

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
FACULTY SENATE MEETING AGENDA
NOVEMBER 10, 2015 – 3:30–5:00 P.M.
GREAT HALL, MEMORIAL UNION**

Present: Ackermann, M.; Arndt, G.; Bigelow, T.; Bowler, N.; Boyles, J.; Brown, J.; Burke, B.; Butler, A.; Dekkers, J.; Derrick, T.; Dilla, W.; Dollisso, A.; Essner, J.; Evans, J.; Fei, S.; Freeman, S.; Gyll, M.; Haddad, M.; Harding, C.; Hartzler, B.; Jackson, R.; Jurenka, R.; Kim, S.; Leigh, P.; Looney, M.; Luecke, G.; Manu, A.; Martin, P.; Mennecke, B.; Munkvold, G.; Naegele, D.; Niemi, J.; Ockey, G.; Owen, M.; Post, C.; Retallick, M.; Roe, K.; Royston, N.; Russell, D.; Ryan, S.; Schaefer, V.; Schalinske, K.; Seeger, C.; Selby, M.; Stone, L.; Sturges, L.; Sturm, J.; Suzuki, Y.; Tener, J.; van der Valk, A.; Wallace, R.; Wang, Q.; Weber, E.; Winter, A.; Zaffarano, B.; Zarecor, K.

Absent: Bain, C.; Biggs, S.; Cornick, N.; Faber, C.; Fiore, A.M.; Godbey, E.; Herrnsstadt, S.; Hill, J.; King, D.; Krier, D.; Monroe, J.; Nelson, S.; O'Connor, A.; Padgett-Walsh, C.; Rajan, H.; Sanders, E.; Sponseller, B.; Stevenson, G.; Tian, J.; Waggoner, K.; Williams, C.;

Substitutes: W. Carter for Amidon, K.; J. Schroeter for Bhattacharya, J.; M. Kimber for Day, T.; S. Mickelson for Koziel, J.; S. Bradbury for Paschke, T.; J. Kushkowski for Pellack, L.; S. Francis for Reddy, M.

Guests: Bratsch-Prince, D. (Assoc. Provost); Holger, D. (Assoc. Provost); Rosacker, E. (University Relations); Rippke, S. (Parliamentarian); Lawson, T. (P&S Council); Dark, V. (Psych); Newell, J. (ISU Daily)

I. Call to Order

A. Seating of Substitute Senators

President Wallace called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m. and seated the substitute senators.

II. Consent Agenda

A. Minutes of Faculty Senate October 20, 2015 - [S15/M/2]

B. Agenda for November 10, 2015 – [S15/A/3]

C. Docket Calendar – [S15/C/3]

Senator Schaefer moved to accept the consent agenda. Senator Martin seconded. The motion passed without dissension.

III. Announcements and Remarks

A. Faculty Senate President

President Wallace called senators' attention to the YWCA/Faculty Giving Tree and thanked participants for their generosity.

President Wallace said that there is a forthcoming proposal to merge the department of Anthropology with the department of World Languages and Cultures. FH 2.7 requires that FS have oversight of this process.

President Wallace encouraged senators to look at the current edition of *Inside Higher Education*, which has a story about ISU President Leath's efforts to help curb dangerous drinking and related behavior.

A meeting is being planned with the leaders of the faculty senates (or union) of the three Regents universities. This will likely take place early next semester. This will enable faculty at the three universities to identify issues of common concern and identify strategies to address them.

President Wallace encouraged senators to nominate themselves or others for President-Elect. The vote will take place at the January FS meeting.

B. Faculty Senate President-Elect

President-Elect Strum called senators' attention to two programs offered by the Department of Public Safety: Recognizing and Reporting Disturbing Behavior (RRDB) and Violent Incident Response Training (VIRT). People who would like further information should contact Lt. Elliott Florer (294-4428) or Ofc. Anthony Greiter (294-3009). Faculty should be aware of how to respond to a campus emergency. (President Wallace noted that DPS Director Stewart will speak at the December FS meeting.)

On the topic of Open Access, President-Elect Sturm noted the historic resignation of the 31 editorial board members of the journal LINGUA to protest Elsevier's policies on pricing. They will band together to create a new OA journal, GLOSSA. Many peer universities are passing resolutions to support OA. He encouraged senators to think about whether they would support a resolution endorsing OA and asked them to think about the impacts on P&T and careers.

Senator Tener asked President-Elect Sturm to make available to senators the information concerning LINGUA.

C. Senior Vice President and Provost

Provost Wickert was unable to attend the meeting because he was at a meeting with other Regents universities provosts about finding a consultant for the Regents Regional Center in Des Moines.

Associate Provost Holger reported on the Higher Learning Commission's accreditation team visit. The review team conducted a number of small meetings with people specifically selected for their areas of expertise. The net effect was that the team was able to have their questions of clarification answered by knowledgeable about those areas. In general, the team sought to confirm what was reported in the documents submitted by ISU. The team said that they thought the faculty, staff, and students with whom they met

were candid. At the end of the visit, the team was given the opportunity to ask for more information. No further requests have been received. Associate Provost Holger takes all of this to indicate that the team likely has no major reservations about our reaccreditation. In the next two weeks, the team will compose its draft report. This will not be a final decision, but it will give us a clear indication of what their recommendation will be. The decision will be issued later in 2016. Associate Provost Holger credited the good policies and processes laid out clearly in FH for making the review process run so smoothly.

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

P&S Council: Ms. Lawson said that the Council is acquiring more information about whether the Emerging Leaders Academy is restricted to those employees who are at pay grade P-35 or higher. They have secured agreement that the President-Elect of P&S Council is eligible to participate in the Emerging Leaders Academy regardless of pay grade. The Council is also working on increasing the maximum number of credits from 3 to 4 for tuition repayment for P&S employees.

SG: No report

GPSS: No report

IV. Unfinished Business

President Wallace introduced the four motions by saying that the Executive Board decided to break S14-19 into four independent motions in order to isolate the controversial elements and vote on those directly. This was done in response to all of the feedback received. President Wallace thanked all of the senators for their comments.

A. Placement of Existing FH Sections Concerning PRS – [S14-19-1] – Dark

No comments. Motion passed with one dissenting vote.

B. NTE Faculty & the PRS Medication Procedure – [S14-19-2] – Dark

Senator Bradbury expressed concern about the haste with which senators were being asked to act. This meeting was the first opportunity to discuss the revised independent motions and she was concerned that (having just received the agenda items the preceding Thursday) senators did not have sufficient opportunity to discuss the changes with their constituencies. Senator Bradbury moved to postpone vote on S14-19-2. President-Elect Sturm seconded the motion.

Senator Freeman said that there had been ample time for feedback on the proposals. He did not see a need for further delay.

Senator Brunner thought another month would be helpful for faculty to talk about the three remaining motions with their departments.

Senator Martin did not see anything new in the proposals and did not support delaying the vote. If anything, he argued, the language was simpler and more straightforward.

Senator Schaefer said that his caucus had discussed this issue enough.

The motion to postpone the vote on S14-19-2 failed, though it garnered some support.

Senator Tener raised the concern that the new language did not highlight the change that was being made to FH. The new language says that *faculty* may pursue PRS mediation, but it does not make clear that NTE faculty are eligible. Professor Dark replied that “faculty” applies to all faculty. Senator Tener thought that it would be better to make clear that NTE faculty are eligible for mediation too.

S14-19-2 passed with one dissenting vote.

C. Procedures Concerning Creation and Maintenance of PRSs – [S14-19-3] – Dark
Professor Dark said that this motion ensures that there is a formal review date for PRSs.

Senator Butler moved that vote on S14-19-3 and S14-19-4 be postponed to the December FS meeting. (Parliamentarian Rippke assured senators that parliamentary procedure permits doing so, even though just one of the motions is under consideration.) Senator Bradbury seconded the motion. Senator Butler said that these two motions contain the controversial content and it would be appropriate for senators to discuss this with their constituencies. She added that if the changes were approved in December instead of November, they would still go into effect in the same edition of FH. So she saw no special urgency for voting on the motion at this meeting.

Senator Freeman said that CALS caucus had discussed these issues since April when they were first proposed. CALS faculty have nothing more to discuss on this matter.

Senator Tener asked Professor Dark whether the substantive comments that the PRS Task Force received were incorporated into S14-19-3 or S14-19-4. Professor Dark replied that only S14-19-4 was substantively changed in light of comments. Senator Tener concluded that there were substantive differences between the proposals from April and the current proposal. So he supported delaying the vote one month.

President-Elect Sturm also supported delaying the vote one month. Given that some senators were asking for further time to be better informed, he thought it was best to delay the vote.

Senator Martin didn't think that the delay would change the discussion any. Because of the Thanksgiving break, there would not be many opportunities for departments to meet prior to the December meeting.

The motion to postpone failed, with thirteen senators supporting it.

S14-19-3 passed with one dissenting vote.

D. The PRS Description of Areas of Position Responsibility – [S14-19-4] - Dark
Professor Dark described this motion as “the hard one.” There were major points of contention brought out by the comments received by the PRS Task Force. The proposed motion removed the seven areas of position responsibility and instead provided a list of possible areas of position responsibility. This provides faculty with the flexibility to define the areas as appropriate for their positions. The motion retains the Task Force’s requirement that there be some differential weighting/importance/proportion assigned to the different position responsibilities. There needs to be some way to communicate clearly in the PRS how two different faculty assignments in the same department or college differ. (For example, if one faculty member teaches six classes per year and another teaches one class per year, the difference should be reflected in the proportions assigned to teaching responsibilities.) This information will help evaluators understand better what the faculty members were expected to do.

Senator Zarecor reported that faculty members in the department of Architecture had concerns about how the PRS is set up in relation to the requirements for P&T. The language of the PRS policy establishes more and different categories from those required for P&T. She wondered whether the FH sections on P&T would be revised. She expressed the concern that the PRS should not supersede understandings of the P&T categories. Professor Dark replied that the PRS is used for more evaluations than just P&T. So the PRS Task Force tried to keep separate the question of categories for P&T and the description of position responsibilities in the PRS. Scholarship is still the basis for promotion. But the PRS needs to clearly communicate the expectations for scholarship and reflect that someone with higher teaching than another faculty member will have correspondingly different expectations for scholarship.

Senator Zarecor replied that Professor Dark’s response concerns percentages of effort. She reiterated that her question concerned the number of areas of position responsibility. The PRS may have more than four categories. If that is done, there’s a mismatch between the PRS and P&T. She thought that FH 5 should be clarified in light of the new PRS policy. Professor Dark replied that there is no intention to modify the FH section on P&T.

Senator Freeman said that the P&T policy makes clear that the primary basis for promotion is scholarship. Second is effectiveness in areas of position responsibility. Third is institutional service. So the adoption of more PRS categories would not have any impact on P&T categories. Even with the new PRS policy, faculty will be promoted primarily on the basis of scholarship (including scholarship of teaching, of extension, and scholarship understood as research or creative activity). At most, the new PRS policy would have an effect on the second area of evaluation for P&T (effectiveness in areas of position responsibility). The PRS policy makes clear that the faculty member and his or her department chair can negotiate what position responsibilities he or she has.

Senator Bradbury agreed with Senator Zarecor’s concerns that FH 3 and FH 5 do not match. She expressed concern about variances in understandings of extension and

outreach responsibilities. She thought that postponing the vote on S14-19-4 would enable faculty to discuss the matter with their departments. She moved to postpone the vote until the December meeting. Senator Tener seconded. The motion to postpone was defeated, with ten supporting votes.

Senator Bigelow thought that the new language successfully achieved the flexibility Professor Dark described. The list of areas provides “examples,” and no PRS is required to list every single area. He said that the new motion addressed the concerns that his constituents had.

Senator Dekkers asked for clarification about the sentence stating that the PRS is a “public document.” Professor Dark replied that the PRS is a generalized job description, not a confidential personnel document. The PRS is a public document in the same sense that the budget book is a public document. We’re not publicizing PRSs, but if someone wants to look at it, he or she may. Senator Dekkers replied that he supports transparency, but he was concerned that that sentence would be likely to be misunderstood. He thought that departments should determine who has access to the PRS.

Senator Dekkers moved to remove the third sentence in 3.4.1 concerning the PRS’s being a “public document.” Senator Owen seconded.

Senator Kushkowski said that the statement is helpful. In the library, when a faculty member was promotion to an administrative position, the member needed to amend the PRS. The faculty member wanted examples from other administrative PRSs in the library. When the faculty member asked HR, HR said that the PRSs are private personnel documents and they could not make any available. This language clarifies that the PRSs are available.

Senator Selby spoke against the motion. She said that she did not think that it was optional whether to make the PRS available upon request. As a public university, we are legally obligated to make this information available.

Senator Dekkers replied that he was not advocating that we break the law. But he did not see why that point needed to be emphasized in the FH section concerning PRSs. There are other documents and information which are publicly available too, but that point is not made in FH. Why is that point being made here with respect to PRSs?

Senator Munkvold concurred. He said that the motion to delete the sentence is not disputing whether the sentence is true, but whether it needs to be stated in FH.

Professor Dark replied that the sentence is included because Paul Tanaka (University Counsel) described the PRS that way. The PRS Task Force heard anecdotes in which unfair deals were made between department chairs and faculty members about position responsibilities and other faculty in the department were unaware. How do you prevent such deals? By making the PRS publicly available. In the past, some people have treated

the PRS as a private personnel document, when it is actually a generalized job description.

Senator Bigelow said that one purpose of FH is to help faculty understand how to operate at the university. Until this discussion, Senator Bigelow said that he was unaware that the PRS is a public document. New faculty negotiate their PRSs with their chairs. This policy makes clear that they may see other PRSs and that others may see theirs.

The motion to delete the third sentence in 3.4.1 was defeated, with 13 supporting votes.

Senator Leigh asked for clarification. She was concerned whether including the list of possible areas of position responsibility continued to validate those areas. That is, those are accepted possible areas of position responsibility. If a department or school wants to add another area, is it correct that this policy permits them to do so? Professor Dark replied that these are examples of areas that may be included. Faculty are not limited to these areas. For example, they may wish to combine extension and outreach or combine professional practice and clinical practice into a single category. Senator Leigh replied that she had heard Professor Dark say that the policy was backing away from limiting faculty to the seven categories. Professor Dark said that this was in response to concerns from faculty with extension appointments. They wanted the flexibility to combine or keep separate extension and other areas. The policy lists categories and allows faculty the flexibility to combine them. Senator Leigh said that it was unfortunate that the description of those areas was deleted from the policy. Professor Dark agreed, but said that she lost that battle and compromised.

Senator Seger thought that that this compromise made the policy more ambiguous.

Following Senator Leigh's comments, Senator Zarecor asked whether there could be different understandings of areas of position responsibility within the same department. Should departments be required to set the interpretation of the categories, or could two different faculty in the same department have different interpretations (e.g., of extension and outreach)? Furthermore, what happens if a chair wants all seven areas listed but the faculty member wants just four? Professor Dark replied that nothing in the policy requires that every area be listed in every PRS. The faculty member has the right to negotiate with the chair what is to be included in his or her PRS.

Senator Owen agreed with Professor Dark's response. He said that the spirit of the motion is to maximize flexibility. The list includes recommendations, not requirements. If the faculty member or department chair want a particular interpretation, they're allowed to do so. If a disagreement arises, there is a mediation process available.

Senator Kushkowski pointed out that the P&T categories are defined in FH 5.2.2. Senator Freeman said that nothing in the PRS policy changes anything about P&T. And nothing in the P&T policy dictates how to understand the PRS categories. Nothing prevents a department or college from adopting a certain set of categories. The PRS policy

authorizes colleges and departments to select the categories that are best for their purposes.

S14-19-4 passed with one dissenting vote.

V. New Business

A. Discontinuation of Botany Graduate Major – [S15-4] – Bigelow

Senator Bigelow said that the program had not had a student since 2003. No comments.

B. Geographic Information Science Minor – [S15-5] – Bigelow

No comments.

VI. Good of the Order

None.

VII. Adjournment

Senator Owen moved. Senator Bigelow seconded. The meeting adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

NEXT MEETING TUESDAY, DECEMBER 8, 2015-- 3:30-5:00 P.M., GREAT HALL, MU

Respectfully submitted December 3, 2015,

Annemarie Butler
Faculty Senate Secretary