

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
APRIL 21, 2015 – 3:30–5:00 P.M.
GREAT HALL, MEMORIAL UNION**

Present: Agarwal, S.; Arndt, G.; Bain, C.; Beattie, G.; Bigelow, T.; Biggs, S.; Brown, J.; Burke, B.; Butler, A.; Dark, V.; Day, T.; Dekkers, J.; Derrick, T.; Essner, J.; Fei, S.; Freeman, S.; Guyll, M.; Han, G.; Harding, C.; Hill, J.; Jackson, R.; Jurenka, R.; Kim, S.; Leigh, P.; Looney, M.; Manu, A.; Martin, P.; Martin, R.; Minion, C.; Monroe, J.; Nelson, S.; Niemi, J.; O'Connor, A.; Padgett-Walsh, C.; Paschke, T.; Pellack, L.; Post, C.; Reddy, M.; Roe, K.; Russell, D.; Ryan, S.; Sanders, E.; Schaefer, V.; Schalinske, K.; Seeger, C.; Selby, M.; Sponseller, B.; Sturm, J.; Suzuki, Y.; Taylor, G.; Tian, J.; van der Valk, A.; Waggoner, Kathleen; Wallace, R.; Wang, Q.; Weber, E.; Zaffarano, B.; Zarecor, K.

Absent: Amidon, K.; Beetham, J.; Bhattacharya, J.; Bird, S.; Bowler, N.; Evans, J.; Faber, C.; Godbey, E.; Griffiths, P.; Hartzler, B.; Rajan, H.; King, D.; Kong, S.C.; Koziel, J.; Naegele, D.; Owen, M.; Selek, H.; Stalder, K.; Stevenson, G.; Stone, L.; Sturges, L.; Williams, C.; Zhao, Y.

Substitutes: M. Clough for Olson, J.

Guests: Wickert, Jonathan (SVPP); Bratsch-Prince, D. (Assoc. Provost); Rosacker, E. (University Relations); Rippke, S. (Parliamentarian); Satre, Z. (ISU Daily); Tehan-Harris, A. (P&S Council); Tripathy, A. (GPSS); Bock, A. (AFSCME)

I. Call to Order

A. Seating of Substitute Senators

President Schalinske called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. and seated the substitute senators.

II. Consent Agenda

A. Minutes of Faculty Senate April 7, 2015 - [S14/M/8]

B. Agenda for April 21, 2015 – [S14/A/9]

C. Docket Calendar – [S14/C/9]

D. FH 3.3.2.1 – Appointment Policies – [S14-20]

Senator Sturm moved, and Past President Dark seconded. The motion passed without dissension.

III. Special Order: Tim Day, Faculty Athletic Representative Report

A. Academic Performance Overview

The student athlete GPAs in spring and fall 2014 (3.00 and 2.99) were slightly lower than the student body GPA (2.94 and 2.95). The data over time support the conclusion that the student athlete population keeps pace academically with the general student population.

The NCAA sets an Academic Performance Rate (APR) that measures retention and eligibility of student athletes. Last year was the best APR since the practice began in

2007. The top score is 1000 (perfect retention, perfect eligibility, and all student athletes making progress toward the degree), and last year ISU had four sports with 1000.

B. Office of Student Athlete Development

Senator Day introduced Patrice Feulner, Director of the Office of Student Athlete Development. Her office takes a holistic approach to student athlete well-being. Professors who have concerns about student athletes who are enrolled in their courses should contact Ms. Feulner.

C. NCAA Changes

One recent change has been that the value of a full grant-in-aid now includes full cost of attendance. Senator Day also called senators' attention to work in progress by the NCAA Academic Committee (which is composed mostly of faculty) to form new NCAA legislation on academic misconduct, in light of highly visible cases (e.g., at UNC and Syracuse). Senator Day noted that the new policies may conflict with policies set by ISU faculty, and he will continue to update FS and FS Executive Board about any changes.

IV. Announcements and Remarks

A. Faculty Senate President

None

B. Faculty Senate President-Elect

1. New Policies

The comment period ends tomorrow for Assistance Animals on Campus (available at www.policy.iastate.edu).

There will be discussion of issues relating to a proposed ban on e-cigarettes as part of the Smoke-Free Campus Policy. (The University of Iowa adopted a tobacco free campus policy effective August 24.) The current Smoke-Free Campus policy can be found at: www.policy.iastate.edu/sites/default/files/resources/108/Smoke-Free%20Campus%202012-11-01%20SECURED.pdf .

2. Traffic Control

Members of the university community are invited to provide input about the disposition of Osborn Drive to a consultant group and FPM. Traffic has increased because of greater frequency of buses, more pedestrian traffic, and is especially heavy between classes. There is an online survey available on FPM's website through May 8.

3. FS EB Retreat with ISU President Leath and Provost Wickert

President-Elect Wallace said that EB would appreciate suggestions for topics of discussion for FS EB's meeting with ISU President Leath and Provost Wickert in August. Senators should e-mail President-Elect Wallace.

C. Senior Vice President and Provost

1. TIER Study: Academic Affairs Component

On April 10, Chaffey Consulting Group made their first visit to ISU. (The consulting group was hired by BOR many years ago for a different efficiency study, and so they are familiar with the differences among the three public universities.) There are two business cases under academic affairs: e-learning (including distance and hybrid instruction) and enrollment management. (In meeting with consultants, ISU representatives emphasized that ISU's approach to online education is to have the very same faculty teach online classes as those who teach face-to-face classes. In a fast paced market, our emphasis is to ensure the same high quality of online classes as our face-to-face classes have.) ISU leaders provided the consultants with briefing materials, data, and various reports (including data about distance education, retention rates, and four- and six-year grad rates). The consultants will finish their campus visits in approximately another month. They will "digest" the data over the summer, and will be back in full force in the fall, with the goal of having preliminary recommendations in September.

2. BOR Meeting

There will be a BOR meeting on April 23. There is a light agenda, including some governance reports as well as P&T decisions. Letters from ISU President Leath and Provost Wickert will be sent to P&T candidates on Thursday.

3. Iowa Legislature Update

Provost Wickert said that although we would normally expect joint budget targets to be identified by the House and Senate, they are far apart on the overall size of the budget as well as the size for particular units. So he predicts that the session will have a late adjournment date. Unfortunately, budget decisions that matter most to ISU are typically handled last.

Senator Guyll asked Provost Wickert about a report from the IT support person to the Department of Psychology. According to the IT support person, because of recommendations from the TIER study, IT services will be centralized, and in particular printing would be centralized. This would mean that faculty can no longer print in their offices, but instead have to print to some remote shared location. Furthermore, faculty would no longer be allowed to purchase multi-function printers. Provost Wickert replied that these were recommendations from the previous consultant (Deloitte). Additionally, Deloitte recommended transitioning to thin client computers. However, Deloitte is no longer in charge of the TIER study, and not all of their recommendations have been adopted. Following the termination of Deloitte's contract, the universities wrote their own plans for HR and IT. In ISU's plan, the recommendations about printers that were not accepted. This is because ISU's units are neither completely centralized nor completely decentralized. So the IT efficiency plan needs to accommodate this. So some of Deloitte's suggestions have been incorporated (e.g., thin client computers in labs and clusters and teaching centers) while other suggestions have not.

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

P&S: no report

SG: no report

GPSS: Mr. Tripathy said that more than 1800 students registered for various components of the research conference (including poster presentations, talks, and keynote talks). About 80 faculty attended, mostly as judges.

V. Unfinished Business

A. Health Coach Certificate – [S14-17] - Bigelow

The motion passed without dissension.

B. Changes to FH sections 3.4.1.1 and 5.4.1.2 – [S14-18] – Selby

In response to the statement from the AAUP (distributed with agenda materials), Senator Selby said that the second paragraph of the proposal states precisely the same goals, including the reasonable expectation of renewal after several years of creditable service and ensuring that NTE faculty who are not renewed have time to search for a new job. The current situation is not meeting these goals. After meeting with a variety of administrators, the task force determined that reducing the notice time to six months and requiring notice of intent to renew or not renew would better meet those goals. Senator Selby asked opponents to offer a better solution.

Senator Butler said that she had asked administrators why they issued blanket notices of non-renewal. She was told that they wanted to avoid the possibility of grievances from giving some faculty new contracts and others notices of non-renewal. So to comply with the policy, the administrators determined that the best course of action was to give everyone notice of intent not to renew. Senator Butler pointed out that there is nothing in the proposal that would alter this approach. Administrators would still be faced with the choice of giving notice to renew or not renew. To avoid the same sort of potential for grievance, they would make the same decision. And just as before, notice of intent not to renew would not be binding; they could still issue such notices to faculty whom they fully intend to rehire. Senator Butler said that what is creating this situation is more complicated than the deadline for notice. While she acknowledged that she did not have a better proposal, she thought that the Provost's Office's shared task force with FS could look at the entire system and identify a better solution.

Senator Sturm said that over the course of conversations with members of AAUP, he came to believe that other changes need to be made. NTE faculty who have served for more than three years should expect to receive twelve months' notice, unless the chair or dean can supply a justification against doing so. Such a justification might be evidence of a downward trend in enrollment, no longer offering the course, or poor student reviews or other evidence of non-performance. This modification would ensure that NTE faculty do not receive pro forma letters of intent not to renew.

Senator Selby replied that the intent of this proposal was to give NTE faculty actual notices and change how they are treated. Administrators have agreed that this proposal will result in a change in current behavior. She disputed that this proposal would yield the same behavior only six months later.

Senator Freeman pointed out that receipt of notice not to renew when others have not received such notice is not grounds for grievance. FH supports nonrenewal without cause. Senator Selby added that notices of intent to renew would bind administrators to renew faculty. The proposal is trying to ensure that more notices of intent to renew are issued. Senator Freeman observed that financial exigency might be a case where such notice is not binding.

Past President Dark said that notices of intent to renew was not supposed to be included in this document, because the section concerns nonrenewal. In FS EB this was discussed and it was supposed to be removed.

Senator Butler noted that even though administrators may have promised to issue more genuine notices of intent to renew or not renew if this proposal is passed, future administrators will not be bound to such promises. However if we change the FH, we will be stuck with the shorter notice time.

Senator Padgett Walsh said that the goal should be to stop abusive practice rather than change policy. There is nothing in the current FH language that requires administrators to send out so many notices of intent not to renew. There is no problem in the policy itself.

Senator Bigelow suggested that there should be a change to convert nonrenewal notices into commitments not to rehire. Senator Selby replied that she thought such a policy might result in good faculty being let go.

Senator Monroe asked what advantage is gained by shortening notice time to six months. Is it because of budget uncertainty that decisions cannot be made? If everyone receives notice of nonrenewal, then no one receive notice of renewal. The notice does not serve the clarification function that the AAUP claims because faculty do not know whether the notice is genuine or not. Does six months resolve the uncertainty? Senator Selby replied that it solves it well enough. A prediction is still being made, but better information about the budget and enrollment is available. She added that this policy affects only NTE faculty who have been at ISU for three or more years; new lecturers get no notice. If the budget “goes sour,” presumably some faculty can be let go. The proposal focuses on those departments that heavily use these NTE positions. With six more months, they have better enrollment projections and a better sense of the need for courses.

Senator Padgett Walsh replied that administrators can still give that six month information now; they just choose not to do it. One serious problem with the current situation is that the administrators give our nonrenewal notices and NTE faculty never hear anything else. NTE faculty already provide significant flexibility to budgets and

course scheduling. Having a meaningful one year's notice would be a better outcome all around. The administration should try to ensure that notice is meaningful. Senator Selby replied that meaningful notice was the goal of this proposal. She couldn't see how else to achieve meaningful notice.

Past President Dark said that she is even more convinced that this proposal is bad. These procedural issues on campus have been referred to as abuses. There has been a promise from administrators that this practice will stop. People have been educated about the problem and people will take action. But if we adopt the current proposal, we will be going against the advice of AAUP, and ISU strives to comply with their recommendations. She would feel very uncomfortable going against their recommendation.

Senator Selby replied that she has had many discussions about NTE faculty. Administrators have promised to change to longer contracts. But she heard no such promises if the deadline for notice is left at twelve months. Past President Dark replied that longer contracts have more impact on the number of people who receive notices. Senator Selby replied that it would have an impact on the *frequency* with which people receive such notice.

Senator Sturm observed that the discussion has shown that the current situation is not good. But there has been a significant amount of concern that the proposal would create a better situation. Although he respected the hard work that went into crafting the proposal, he was confident that FS could come up with a more elegant solution. He asked senators not to rush to judgment on this motion.

By a voice vote the motion failed, although it did receive some support.

VI. New Business

A. PRS Changes to Handbook – [S14-19] Dark

Senator Freeman made the following motion on behalf of CALS caucus:

We move that a vote on S14-19 be postponed to Fall 2015. Because the PRS forms the basis for every faculty evaluation it is critical that we have the opportunity to fully discuss the proposed changes with department faculty and seek their input. With the compressed Senate meeting schedule at the end of the academic year, many of our departments have no faculty meetings scheduled between the distribution of this docket item in preparation of the first reading on April 21 and the potential second reading and vote on May 5. Postponement until fall will allow us to have meaningful departmental discussions and more accurately present the desire of the faculty who have elected us to represent them.

The motion passed with one dissenting voice. Discussion of the proposal continued.

Past President Dark, who chaired the PRS task force, said that the proposed FH language implements the recommendations of the PRS task force. Their aim was to provide guidance and uniformity across campus. The task force examined more than 100 PRS

from all parts of campus. They also took into consideration the task force report on engaged scholarship. They asked what a PRS should look like when it has a number of functions, including evaluation of faculty (for P&T, post-tenure review, and annual reviews). The PRS was initially introduced in 1999 as a tool for P&T of tenure eligible faculty. Since then the benefits of having a PRS have become more apparent. It is an important tool in all faculty evaluation. Consequently, faculty should be more careful in constructing their PRSs. The first recommendation is that all new or prospective faculty should receive an annotated PRS right away. The task force supplied a generic template, but recommends that each college develop its own.

The task force had a variety of recommendations about the content of the PRS. First, the task force recommended expanding the number of categories of effort. Currently there are four areas: (1) research and creative activity, (2) teaching, (3) institutional service, and (4) extension and professional practice. The task force decided that these categories do not fully capture the varieties of work that faculty do. While they did not wish to create too many categories, they wanted to capture the major types of activities that faculty do. They recommended seven categories. The second major recommendation is to mandate use of percentages in PRSs. The task force determined that these percentages should express the proportion of effort expected from faculty. This will give guidance to faculty about how much time they should be spending on each of the areas of position responsibility. She added that the proportion of effort is over several years. So a faculty member cannot conclude from an especially busy week for service that she has performed her entire service for the year.

The task force recommended that PRSs be developed for all faculty, including NTE faculty. They recommended expanding the mediation process to NTE faculty.

The task force also recommended that the PRS stipulate a formal review date. For post-tenure faculty, that date might be the date of the next post-tenure review. Furthermore, the task force recommended a more formal description of who is involved in development of a faculty member's PRS.

Senator Freeman said that three of the current categories came from Ernest Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered*. "Scholarship of Integration" was not included as a category. Boyer thought that extension and outreach/professional practice are the same, but they are not. An extension appointment is a financial arrangement, not a formal faculty position. But on Boyer's account, lots of faculty are doing extension work that is not currently listed. This would complicate external review.

Senator Freeman added that the "should" in "should not be divided into fractions smaller than 5%" suggests that departments have the option of complying. He added that the restriction may lead to some work being unrecognized. For example, if editorial work takes less than 5% of time, then it should not be listed. But then the faculty member has no professional service listed and reviewers would see no evidence of professional service.

Senator Freeman noted that institutional service is required for P&T: every faculty member has to perform at least 5% institutional service.

Past President Dark insisted that the FH section on PRSs holds that institutional service is required. With respect to percentages, Past President Dark underscored that these are guidelines and represent proportion of effort. If the activity occupies less than 5% of the faculty member's activities, it should not be listed on the PRS. Its not being listed will provide guidance to evaluators: the faculty member is not expected to do much activity in this area. The task force decided that the percentages were needed to clarify the difference in expectations between 40% research and 25% research responsibility.

Senator Freeman replied that he agrees that faculty do lots of activities that are not scholarship. And he agreed that it is important to have percentages, not to designate a difference in terms of quality but quantity. He worried, however, that by having so many categories, faculty members may not be able to list activities that they do because they fall below 5% effort. So instead of the PRS saying that the activity wasn't expected, the PRS will now say that the faculty member is not getting credit for it. To this point, Past President Dark responded that the task force was careful to say that proportions were not to be used as weighting unless the department decides that they are. Senator Freeman responded that any category with 0% tells the annual reviewer that the faculty member is not expected to do it. And reviews are based on the PRS. Past President Dark countered that reviews are based on materials, which are evaluated relative to the PRS. The PRS should not be regarded as a straightjacket. There need to be a sufficient number of categories to recognize the wide variety of responsibilities that faculty have. If your department does not have expectations for you in one of the categories, that does not mean that you will not be recognized for performance in those areas. Instead the change in responsibilities should be a basis for renegotiation of the PRS.

Senator Bigelow said that he too was concerned about the restriction to 5%. He said that professional service is considered at annual reviews. He worried that this could be spun as a negative. If the PRS does not list professional service but the faculty member performed it, the reviewer could say that the faculty member should not have spent her time doing it. He also raised a concern about the number of categories; with a smaller number of categories, similar activities could be lumped together to compose sufficiently large percentages. Past President Dark countered that the four categories do not recognize work in administration. Many faculty do not have administrative responsibilities, but some do. Furthermore, this proposal enabled the PRS to distinguish between institutional service and professional service. Serving as editor for a journal is not service to the university, but service to the profession. FH makes clear that not all service is the same. With this distinction, the PRS can recognize that faculty members are doing service, just not to the university. With four categories, it's unclear where professional service should go. It's not extension. In Psychology, it's listed under research, even though it clearly does not fit there.

Senator Beattie was concerned that the number of categories removes flexibility. If a faculty member is elected to a professional board, she might do less institutional service. Senator Beattie's current PRS provides her enough flexibility to accommodate this. She agrees that all faculty should do institutional service. With the task force's proposal, Senator Beattie would have to renegotiate her PRS every year to reflect differences in her professional activities. Past President Dark replied that the percentages are meant to be guidelines. 5% of effort may cover 1% to 8% of effort. She added that institutional service already is a category listed in FH. The task force's proposal does not change this. Instead, what is changed is where to list professional service. It never should have been listed under institutional service. Senator Beattie replied that when the PRS is used for P&T review, it is not treated simply as a guideline. Instead, committee members review the candidate's performance in terms of these percentages. Past President Dark responded that the task force doubted this claim: when faculty are evaluated for P&T, research and creative activity are the main focus. But only scholarly products reviewed externally belong in this category. When faculty are assessed by external reviewers, it's on the basis of their research activity.

(A motion was passed with some dissension to extend the meeting for five minutes.)

Senator Sturm said that he did not see anything in the proposal that would prevent a faculty member and chair from agreeing to a PRS that lists 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. In his experience, P&T does not evaluate research only. He is aware of cases where faculty were denied promotion because of poor teaching. But he agreed that he had never seen someone denied promotion because of poor service or extension work.

Senator Freeman said that there is nothing in FH that says that institutional service must be a category in the PRS. It is a requirement for tenure-track faculty. Nothing says that a faculty member must be effective in every possible area of position responsibility. Instead the language allows faculty members the opportunity to list items in their PRS that are helpful to them. Past President Dark said that the requirement for institutional service is listed somewhere in the introductory sections of the PRS. Senator Freeman countered that it does not say that exactly those items have to be listed. For example, Senator Freeman does not have an extension appointment, so no extension activity is listed in his PRS. But in the FH section on P&T criteria, institutional service is required. Past President Dark replied that P&T is an evaluation, and evaluations are supposed to be relative to the PRS. All important categories of responsibility need to be listed in the PRS. The task force tried to make clear that for people other than tenured professors, the proportions of effort should reflect the expectations regarding promotion, tenure, or advancement in the department. Senator Freeman replied that that is not written in FH 5.1.1.5. Past President Dark said that it is listed somewhere in FH.

Senator Seeger said that separating extension from outreach is confusing. He said that in Landscape Architecture, faculty describe themselves as performing extension and outreach. He recommended that the committee take a closer look at how the activity is defined by that office. Senator Seeger said that his activities were evaluated point by

point with respect to his PRS. Past President Dark said that the task force found extension and outreach to be very contentious. One person on the committee representing extension commented that he found it strange that extension and outreach were conflated. The task force report on engaged scholarship said that extension is a formal appointment. People on the PRS task force read the engaged scholarship report as suggesting that “extension” should be eliminated and replaced with “engagement and outreach.” But a strong contingent of the PRS committee insisted that there needs to be a category of extension for people who have extension appointments. Senator Seeger replied that as an extension specialist, he is doing outreach. But he could understand how someone could do outreach without an extension appointment.

Senator Ryan said that PRS percentages are definitely used in P&T. Past President Dark said that not every PRS lists percentages of effort. What is primarily evaluated in P&T is the extent to which the faculty member has made contributions in research and creative activity. Senator Ryan disputed this, saying it is not true and does not hold in every college.

VII. Good of the Order

Senator Sturm reminded LAS senators that there would be a brief caucus meeting following adjournment.

VIII. Adjournment

President-Elect Wallace moved and Senator Sturm seconded. The meeting adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

NEXT MEETING TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2015-- 3:30-5:00 P.M., GREAT HALL, MU

Respectfully submitted April 26, 2015,

Annemarie Butler
Faculty Senate Secretary