr. Boyne replied that the phrase was not necessary. She did not want to undermine faculty confidence or insinuate mission creep.

Senator Perkins supported striking the phrase. In business, stakeholders aren’t accrediting agencies, but employers. He thought it would compound the problem if we were to list examples of stakeholders.

Senator Morgan withdrew her amendment. Senator Bennett-George withdrew her second.

Senator Perkins moved to delete the stakeholder passage highlighted in blue. Senator Peterson seconded.

The amendment was adopted by a hand vote.

Senator Hornbuckle moved to delete “Quality” highlighted in blue. Senator Wallace seconded.

The amendment was adopted by a hand vote.

The motion was adopted, 60-2.

**5.8. Graduation with Distinction [20-32] – Bennett-George**

No comments. The motion was adopted, 57-3.

**5.9. Repeated Courses Policy [20-33] – Bennett-George**

No comments. The motion was adopted, 55-3.

**5.10. FS Bylaw Change: New Committee under AAC – US Diversity Course Requirement Committee [20-34] – Bennett-George**

Senator Bennett-George presented the motion as well as an amendment to replace “doctoral degree” with “terminal degree.” Senator Al Shihabi seconded.

Senator Al Shihabi spoke in support of the amendment. She said that members of COD caucus were concerned that the language might disqualify otherwise qualified people from serving as chair of the committee.

Senator Behnken said that the reason a doctoral degree was required is that it is typically what professors hold. A terminal degree might make someone with a BA or MA eligible to serve. The level of education required for a Ph.D. is different from other degrees. The working group and Academic Affairs Council (AAC) wanted to ensure the rigor of this particular committee.

In the Chat, Senator Royston commented, “Not all content areas offer a doctoral level degree - such as theatre.”

The amendment was adopted by a hand vote.

The motion was adopted, 56-8.

**6. New Business**

**6.1. U.S. Diversity Requirement [20-35] – Bennett-George**

Senator Bennett-George said that this proposal will amend the Catalog language related to the U.S. Diversity general education requirement. A working group, led by President-Elect Wheeler, wrote a report on the requirement last year. This year, AAC took the report and developed this proposal to implement the report’s recommendations. There are three versions in the document: the current Catalog copy (which is to be replaced); the AAC’s proposed revisions (both with “track changes” and a “clean copy”); and revisions to the AAC’s proposal made by a subgroup of FS Executive Board (EB) (both with “track changes” and a “clean copy”).

Senator Bennett-George said that she thinks that this is incredibly important legislation put forward within FS. The U.S. Diversity requirement has not been substantively changed since it was first implemented in the 1990s. no major change since first implemented in 90s. The proposed changes bring it into alignment with a much more modern understanding of diversity and more rigorous review for prospective courses to satisfy the U.S. Diversity requirement.

President Faber stressed that this is a first reading, and there will not be a vote. She said that she had heard a lot of different things from senators. She invited someone from the EB subgroup to explain why they made the changes that they did to the AAC proposal.

President-Elect Wheeler said that there had been so much discussion on this item, that EB members felt that it was important to spend time on the language. The members of EB subgroup were Senator Oberhauser (Director of Women’s Studies); Senator Gillette; Senator Bennett-George (AAC Chair); President-Elect Wheeler; and Past President Sturm (who had charged AAC with implementing the working group report). The focus of the discussions in EB subgroup were about the difficulty of being very specific and at the same time being broad enough so as not to exclude too much. This is what the difficulties come down to. The most contentious issue in EB subgroup’s changes is to reduce the number of required learning objectives for approved courses from all of them to just three out of four. The four learning objectives appeared in the working group report. By requiring only three learning objectives, EB subgroup thought that it would broaden the language or intention of the document.

President-Elect Wheeler added that she had spoken with students in SG after the EB subgroup’s changes. They discussed whether it was good idea to reduce the required number of learning objectives to three. Students pointed out that it depends on what we mean by “diversity.” The students were okay with the reduction, but some expressed that they thought that some learning objectives were more important than others.

Senator Behnken pointed out that the working group was composed by experts on U.S. diversity and had student members. The group worked for a semester and much of the summer to produce their report. AAC has been working all year on implementing their report. So the AAC proposal specifically has been in the works for over a year, not to mention more than six years that AAC has been working on the U.S. Diversity proposal. Senator Behnken said that the types of concerns that EB members were raising (as reported in the approved March 30 EB minutes) could have easily been answered by AAC had the questions been referred to the Council. Senator Behnken was happy to hear that student feedback was solicited on the EB subgroup proposal, but pointed out that students helped to draft the AAC version.

With regard to the content of EB subgroup proposal, Senator Behnken said that he appreciated some additions, such as “diverse and rich education” in the prefatory paragraph, and the addition of equity and inclusion to the fourth learning objective. However, he suggested that because the focus of the general education requirement is U.S. Diversity, the order should be “diversity, equity, and inclusion.” Senator Behnken pointed out that the changes to the first sentence of the second paragraph took a precise and concise sentence from the AAC proposal and muddled it, resulting in a clunky, grammatically incorrect sentence. He said that the inclusion of “such as” in parentheses implies that race, ethnicity, and gender are afterthoughts, rather than the focus. Both in the working group and in AAC, care was taken to be specific about what approved classes would do. These changes widen the scope in an unfortunate and problematic way. In the second learning objective, “surrounding” doesn’t make any sense. The analytical concepts are race, ethnicity, and gender. Period. With respect to the decrease in the number of required learning objectives, Senator Behnken pointed out that that is not a pedagogical best practice for learning objectives. He added that this is one of the big problems with the current U.S. Diversity requirement. Why would we build into a new diversity requirement many of the same problems the current requirement has? Senator Behnken stressed common ground: we agree that this is important and needs to get done. He said that he met with two students who had developed their own diversity classes, and they brought it to faculty and administrators to find out how to get it

offered. Senator Behnken said his response was twofold: on the one hand, it's great that students put together such an impressive proposal. But on the other hand, students shouldn't be the ones developing courses; faculty should. It points to the problem that what we're offering does not suffice. Senator Behnken added that if the students' class were offered, it would satisfy all four of the learning objectives. If the students can put these courses together, ISU faculty can do so too.

Senator Peterson pointed out that FS had a lot of meeting time wordsmithing a proposal. In addition to the substantive issues pointed out by Senator Behnken, EB subgroup proposal has a lot of technical and typographical errors that would need to be fixed. Senator Peterson suggested that FS focus on the AAC proposal. We can discuss whether it makes sense to reduce the number of required learning objectives for a class to be approved for the U.S. Diversity tag. But the AAC proposal is written better and clearer. Furthermore: if we don't revise this proposal for another 15 years, the words we choose really matter. The AAC version is better written, and should be the version we use going forward.

In the Chat, Senator Hornbuckle wrote, "I agree that the sloppiness is not acceptable."

In the Chat, Senator Schaal wrote, "I agree with Senator Peterson."

Secretary Butler said that we use general education requirements for skills and content that we think students will need when they graduate and enter the workforce and become citizens. Given recent events, it is clear that students need an understanding of the core concepts of race, ethnicity, and gender in order to understand why our social and political events are unfolding in the ways they are. Secretary Butler said that while there are many important subjects (including sexual orientation or religion) that intersect with these three areas, the focus of this requirement is *U.S. Diversity* and not diversity, equity, and inclusion more generally.

President Faber invited others to comment, but there were no further comments.

Secretary Butler made a motion for a substitute motion: replace the EB subgroup version with the AAC version. She said that no one had spoken *in favor* of EB subgroup's changes, although President-Elect Wheeler had explained them. On the other hand, senators had pointed out problems with EB subgroup's version. Secretary Butler concluded that it made sense for senators to focus their attention on the AAC version in their discussions within their departments and caucuses. Senator Peterson seconded.

Senator Oberhauser spoke against the motion. One reason for EB subgroup's changes was to make the proposal more general in terms of diversity. There are many different axes of power and ways of looking at power: ableism, racism, sexism. EB subgroup did not want to have a precise list, but group all such topics under the broader term "social complexity." Senator Oberhauser added that she supports decreasing the number of required learning objectives from four to three. Again, the reason was to make a broader variety of classes eligible for approval. It would be too much to expect a course to cover all four learning objectives with respect to race, ethnicity, and gender.



Senator Behnken replied that power dynamics depend on the analytic category you're talking about. "Able-bodied vs. disability" are terms of inclusion, not diversity. The AAC proposal front-ends diversity with respect to human populations. The three analytic categories of race, ethnicity, and gender tie into other categories as well.

Senator Gillette pointed out that the AAC version includes race, ethnicity, gender, and religion. Would an approved course have to cover all of these topics?

Senator Behnken said no. The work group had proposed diversity, race, ethnicity, and culture as the analytic categories. The AAC version left gender out. That would need to be fixed. But the instructor would choose which analytic concepts of diversity to make the focus of the class. Maybe the class would be primarily race and ethnicity, but gender and religion are brought in. It would be awesome for a class to cover all these things, but that would be way too much.

Senator Perkins pointed out that Secretary Butler's motion to substitute a motion was out of order. Doing so would simply withdraw EB subgroup's motion and put the AAC version on the agenda for a first reading at the next FS meeting. In response, Senator Peterson withdrew his second and Secretary Butler withdrew her motion.

Senator Peterson moved to amend EB subgroup's motion to be the AAC version. Senator Wallace seconded.

The motion to amend was adopted by a hand vote, with multiple dissenting votes.

## **6.2. Masters of Healthcare Analytics and Operations [20-36] – Bennett-George**

Senator Bennett-George summarized the proposal. No comments.

## **6.3. FH 5.4 Evaluation, Renewal, and Advancement of Term Faculty Appointments [20-37] - Andreasen**

Senator Andreasen said these changes would modify FH 5.4.1.3, which addresses specifically term faculty advancement. The subdivisions are all new material. After two cycles of term faculty advancement, it is clear that FH needs to provide more guidance about policy. #3 is very important so that colleges and departments clarify policy. There are a variety of term faculty appointments across the university.

Senator Andreasen outlined some changes that will be made before the second reading. In FH 5.4.1.3.2, the first paragraph will be moved to the end of the section. The statement about "prior faculty service at other academic institutions" will be modified to include prior expertise in the discipline, because term faculty appointments include that as consideration for advancement. The section will also clarify that a teaching term faculty member is eligible for advancement after a total of five years combined in the lecture/assistant professor rank.

Senator Andreasen added that the section concerning advancement to term professor was based on the original FH 3.3.2.3. But that created grammatical infelicities that need to be fixed.

In FH 5.4.1.3.4, a change will be made to clarify that term and tenured/tenure-track ranks are all similar ranks for service on committees.

Senator Andreasen added that she is working to get clarification on the next-to-last sentence and its process.

No comments.

## **7. Announcements**

### **7.1. Faculty Senate President**

None, in the interest of time

### **7.2. Faculty Senate President-Elect**

President-Elect Wheeler said that she will be stepping off of the Academic Continuity Work Group, and Senator Perkins (the rising FS president-elect) will take her place. President-Elect Wheeler will be taking President Faber's place on the Moving Forward Committee chaired by VP Lawrence.

### **7.3. Senior Vice President and Provost**

#### **Vaccine Clinic**

Provost Wickert thanked volunteers for their work at the vaccine clinic. Last Friday, he served as a "way finder," greeting people and showing them around. 400 students were vaccinated on that day. About 1000 students were vaccinated last Thursday. In his expert opinion as an engineer, he thought "the system we're running here is just about as good as you can imagine." This week, there will be about 3000 doses administered, 350 of which are second shots. We will continue to staff the clinic in coming weeks to provide students, faculty, and staff, based on the amount of doses we receive.

#### **Fall Instruction**

Provost Wickert sent a memo yesterday regarding fall instruction. He said it is an important step to set expectation and plan for the fall. The default will be in-person instruction, very much like Fall 2019. This will be communicated to students, as well as the attendance policy for the fall, so that students will know that we are returning to the in-person experience that ISU is known for.

#### **Dean of Library Search**

Provost Wickert met with the search committee earlier today. He thanked everybody who joined open forums and served on the search committee.

In the Chat, Senator Frank wrote, "Faculty I talk to are concerned that ISU may not require Covid vaccination for students returning/entering in Fall. There is a precedent where students are required to have a Measles vaccination, which has exceedingly less prevalence today, so why not Covid is the question I hear." Provost Wickert replied that we will not be requiring a vaccine now or during the academic year 2021-22. That decision has been made. BOR announced that decision for all three universities last week. Provost Wickert said that he appreciated the comments about MMR vaccine. But it's not an option for us. There are more than 50 universities requiring vaccines (e.g., Rutgers, Cornell), but they are not in Iowa. ISU is part of the

government of the State of Iowa, and subject to the policies, rules, and goals set by BOR, IDPH, Iowa legislature, and governor.

In the Chat, Senator Freeman asked, “Can we require for a subset of students even if we can't require vaccines broadly?” He clarified that student athletes or students living in resident halls might be populations with high risk for transmission. Provost Wickert repeated that BOR has made their decision on this issue. We are committed to following that guidance. We will continue to communicate the importance of vaccines to students, and stress that vaccines are good, safe, part of the solution. These views are rooted in science and very appropriate for a university of science and technology. We will communicate this to incoming students over the summer. We will do everything we can to make vaccines available to students, and we are doing that now, based on the amount of vaccines we receive. We are looking into the possibility of having a vaccine clinic in the fall, maybe at multiple locations. We will encourage students to get vaccinated before returning in the fall.

In the Chat, Senator Behnken asked, “Will we maintain any of the covid protocols, esp masking, in the fall?” Provost Wickert said that we continue to look at that. We have some time before we need to make a decision about masks. ISU has set August 1 as the date by which we will announce our intentions with regard to masks. There will likely be some version of Cyclones Care campaign. Around campus, we will likely find less signage (on doors, the banner over the library, stickers on floors, and stairway designations).

In the Chat, Senator Mackiewicz asked, “What about guidance for departments about meetings? Our department has too many people to fit in our largest meeting room.” Provost Wickert replied that in the memorandum, he expressed that departments will have flexibility for how to run their meetings. The emphasis of the memo was that in-person instruction will resume at Fall 2019 levels. But we have discovered some advantages to virtual technologies. Faculty know best how to run their research groups, departments, and committees, and can decide whether it makes sense to return to in-person meetings, or continue virtual meetings (or some combination). Provost Wickert added that Provost's Council had a hybrid meeting with most people in person, and four or five people online. He thought it worked well, and will alternate in-person and online meetings for the next month or two. In the Chat, Senator Mackiewicz responded, “I agree about some of the advantages of virtual meetings. Thanks for your response, Provost.”

In the Chat, Senator Watanabe asked, “Are there plans to return Faculty Senate to in-person meetings?” President-Elect Wheeler said that she would love to have in-person meetings. She needs to look into whether it will be technologically feasible to have hybrid meetings, because some senators will need to be online.

In the Chat, Senator Gillette wrote, “Also keeping in mind that young children will not likely be vaccinated in the fall, so there may be some work/life balance that continues to be needed (and virtual meetings or hybrid meetings would support that).” She added that it wasn't so much a question as a comment. Her child will not be vaccinated by August or September. Provost Wickert said that ISU is keeping an eye on what school districts do (in person, online, or hybrid). He thanked her for raising an important work/life consideration.

In the Chat, Senator Campbell asked, “Will we return to the normal class time schedules?” Provost Wickert said that that is a topic for the Academic Continuity Work Group. As those decisions are made, they will be communicated. This past memo #26 was about fall instruction and meetings. Provost Wickert anticipates that there will be future memos, including one about the attendance policy (about which input will be solicited from SG and GPSS).

In the Chat, Senator Rayburn wrote, “Vaccines & masks are one thing. But, what about distancing for large classes or large groups? Will that mitigate changing in-class instruction for those courses/labs?” Provost Wickert said that classrooms will be at 100% capacity. There has been no evidence of transmission in classrooms. Students, faculty, and staff should take advantage of vaccinations.

#### **7.4. P&S Council**

None

#### **7.5. Student Government**

SG President Campbell said that her term began at the end of March. SG looks forward to providing feedback on the U.S. Diversity requirement proposal. SG has an ad hoc committee on student engagement and equity, diversity, and inclusion support for students on campus. These conversations will continue during the summer. There is a new SG umbrella project that loans umbrellas to students caught in the rain. The new umbrellas in Cyclones colors just arrived. SG is receiving estimates on a gender-neutral bathroom project. Dance Marathon raised \$184,579.24 for Children’s Miracle Network. There will be an International Food Fair this weekend.

#### **7.6. Graduate and Professional Student Senate**

GPSS Vice President Carrie Ann Johnson said that Monday would be their last legislative session. She will become the GPSS Senate Engagement Officer next year.

#### **8. Good of the Order**

None

#### **9. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 5:31 p.m.

---

**NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, May 4, 2021 – 3:30 p.m. – Webex**

Respectfully submitted April 26, 2021,

Annemarie Butler  
Faculty Senate Secretary