

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES  
MAY 1, 2018 – 3:30–5:00 P.M.  
SUN ROOM, MEMORIAL UNION**

**Present:** Al Shihabi, D.; Anderson, M.; Andreasen, C.; Armstrong, P.; Beitz, D.; Beresnev, I.; Boyles, J.; Brown, J.; Bugeja, M.; Burke, B.; Butler, A.; Cantor, D.; Carr, C.; Chilcott, T.; Cliber, J.; Cochran, E.; Cornick, N.; R. Davis; Day, T.; Dekkers, J.; Delate, K.; Dilla, W.; Dollisso, A.; Ekkekakis, P.; Evans, J.; Faber, C.; Freeman, S.; Friedel, J.; Gomes, C.; Grass, S.; Gudmunson, C.; Hanson, V.; Hartzler, B.; Herrnsstadt, S.; Johnson, D.; Kimber, M.; Krier, D.; Lonergan, E.; Looney, M.; Lutz, R.; Martin, P.; Martin, R.; Meissner, C.; Monroe, J.; Montabon, F.; Munkvold, G.; Ockey, G.; O'Connor, A.; Padgett-Walsh, C.; Perkins, J.; Peterson, D.; Rayburn, C.; Roe, K.; Rosa, J.; Royston, N.; Russell, D.; Ryan, S.; Schneider, I.; Schrier, T.; Schwab, C.; Seeger, C.; Sponseller, B.; Sturm, J.; Tener, J.; Wallace, R.; Wheeler, A.; Williams, C.; Winer, E.; Winter, A.; Wu, H.; Yin, Y.; Zaffarano, B.; Zarecor, K.; Zimmerman, J.

**Absent:** Bain, C.; Borich, T.; Braun, S.; Cook, K.L.; Fiore, A.M.; Gassmann, A.; Luecke, G.; Mackiewicz, J.; Muench, J.; Parsa, R.; Pellack, L.; Rajan, H.; Sturges, L.; Westgate, M.

**Substitutes:** J. Rursch for Bigelow, T.; D. Winham for C. Campbell; A. Elobeid for Kreider, B.; S. Bennett for Marcketti, S.; H. Wu for Niemi, J.; K. Gilbert for Schalinske, K.; M. Shelley for Waggoner, K.

**Guests:** Wickert, J. (SVPP); Bratsch-Prince, D. (Assoc. Prov); VanDerZanden, A.M. (Assoc. Prov); Rosacker, E. (University Relations); McNichols, T. (Parliamentarian); Clingan-Fisher, D. (Ombuds Office); Schweers, R. (SVPP Office)

**I. Call to Order**

**A. Seating of Substitute Senators**

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

**II. Consent Agenda**

**A. Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting – April 17, 2018 - [S17/M/8]**

**B. Agenda for May 1, 2018 - [S17/A/9]**

**C. Docket Calendar – [S17/C/9]**

**D. Council/Committee Annual Reports [S17- 25]**

Senator Freeman moved to accept the consent agenda. Senator Wallace seconded. The motion was adopted.

**III. Special Order: Approval of Spring 2018 Graduation List [S17-26]**

Senator Armstrong moved to accept the list. The motion was adopted.

**IV. Special Order: Memorial Resolutions [S17-27]**

A moment of silence was observed to honor colleagues who had passed away.

- V. Special Order: Annual Promotion and Tenure Report – SVPP Jonathan Wickert**  
BOR approved the recommendations in April 2018. The promotions were as follows: 52 were promoted to professor and 2 were not; 28 were promoted to associate professor with tenure and one was not; one was promoted to associate professor. In total, there were 81 successful cases for promotion and 3 not, of which one received an extension. This 95% success rate is consistent with previous years.

Of 80 post-tenure reviews, 75 were meeting expectations (94%) and 5 were below expectations, which required implementing action plans.

Provost Wickert said that it is clear that department and college P&T committees take the work seriously. The review materials are getting better every year, not just in terms of the candidates' work, but how the case for promotion is made. Provost Wickert credited the programming by Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince with effective training on annual review and P&T processes. Provost Wickert also credited improved clarity about the standards for credit on the tenure clock at the time of hire.

**VI. Announcements and Remarks**

**A. Faculty Senate President**

President Day thanked senators for their active and civil participation in the debates about term faculty changes.

**B. Faculty Senate President-Elect**

None

**C. Senior Vice President and Provost**

Provost Wickert observed that he had attended many meetings in the Sun Room, but the curtains are never open to let sun into the Sun Room.

**Budget**

Provost Wickert reported that the legislature is making progress. The House and Senate agreed on targets. There is a proposal (but not yet voted upon) to make the midyear reversion permanent. This would reset the base. The proposal would make an additional \$8.3 million in additional funding, and BOR would decide how to allocate. ISU's base reduction was \$5.4 million, and Iowa received a similar reduction, while UNI received no reduction. There has been no discussion about how BOR will allocate the proposed \$8.3 million.

ISU has requested money for the Veterinary Diagnostic Lab, including \$1 million of planning money and \$12.5 million for each of the next five years. This is short of the full ask, but Provost Wickert was encouraged that the request continues to be included in state budgeting plans.

There has been no decrease in the total money for the Student Innovation Center, but the allocations have been deferred to future budget years. This creates a cash flow problem for ISU.

There has been a lot of discussion about salary, but no decisions yet. We need clarity about the state allocations first. ISU President Wintersteen has been clear that she understands that last year's 0% raises weigh heavily on faculty and everyone else. She thinks it is important to do something.

Senator Burke asked about long-term plans to address salary compression problems. She noted that one common reason faculty cited for leaving the university was salary. She wanted to know the administration's long-term plan, not just a one year plan. Provost Wickert agreed that it is a long-term issue. In LAS, the different branches (social sciences, humanities and arts, physical sciences) were compared to peer groups for salaries at each rank. In general, we fall below the market. In COE and areas of CALS, we are at market. CVM is at market. In COB, we are very below market. This problem will persist for years and is not something that can be addressed quickly. Some years ago, Dean Schmittmann addressed some compression in some areas in her college. ISU administration will continue to look at this very important year. Provost Wickert acknowledged that having a year of salary freeze preceded by 1% raises across the board made matters worse.

### **Commencement**

On Thursday, 533 graduate students will graduate. Professor Alicia Carriquiry will be the commencement speaker. On Saturday there will be two ceremonies for undergraduate graduation. Honorary degrees will be award to Dwight Ink and Jon Kinzenbaw. Provost Wickert thanked Professors Mack Shelley and Carl Bern for their nominations.

### **Congratulations to President Day**

Provost Wickert thanked President Day for an excellent year, and said that he enjoyed working with him.

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

None

## **VII. Unfinished Business**

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

Senator Butler moved to divide the motion into three parts: (1) the parts concerning nomenclature, the reaffirmation of term faculty as part of one faculty, who participate in shared governance and enjoy academic freedom, and the unification of appointment, renewal, and advancement procedures; (2) the professor of practice part; and (3) the teaching professor part. Senator Freeman seconded. President Day noted that the motion was not debatable. The motion was adopted with considerable dissension.

**Amendment about Committee Composition**

Senator Butler moved to amend the motion about formation of advancement and renewal review committees. Department governance documents would specify whether term faculty are to serve on the committees. Senator Freeman seconded.

Senator Padgett Walsh moved to amend the amendment. He proposed to change the language to specify that term faculty at or above the rank are eligible (but not required) to serve on these committees. The motion was seconded.

The amendment was adopted with some dissenting votes.  
The amended motion was adopted with some dissenting votes.

**Amendment about Research Professors**

Senator Evans moved to modify the requirements for research professors. The motion was adopted.

**Motion (1) about Nomenclature and Principles**

The motion was adopted with one dissenting vote.

**Amendment about Minimum Qualifications**

Senator Krier moved to amend the motion to include minimum qualifications for all “professor” titles, including professor of practice. He said that hires for professor positions will continue to be subject to advertisement. But, he argued, academic freedom is anchored in tenure. The concept of “professor” is linked publicly and professionally to tenure, Ph.D.s, and publications. He pointed out that this proposal was consistent with policies at peer universities, e.g. Syracuse University. Senator Wallace seconded.

Senator Looney expressed concern that this proposal was contrary to Senator Monroe’s amendment, which was adopted last meeting. That is, this proposal undoes the rigorous process of evaluation of lecturers to move into professor of teaching titles.

Senator Zarecor expressed confusion. As she understood it, anyone hired with the title “professor” must have the same minimum degree. Senator Krier interjected: or the same waiver process. Senator Zarecor continued. In COD, this amendment would undermine the professor of practice titles. The purpose of those titles was to allow COD to set profession-oriented qualifications in design licensure. In her field, she would expect the minimum qualification to be an architecture license. But an architecture license would never be a minimum qualification for tenure-track faculty in architecture. Senator Krier replied that there already exists a waiver process in FH 3.1.3 that allows for cases in which the person lacks the typical qualifications. Senator Zarecor asked why we would set up a title that would require everyone to go through a waiver process.

Senator Peterson observed that Senator Krier's amendment would require that every faculty position, regardless of rank (and including department chair), has to have the same minimum qualification. He objected: for full professor, the candidate has to have a record commensurate with rank. But Senator Krier's amendment is explicit to the contrary. Senator Peterson said that this amendment would have implications for senior hires. Senator Krier replied that the different ranks aren't pulled out. Senator Peterson said that Senator Krier was introducing new language, which would make FH read like the work of an HR bureaucrat.

Senator Rosa pointed out that the term "professor" has existed longer than tenure. Tenure was established to defend the academy against persecution. COB wants the ability to bring in people who have accumulated wisdom over years of management and practice, who can profess at the highest levels. Such people will not meet the qualifications for tenure professors. He did not see room for a compromise.

Senator Krier noted that term professors are a relatively new category. This policy will affect 600+ faculty. By instituting this policy, the number of faculty with the title "professor" will increase by 44%, half of whom will lack a terminal degree. This change would fundamentally alter the link between the title "professor," Ph.D., and tenure.

Senator Herrnstadt asked why we retain the "lecturer" title. He agreed with Senator Zarecor that this proposal would make it more difficult to hire and the different ranks.

Senator Monroe expressed sympathy to the principle of preserving the value of terminal degrees, especially in programs where a Ph.D. is needed to teach. But he shared the concern that this amendment would require waivers for all hires into the professor of practice track. He attempted to reword the amendment to save the spirit of Senator Krier's amendment, but senators quickly pointed out that the modifications would not work. "Drat!"

Senator Krier said that the amendment was as flexible as possible for different practices in colleges and departments. This does not set impossible standards for assistant, associate, and professor ranks. All it does is underline that all professors shall meet a minimum standard. If the minimum isn't good enough, it shouldn't be a minimum.

Senator Cliber rejected Senator Krier's assertion. The motion does not weaken the link between tenure and Ph.D. Instead, it strengthens the link between the title of "professor" and teaching. And teaching is what we do at this university. He rejected the claim that having a terminal degree makes you a better teacher.

Past President Sturm observed that successful amendments succeed because they increase the policy's flexibility so that departments can act in their best interests. He expressed concern that Senator Krier's amendment would limit flexibility.

Senator Dilla said that the point of term faculty reform was to give a path to term faculty who aren't research faculty, but are teaching-oriented. While he appreciated the defense of the academy, he asked that we also think about faculty. In his department, there are four senior lecturers, two of whom have terminal degrees. If this amendment were to pass, only two of the faculty would be eligible to advance beyond "senior lecturer." He did not think that would be fair. It would fail to recognize the efforts of term faculty.

Senator Freeman echoed the call to provide flexibility to departments.

Senator Krier said that faculty who do not have terminal degrees would have to follow the waiver process which already exists in FH. He noted, however, that it is strange to have faculty without terminal degrees teaching in the graduate program. If we don't value the terminal degree, why are we selling them to our students?

Senator Zarecor replied that her college does not offer Ph.D.s, only MAs. She hopes that her graduates will be successful getting licenses. But it would be unreasonable to require a license as the minimum qualification for tenure-eligible architecture faculty. She supported separate minimum qualifications for teaching and tenure-eligible faculty.

Senator Armstrong said that while this amendment would not affect his department, he thought the reasons against the proposal were good. If waivers would be needed for all professor of practice hires, it's not a good policy.

The motion was lost.

**Motion (2): Professor of Practice**

Senator Butler said that she continued to harbor doubts about the rank of assistant for professor of practice track. Senators replied that that point had been debated and lost at previous meetings.

The motion was adopted, 52 in favor, 13 against.

**Amendment Instituting "Assistant Professor" Rank in Teaching Professor Track**

In favor of the proposal, Senator Padgett Walsh said that the title "professor" could be used in advertisements and multiyear contracts would be offered. "Lecturer" hires would be one year or one semester. After three continuous years of employment, a lecturer would become assistant professor. Senator Wallace seconded.

Senator Zarecor asked what happens when a lecturer is around and due for a third year review. Who decides when the lecturer goes up for assistant professor, relative to the third year review? Senator Padgett Walsh replied that if the lecturer's contract is renewed, the minimum contract is for two years and this proposal kicks in.

Senator Zarecor asked what input from faculty is required for the move from lecturer to assistant teaching professor. The chair could award a multiyear contract without any input. Senator Padgett Walsh acknowledged that this was possible. Faculty input was not required. Senator Freeman (looking to Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince for confirmation) said that if a chair gives a multiyear contract, that is renewal. FH says that renewal requires peer review.

Senator Peterson asked whether the move from lecturer to assistant professor would be considered a promotion and involve a raise. President Day said no.

Senator Burke asked whether this reclassification would take place regardless of whether the faculty member has an MA or Ph.D. Senator Padgett Walsh said yes.

Senator Krier said that any lecturer is renewed after three years automatically is an assistant professor, regardless of educational qualifications. President Day said yes.

Senator Looney supported the proposal. After passing rigorous review of their work, the title expresses that we value their contribution to the university.

Senator Krier asked whether this was a mandatory review: is the faculty member up or out? Senator Padgett Walsh said that the renewal process determines whether the faculty member stays.

Past President Sturm asked whether the proposal is that the maximum number of years for the title “lecturer” is three years. Senator Padgett Walsh said that the proposal requires that the three years be continuous. A faculty member who is intermittently employed would not be guaranteed the reclassification.

Senator Dekkers said that the minimum qualifications may be different for lecturers and professors. If someone comes in meeting the minimum qualifications for lecturer, this proposal would create no opposition to moving to assistant teaching professor. President Day said that once a faculty member is in the system, the process of peer review allows for promotion and advancement.

Senator Dilla asked whether this proposal would automatically classify lecturers on three-year contracts as assistant teaching professors. President Day replied that this policy would set the destination. An implementation plan needs to be developed once the policy is adopted. He observed that the same happened in CVM after we adopted the clinical faculty policy.

Senator Burke asked whether this proposal addresses the desire by term faculty with Ph.D.s (and the required 6-8 years of training and education) to distinguish themselves from term faculty with MAs. President Day replied that this proposal does not address that concern.

Senator Ryan said that in COE a number of faculty supported retaining the “lecturer” title for temporary appointments.

Senator Herrstadt agreed with Senator Burke’s concerns. He thought that there should be a one-year limit on “lecturer” title appointments. Then it’s up or out for the candidate. He was concerned about awarding the same rank to people with different qualifications. He added that he was worried about year-to-year appointments for lecturers. President Day replied that the adopted policies already prohibit four years of one-year appointments. This amendment concerns titles. Senator Herrstadt replied that this amendment would take away the possibility of three-year appointments for lecturers.

Past President Sturm observed that the omnibus proposal includes a process for advancement for lecturers to associate professor of teaching. This amendment effectively moves that process in name only back two years. If this amendment were voted down, there would still be a process for advancement.

Senator Freeman said that he thought the amendment provides a good balance. Without it, he thought departments might prefer to hire teaching term faculty as assistant professors of practice instead of in the teaching track.

The amendment was adopted, with 51 in favor, 24 against.

**Motion (3): Teaching Faculty**

The motion was adopted with some dissent.

Senator Bugeja asked whether the percentages of term faculty as stated in FH would be monitored this year. President Day said that the percentages in FH are targets we set and aspire to. We do not have control or authority over those percentages. We can work with the administration and the provost. Senator Bugeja said that with the passage of these motions, the matter is more important than ever. Nationally, accreditors have placed schools on probation if the number of term faculty becomes too high. He noted that NYU and VCU are on probation. He does not want to see this happen to ISU. High dependence on term faculty affects service loads for tenure-eligible faculty. It affects the budget. And the budget affects graduate education.

**VIII. Special Order**

**A. Recognition of Retiring Senators**

**B. Passing of the Gavel**

President Day was pressed for time. He passed the gavel and “disappeared into the shrubbery.”

**C. Seating of New Senators**

President Martin seated the new senators.

President Martin identified three guidelines he wanted FS to follow during his presidency. First, he reminded senators that we are one faculty, who embrace diversity, inclusion, and equity. Second, as a faculty senate, we can make a difference. We must voice our concerns and share ideas. We believe in shared governance. Only through debate can we know what we need to change and what can remain the same. Although the majority decides, we must listen carefully to minority viewpoints. He encouraged senators to participate and voice their opinions. Third, he asked senators to remember why we are here. As faculty, we came to ISU for teaching, scholarship, mentoring, extension, and outreach. We need to support faculty to do their best possible scholarship, engaged teaching, and foster close connections with others. He encouraged senators to reach out to FS Council chairs and others to develop priorities for next year.

**IX. Special Order: Reorganization of the Department of Supply Chain and Information Systems into two departments**

Senator Montabon said that the proposal is to create two departments from one department. SCIS is getting quite large, and the two parts have distinctive missions and programs. This proposal would reduce some of the administrative burden. This would enable the disparate interests of each program to be represented in FS. The proposal would enable the two departments to create and market separate brands.

Senator Freeman observed that FH requires FS to make a decision: either tell the Provost that we support this proposal and recommend that it be sent to ISU President Wintersteen, or tell the Provost that we do not support it.

Senator Butler moved to suspend the rules so that a vote on FS's recommendation to the Provost could be taken at this first reading. Senator Freeman seconded. The motion was adopted with one dissenting vote.

Senator Dekkers observed that there are several departments that are large and multifaceted, often the result of departmental mergers. He asked what the budget implications are of this division. Senator Montabon replied that the marginal cost is very low. There are already a department chair and associate department chair; this reorganization would promote the associate department chair to department chair as well. This would add 1/9 salary to the budget.

Senator Winer said that he was uncomfortable with the precedent. Following this precedent, a department with 2000 undergraduate students and 45 faculty could break into six departments. Many of us would like greater representation across university administration, and we could claim administrative overhead.

Senator Dilla said that the division would yield departments of comparable size to other departments in the college. Accounting has 23 faculty and Finance has 26. The number of

majors is approximately the same as SC and IS. In response to Senator Winer's concern, Senator Dilla thought that the standard should be consistency in COB, not COE.

Senator Ekkekakis supported Senator Winer's concern. He noted that difficult budgetary times require departments to make do with fewer resources.

Senator Zarecor said that she supported the division. If the department wants to spend their resources to support a second department, then FS should support it.

Senator Montabon stressed brand identity. COB wants to be able to present consistent messages to external constituencies. With the current combined department, the college presents a muddled message.

Senator Williams reported that he consulted a friend who works in supply chain management. His friend thought that it was strange that the two departments were merged into a single department. He recommended the change.

The motion was adopted with some dissenting votes.

**X. New Business**

**A. FH 7.2.2.2 Discrimination [S17-28] – Sponseller**

Senator Sponseller said that these proposed changes bring FH into alignment with university policy. No comments.

**XI. Good of the Order**

Senator Wallace congratulated senators on their good work on the term faculty changes.

President Martin reminded new senators of the brief orientation session following the meeting. There will also be a brief orientation about parliamentary procedure in September.

**XII. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

**NEXT MEETING TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2018 – 3:30-5:00 P.M., SUN ROOM, MU**

Respectfully submitted September 4, 2018,

Annemarie Butler  
Faculty Senate Secretary