

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
APRIL 17, 2018 – 3:30–5:00 P.M.
SUN ROOM, MEMORIAL UNION**

Present: Anderson, M.; Andreasen, C.; Armstrong, P.; Beitz, D.; Beresnev, I.; Bigelow, T.; Borich, T.; Boyles, J.; Braun, S.; Brown, J.; Burke, B.; Butler, A.; Cantor, D.; Carr, C.; Chilcott, T.; Cliber, J.; Dekkers, J.; Delate, K.; Dilla, W.; Dollisso, A.; Ekkekakis, P.; Evans, J.; Faber, C.; Freeman, S.; Friedel, J.; Gassmann, A.; Gudmunson, C.; Hanson, V.; Hartzler, B.; Johnson, D.; Kimber, M.; Kreider, B.; Krier, D.; Looney, M.; Luecke, G.; Lutz, R.; Marcketti, S.; Martin, P.; Martin, R.; Meissner, C.; Monroe, J.; Montabon, F.; Munkvold, G.; Niemi, J.; Ockey, G.; Padgett-Walsh, C.; Pellack, L.; Perkins, J.; Peterson, D.; Rajan, H.; Roe, K.; Rosa, J.; Royston, N.; Russell, D.; Ryan, S.; Schneider, I.; Schwab, C.; Seeger, C.; Sponseller, B.; Sturges, L.; Sturm, J.; Tener, J.; Wallace, R.; Westgate, M.; Wheeler, A.; Winer, E.; Winter, A.; Yin, Y.; Zaffarano, B.; Zarecor, K.

Absent: Bain, C.; Cochran, E.; Day, T.; Herrnstadt, S.; Muench, J.; Waggoner, K.; Williams, C.

Substitutes: M. Muecke for Al Shihabi, D.; R. Davis for Cornick, N; C. Campbell for Fiore, A.M.; C. Minion for O'Connor, A.; A. Mendonca for Schalinske, K.; D. Linhares for Zimmerman, J.

Guests: Wickert, J. (SVPP); Bratsch-Prince, D. (Assoc. Prov); VanDerZanden, A.M. (Assoc. Prov); Rosacker, E. (University Relations); Belding, M. (GPSS); Bries, A. (GPSS); Leeson, D. (ISU Daily); Rippke, S. (Parliamentarian); Clingan-Fisher, D. (Ombuds Office); Schweers, R. (SVPP Office); Boettger, N. (BOR); Boettger, D.

I. Call to Order

A. Seating of Substitute Senators

President-Elect Martin called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m. and seated the substitute senators. President Day was away at the NCAA Division 1 Council meeting, representing Iowa State University. President-Elect Martin welcomed special guest Regent Nancy Boettger and her husband, Dave.

II. Consent Agenda

A. Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting – April 3, 2018 - [S17/M/7]

B. Agenda for April 17, 2018 - [S17/A/8]

C. Docket Calendar – [S17/C/8]

Senator Wallace moved to accept the consent agenda. Past President Sturm seconded. The motion was adopted.

III. Special Order: Deanna Clingan-Fischer, University Ombuds Office

Deanna Clingan-Fischer, ISU's first full time ombudsman, said that she was formerly Iowa's long-term care ombudsman, and she is new to the academic world. The ombuds

office is a confidential, neutral, and informal resource that can help with concerns or conflicts that may interfere with day-to-day workplace or academic activities. Her office serves faculty, administrators, supervisory staff, P&S staff, post-docs, merit staff, and graduate students.

The major reasons faculty visit the ombuds office are to handle conflict with a colleague, conflict with a supervisor, conflict with a subordinate, or other lack of respect issues.

Senator Beresnev asked how a faculty member decides whether to go to the ombuds office or other administrative channels (e.g. HR, dean's office, department chair). Ms. Clingan-Fischer replied that faculty can begin with the ombuds office, and she will direct the faculty member to other resources, if necessary.

IV. Announcements and Remarks

A. Faculty Senate President

None

B. Faculty Senate President-Elect

Faculty Spring Conference

President-Elect Martin thanked senators for their support of the spring faculty conference. There were 171 registrations, and by all measures, it was a success.

At least four themes emerged from the conference:

1. Strengthening the diversity of our campus, and promoting an inclusive environment.
2. Emphasizing the importance of active, concerned citizenship and ethical leadership (ACCEL) in our curriculum and among students and faculty.
3. Recognize that the future of land-grant universities (just like their past) is based on science and being open to all. ISU is a university dedicated to the education of the working people of Iowa.
4. Interacting more directly with the people of Iowa by listening, learning, and leading.

President-Elect Martin will use these themes to guide FS activity next year. He thanked the Provost's Office, FS Representative Committee, and FS for fostering communication and dialogue.

BOR Meeting

President Day delivered a statement concerning FY19 faculty salaries. He spoke about faculty commitment to research, teaching, and service. Faculty have been asked to do more with less, with increased student credit hours over time, significant increase in research activities. (President Day shared data to support these claims.) President Day noted that ISU is at the bottom of our peer group in salaries. ISU is also witnessing the largest number of faculty resignations in ten years. All of these factors contribute to low faculty morale. President Day asked BOR for more support.

C. Senior Vice President and Provost

BOR Meeting

Provost Wickert said that President Day delivered an excellent presentation to BOR, as did P&S Council President Jessica Bell and student leaders. Comments regarded ISU's budget and tuition proposal.

At last week's meeting, BOR had the first reading of the tuition proposal, which includes 3.8% increase for undergraduate resident students and 4% increase for other student classifications. It also proposes differential tuition rates in a number of academic programs with demonstrable higher cost of instruction (due to a strong experiential learning component, such as labs or studios, etc.). The proposal would move towards a tiered tuition structure so that there is a base tuition rate. Students in experiential learning-intensive programs in CALS, LAS, and Human Sciences would have one differential rate; and students in Engineering and Business would have a second, higher rate. These rates would be phased in over the next three years, to create a tuition structure that is clear and simple to students and their parents. This would align higher cost programs with students who are actually benefitting from the programs. This proposal began one year ago, with many conversations with FS (including RPA) and SG leaders. BOR will vote on the proposal in June.

Midyear Reversion

Provost Wickert referred to an article in *Inside Iowa State* about how ISU handled the midyear budget cut of \$5.4 million. ISU President Wintersteen made the decision to try to absorb as much as possible centrally. Looking at the entire university's budget, she found that \$4 million could be absorbed centrally, including salary savings from not filling open faculty and staff positions. The division of Academic Affairs was able to absorb cuts centrally, affecting CELT, Honors, the Graduate College, Institutional Research, and the Provost's Office.

Provost Wickert said that it is uncertain whether these cuts will become permanent and appear in FY19 budget. He is directing colleges to continue to be prudent in budget planning.

Textbook Affordability

At March 20 FS meeting, Provost Wickert described successes by faculty in saving students significant money on textbooks by adopting digital content delivered through the learning management system. ISU, through a partnership between the bookstore, CELT, the Provost's Office, and the university library, is working to expand the program. Provost Wickert circulated flyers describing the program.

Through a partnership between CELT and the library, departments including mathematics, physics, and history are adopting open educational resources (OER). CELT issued an RFP, and 27 proposals were submitted by faculty in departments across campus. The goal is to help faculty migrate from legacy textbooks to OER.

ISU Foundation and Alumni Association

The ISU Foundation Governor’s reception in Scheman will honor distinguished alumni for their inspiring and impressive accomplishments. Top donors will also be on campus for capital campaign meetings in the colleges.

D. Other (P&S Council; SG; GPSS)

GPSS (Michael Belding): Michael Belding thanked faculty for promoting and supporting GPSS’s research conference. He introduced Amanda Bries (Ph.D. candidate in FS HN) as the next GPSS president.

V. Unfinished Business

A. Doctor of Education [S17-21] – Bigelow

No comments. Motion was adopted.

B. Graduate Certificate in Meat Science [S17-22] – Bigelow

No comments. Motion was adopted.

C. FH 10.4.3.3 Military Service [S17-23] – Bigelow

No comments. Motion was adopted.

VI. New Business

A. FH 10.5 Policy for Dealing with Disruption in the Learning Environment [S17-24] – Bigelow

Senator Bigelow said that the proposal expands “classroom” to include other learning environments. It describes steps for handling disruption, both minor and major. The proposal was vetted by a committee, Student Affairs, and FS EB.

Past President Sturm said that he saw a lot of good material in the proposal, but he thought it should not pass without amendment. FH 10.5.2.1.7 and 10.5.2.1.8 seemed most important to retain as policy. Other parts seemed like important information, but not policy related to classroom disruption.

Past President Sturm also voiced concern that the committee (highly qualified as its members are) included only one faculty member and proposed changes to FH. He thought FH should be changed principally through input from faculty. He asked what comments faculty on Academic Affairs Council had, or whether they passed the proposal as submitted.

Senator Bigelow replied that AAC passed the proposal as submitted. Most of the feedback came from Student Affairs.

Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince said that the proposal was circulated with two additional documents (a series of resources and a series of guidelines). Questions from AAC and Student Affairs concerned the guidelines, not policy. Assistant Dean of Students Kipp Van Dyke and Assistant Dean of Students Sara Kellogg were on

hand to answer questions. (They were not recognized by the president to speak.) Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince explained that the whole initiative began because the assistant deans wanted to provide more tools and guidance to faculty to handle disruptive situations that arise in the classroom.

Senator Westgate asked whether DPS was involved in discussions. Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince said that DPS Captain Carrie Jacobs was on the committee, as was a faculty member with a lot of experience of interruptions in large classroom classes.

Senator Braun appreciated that faculty responsibilities are clarified. He would like to see more responsibilities given to students, and clear guidelines for how they should and should not take advantage of being at ISU.

Senator Braun also expressed concern about the repeated requirement of documentation. It is impossible for an instructor to document every single mild interference (e.g. cell phone usage) in a large classroom. If faculty are expected to document every single disruptive act and follow up with e-mails, faculty would have no time to do anything else.

Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince replied that student expectations are codified in the Student Conduct Handbook, in the Student Affairs division. She also said that documentation is especially important if disruptive behavior persists and significant steps need to be taken to address a pattern of behavior. Documentation is important in order to be fair to students and to provide faculty records.

VII. More Unfinished Business

A. NTE Reform – FH Chapters 3 and 5 [S17-20] - Day

President-Elect Martin said that the main proposal was introduced to FS on March 6. Faculty have had the opportunity to discuss the proposal in councils, FS EB, and caucus meetings. Nine amendments were received. Once these are discussed and voted on, FS can move to vote on the main motion. President-Elect Martin reminded senators of parliamentary procedure.

A motion to limit debate on each amendment to six minutes total, with individual speeches limited to one minute apiece was moved by Past President Sturm and seconded by Senator Tener. Needing 2/3 support, the motion was lost (38-32).

A motion to limit speeches to one minute was made by Senator Freeman and seconded by Senator Armstrong. The motion was adopted (47-22).

Amendment 1.

Senator Freeman introduced the amendment, changing practice titles to “fellow.”

Senator Zarecor said that, although not unanimous, COD does not feel that these titles meet their needs, and she did not support the amendment.

Senator Delate expressed concern about not having time to discuss the amendments with faculty in her department. However, she sensed from chatter that there was not support for postponing debate on amendments.

Senator Butler pointed out that there is precedent among peer universities for the professor of practice titles. She urged senators to trust faculty that these are the appropriate titles to recruit experts from industry to ISU.

Senator Munkvold said that other proposed titles relate to duties that are expected of people in the position. Professor of practice title is not in line with the concept that titles have to do with the mission.

Senator Bigelow said that the goal of practice titles is to have an honorary title to recognize distinguished accomplishments. He thought “fellow” achieves that goal.

Senator Beresnev observed that passing this amendment would have implications for future professor of practice amendments.

The motion was lost, 24-41.

Amendment 2.

Senator Bigelow introduced the amendment, which proposed to have only one rank (professor) in the practice line.

Senator Gassmann pointed out that if one practice-focused amendment passes, it would conflict with others. Therefore the order in which amendments are presented becomes important. How was the order decided? President-Elect Martin replied that a lot of thought went into the order, from greatest change to smallest change.

Senator Montabon thought that this amendment was worse than the first. In business, there are a number of people at all levels.

The motion was lost, 22-43.

Amendment 3.

Senator Zarecor introduced the amendment, which retains only associate professor and professor of practice titles. This would permit departments to hire someone at two levels of accomplishments, and allow for promotion to professor. Senator Monroe seconded.

Senator Munkvold said he supported the proposal, but wanted to hear arguments against it.

Senator Montabon said that in the past six years, Business had hired people who fit the assistant professor of practice title perfectly. The assistant professor of practice title

would lay out a career path. The full range of ranks would allow departments to consider the length of career and accomplishments of incoming term faculty.

Senator Zarecor said that COD is not opposed to assistant professor of practice, but they would not use it often. Such candidates would typically be hired as lecturers.

Senator Winer said that assistant professor of practice titles do not make sense. Someone who works for two years in industry has potential to have industry experience, but he did not see how that potential warrants a title. Professor of practice appointments are not supposed to offer a career path.

Senator Roe thought it was too restrictive to disallow a category or rank just because some departments might not use it. He urged senators to consider that other departments may find the titles useful. He also liked the consistency of three ranks across all titles.

Senator Montabon said that the distinction comes down to years of experience.

Past President Sturm asked whether Business would support calling the first rank “lecturer” instead.

Senator Montabon replied that Business wants to get the practice titles to enable them to hire people off the tenure track. He admitted that Business would use the rank of professor primarily. But he thought it was easy to envision a future where even if the lecturer title were available, Business would stop using it and designate faculty as professor of practice instead.

The motion was lost, 24-41.

Amendment 4.

Senator Braun said that the motion removed teaching from the duties for professor of practice to clarify how practice titles differ from teaching titles. He worried that having two titles, both of whose primary responsibilities are teaching, would establish a two-tier system at the university. Senator Bigelow seconded.

Senator Bigelow said that a title is a description of what someone will do, not what someone has done. With a practice title, industrial practice is what the person will do. If these titles are adopted as currently proposed in S17-20, everyone is doing the same thing (teaching) and the people with teaching titles are second-rate citizens.

Senator Seeger replied that faculty are hired to teach the practice. They have real-world experience, such as studio experience.

Senator Braun acknowledged the point, but he thought that by establishing practice ranks we are saying that some practice is more valuable than others. Term faculty in English and theater also have experience in what they teach.

Senator Dilla thought amendment 4 repeated a point made better in (his) amendment 7, which assigns a combination of teaching and institutional or professional service to the descriptions of teaching and practice titles. He did not think it was a good idea to eliminate teaching altogether from practice titles.

Senator Freeman said that he came to support the amendment. Professors of practice will use their professional experience to help students learn. But that's what we all do. In his safety classes, he calls upon his experience in safety to prepare students to be safety professionals.

Senator Minion said in CVM, clinical faculty hired as professors of practice must have outside experience (e.g. residency, etc.) that goes beyond an academic degree. He said he would not want the next class of veterinarians trained by first year graduates in CVM. We need outside experts.

Senator Seeger said that in architecture and landscape architecture, students engaged in studio-based learning. Professors of practice not only teach, but also connect students to professional networks and engage in outreach with other clientele.

Senator Zarecor said that professors of practice are hired to teach students. It makes no sense to remove teaching from their responsibilities.

The motion was lost, with only five supporting votes.

Amendment 5.

Senator Beresnev introduced the motion which makes the teaching titles lecturer, senior lecturer, and principal lecturer.

Senator Freeman said that the rejection of amendment 1 entailed that practice titles would use "professor." This shows that faculty are not sincerely concerned about the proliferation of professor titles. This amendment needs to be defeated for reasons similar to those that defeated amendment 1.

Senator Munkvold said he objected to the amendment for other reasons. Currently, term faculty do not enjoy some of the same privileges as tenure-track faculty. One privilege is "professor" in the title. To go back on that would be a real failure.

Senator Beresnev said that the title "professor of practice" is different; it is supposed to be honorary. He did not expect that there would be many uses of that title.

Senator Bigelow expressed concern about fairness of giving the title "professor" to faculty in practice ranks but not teaching, even if the teaching faculty have terminal degrees and distinction in teaching.

Senator Cliber said that keeping “professor” in teaching titles does not dilute the meaning of “professor,” but enhances it, because it gives more prestige to teaching, which is what we’re here to do.

Senator Delate reported that the majority of faculty in her department (horticulture) wanted to retain lecturer and senior lecturer titles.

Senator Evans said that there is a fundamental difference in the role of research and teaching faculty at a research institution. A more complicated, multi-track, multi-rank system would make for arbitrariness in promotion and efficiency.

The motion was lost, with only 10 supporting votes.

Amendment 6.

Senator Monroe said that this amendment was his effort at compromise. On the teaching side, the concern is casualization of titles, short duration of contracts, erosion of tenure and the value of “professor” titles. At the same time, we recognize term faculty already here have made valuable contributions. This amendment splits the difference by coming up with a “professor” title that is meaningful. Peer review based on performance in duties in the PRS are used for promotion decisions. Associate professors and professors receive longer, 3-5 year contracts. One year contracts are used for lecturers. Senator Tener seconded.

Amendment 6 to amendment 6.

Senator Wallace introduced an amendment to amendment 6. It would have five ranks (lecturer, senior lecturer, assistant teaching professor, associate teaching professor, and teaching professor). It accommodates current senior lecturers, but also creates a career path to professor titles. Instead of eliminating the assistant teaching professor rank, departments would have the option to hire into lecturer or assistant teaching professor ranks, just like clinical faculty, in the spirit of FH 3.1.3. Senator Armstrong seconded.

Senator Bigelow objected. He said that the practice title gives “professor” to people without terminal degrees, but here people without terminal degrees would be called “lecturer.” Senator Wallace said that that was a mischaracterization.

Senator Zarecor asked how many years pass between the reviews at each rank. She was concerned that it would take 30 years to reach teaching professor from lecturer.

Senator Wallace replied that the structure is the same as S17-20. It is possible to hire directly into assistant teaching professor ranks for people with terminal degrees. People without terminal degrees would get promoted from lecturer to senior lecturer and could reach the rank of assistant teaching professor through rigorous peer review.

Senator Dilla thanked Senator Wallace for the proposal. In Business, the concern is for current senior lecturers who are Ph.D. qualified. This five-tier distinction would enable

departments to recognize and individual's academic accomplishment and give a better depiction of their job.

Senator Munkvold said that although he preferred the amendment to amendment 6 better than amendment 6 itself, he was opposed to both, because they both penalize teaching faculty for lacking a terminal degree. (He agreed with Senator Bigelow's comments.) Early career teaching faculty should have an assistant professor title.

Senator Krier supported the amendment to amendment 6. He thought it was important to underscore that there is a waiver process to allow exceptional faculty without a terminal degree to be promoted into the assistant teaching professor track. This establishes that it is normative to have a terminal degree. But it creates an opening for exceptional faculty and departments (e.g. music).

Past President Sturm said that he opposed the amendment to amendment 6. He thought it was too onerous of a process of advancement.

Senator Campbell recommended that FS be careful about the wording of titles. In the amendments, sometimes "assistant" or "associate professor of teaching" is used. Other times, "assistant" or "associate teaching professor" is used. The former wording raises the question of what domain tenure-track faculty work in: assistant professor *of what?* She recommended using the latter wording.

The amendment to amendment 6 was lost, 18-47.

Another amendment to amendment 6.

In light of Senator Campbell's comments, Senator Butler moved to modify amendment 6 to use "associate teaching professor" and "teaching professor." Senator Monroe seconded.

Senator Freeman thought the motion was otiose, because the Senate Documents Committee could fix typographical errors.

The motion was adopted with a clear plurality of votes in support.

Back to amendment 6.

Senator Looney said he supported the Monroe Doctrine for the 21st Century. He liked that achieved compromise and had mandatory peer review. Faculty determine who gets the title of "professor."

Senator Krier said that he saw one problem: what happens to current senior lecturers. This was followed by a stunned silence.

Senator Padgett Walsh walked to the microphone and replied, “Something would need to be implemented.” This was met with laughter and applause. Senator Padgett Walsh added that no new appointments could be made with the “senior lecturer” title.

The motion was adopted, 41-22.

Amendment 7.

Senator Dilla said that this proposal makes the language simpler and less restrictive. The proposal makes teaching term faculty devote 75% of their time to “a combination of teaching, institutional service, and professional service” and practice term faculty devote 75% of their time to “teaching in their area of expertise and related institutional and professional service.” In Business, teaching faculty are very involved in professional and career preparation. Professors of practice would be responsible for curriculum coordination and other responsibilities related to their teaching mission. Rather than have the descriptions of titles dictate the content of PRSs, this amendment leaves it up to the college. The amendment was seconded by Senator Bigelow.

Senator Zarecor said that the proposal was received positively in COD. She thought the amendment provided more flexibility and was clearer.

The motion was adopted with a clear plurality of votes in support.

Amendment 8.

Senator Bigelow said that this amendment aims to clarify what is required for a researcher to be “independent.” It is less restrictive about months of salary as PI. This clarifies that research term faculty will be independent, their own investigators, and not just a glorified post-doc. Senator Roe seconded.

Senator Padgett Walsh observed that the proposal specifies criteria for advancement different from those that tenure-stream faculty might have.

Senator Bigelow replied that he thought it compared appropriate to tenure track faculty. Research term faculty (dedicated just to research) will be expected to be more productive in quantity, but not necessarily in quality. So research term faculty should be at least as productive as tenure-track faculty in your discipline.

Senator Evans said that he knew of just one NTER faculty. This faculty member had a contract signed with an external funding agency for five years of full support. He thought it doesn’t make sense to ask a department with a limited budget to spend money when an external agency is willing to do so.

The motion was adopted with clear plurality of votes in support.

Amendment 9.

Senator Bigelow said that this amendment concerns termination of research term faculty lines due to lack of funding. In the current FH, NTER faculty can be terminated for lack of funding. In S17-20, it is not clear that term research faculty could be terminated for lack of sufficient funding. Someone could be on a 3-5 year contract could lose external funding part way through the contract. The department would then be on the hook for the remainder of the contract. This amendment introduces a way to transition people out if funding is lost and the salary cannot be paid. It provided three months of support. 10-20% would come from the college or general fund. The incentive account could be used to cover the remainder. The amendment was seconded.

Senator Montabon said that he had not received a copy of this amendment with the agenda. How does this amendment differ from amendment 8?

President-Elect replied that the amendment was received this morning. It is in order to consider it.

Senator Bigelow replied that they are two separate amendments. Amendment 8 concerns renewal. Amendment 9 restores the ability to terminate term research faculty whose funding dries up.

The motion carried with a clear plurality of votes in support.

S17-20, so amended.

Senator Wallace moved to postpone vote on S17-20 to the next FS meeting. The motion received many seconds. The motion carried with a clear plurality of votes in support.

VIII. Good of the Order

Past President Sturm urged senators to discuss the revised S17-20 with their departments, colleges, and caucuses.

Senator Freeman repeated points made by President-Elect Martin. We worked hard on S17-20 and the discussion and amendments provided greater clarity. He encouraged senators to come back in two weeks ready to pass S17-20.

Senator Tener asked about new senators at the next meeting. President-Elect Martin replied that new senators are not installed until the end of the next meeting.

Professor Hal Schenck (Chair, Mathematics) said that Texas A&M University recently changed term faculty titles. The proposal went through, despite objections from faculty, and included assistant professor, associate professor, and professor of practice titles. Professor Schenck cautioned that any addition of a research component to term faculty PRSs would be misguided and open to abuse.

Senator Montabon observed that the Sun Room has better acoustics than the Great Hall.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:17 p.m.

NEXT MEETING TUESDAY, MAY 1, 2018 – 3:30-5:00 P.M., GREAT HALL, MU

Respectfully submitted April 25, 2018,

Annemarie Butler
Faculty Senate Secretary

P.S. Many thanks to Senator Sponseller for serving as interim secretary at FS's April 3 meeting.