FDAR spent the 2015-16 academic year discussing Faculty Handbook language related to factual information found within a faculty member’s P&T portfolio. What is defined as factual information and what is confidential information is currently not specified in the Faculty Handbook. Consistency is needed on this definition across departments for tenure and promotion decisions at the university level (see below for current FH language). FDAR will bring to the Faculty Senate new proposed language in fall semester 2016.

5.2.4.2.6 Right to Review Factual Information
Each Person for whom a recommendation is being forwarded to the college will be given the opportunity to review the factual information therein, and to inform the chair of any ways in which he or she believes this information to be incomplete or inaccurate.

Committee Reports:
Recognition and Development committee report:
The FS Recognition and Development committee budget for 2015-16 was $65,269.00. There were a total of 114 FTG applications resulting in 69 approved for funding (61%). Resources were distributed across three funding cycles (see attachment for additional Information).

The committee reviewed six Big 12 Fellowship applications during the 2015-16 academic year and recommended approval for all, providing a ranking to the Senior Vice President and Provost (see attachment for additional information).

Facilities and Educational Resources-Committee has met but no action reported at this time.
Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Committee-
   a. Committee does not have any actionable items yet but still discussing what faculty, staff, and students can do about equity, diversity, and inclusion at ISU.
   b. CELT is developing classroom taskforce and held a symposium in April on awareness of diversity and inclusion.
   c. New director of equal opportunity is now in place.
I. FOREIGN TRAVEL GRANT PROGRAM

FTG Program Details

The Foreign Travel Grant program is open to all faculty for university-related travel to foreign countries for scholarly activities and it offers financial support for travel. These funds reduce the financial burden for Iowa State University faculty traveling the world as invited experts delivering keynote addresses, top researchers sharing their results, and renowned scholars sharing their gifts. These opportunities are extremely valuable for faculty professional development and establishing an institutional prominence internationally.

The Faculty Senate recognition and development committee budget had $30,269 for the program, the President’s office provided an additional $20,000, and the Senior Vice President and Provost’s Office contributed an additional $15,000 for a total of $65,269 for the 2015-2016 academic year. These resources were distributed between three travel cycles (Cycle 1 – August 16, 2015 to May 13, 2016, Cycle 2 – January 17, 2016 to August 15, 2016, and Cycle 3 – May 16, 2016 to January 16, 2017) for this academic year. A competitive three stage review process was completed using the departmental review, college ranking, and the university ranking. The funded applications provided up to 75% of the round trip fare quoted by an ISU Official Travel Agent obtained by the Faculty Senate Office or 75% of the actual fare, whichever is less.

FTG Program Participation

The volume of Foreign Travel Grant applications received in one academic year has remained fairly constant over the last 9 years with an average of 98 applications received per year. Table 1 shows the number of applications received and number approved each academic year. The percent of approval ranges from 48% to as much as 72%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic year</th>
<th>Number of applicants</th>
<th>Number approved</th>
<th>Percent Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participation in the program by colleges does vary without any identifiable trends. Colleges with a low number of applications typically have a higher percentage of Foreign Travel Grants approved. In the current academic year (2015-2016) all colleges had 50% or more of their applications funded (see Table 2.)
Table 2. Number of applicants and percent approved by college for the past five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number Submitted</td>
<td>Percent Approved</td>
<td>Number Submitted</td>
<td>Percent Approved</td>
<td>Number Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGLS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VET</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cost supported by the Foreign Travel Grant is a percentage of the air fare. Table 3 shows the estimated full air fare cost and the estimated 75% of the air fare for all applications during each academic year. Variation in air fare rates, when tickets are purchased, and differences in destinations for travelers contribute to the fluctuation over the years. The 2015-2016 academic year reported the largest cost for both the estimated full air fare and the estimated 75% of air fare than any year listed in Table 3. The average cost of air fare per applicant for 2015-2016 was $1,485.

Table 3. Cost of estimated air fare, 75% estimated air fare, and average cost of air fare by program years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Estimated full air fare, combined</th>
<th>Estimated 75% of air fare, combined</th>
<th>Average Cost of air fare, per applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>$137,240</td>
<td>$102,930</td>
<td>$1,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>$129,412</td>
<td>$97,061</td>
<td>$1,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>$126,132</td>
<td>$94,599</td>
<td>$1,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>$121,785</td>
<td>$91,338</td>
<td>$1,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>$130,567</td>
<td>$97,925</td>
<td>$1,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>$101,250</td>
<td>$75,937</td>
<td>$865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>$159,831</td>
<td>$119,873</td>
<td>$1,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>$158,424</td>
<td>$118,818</td>
<td>$1,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>$169,268</td>
<td>$126,951</td>
<td>$1,485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FTG Program Activities

Faculty travel includes many different locations. The destinations and number of faculty visiting these destinations are listed by continents in Table 4. These destinations are for the past 6 years. The two destination continents with the largest number of visits are Europe with 220 and Asia with 116. All the other continents combined had only 79 visits, combined.

There are numerous variations in the activities for each of the Foreign Travel Grants awarded. Sometimes there are combinations of activities that a faculty will accomplish during his or her travel. Regardless of the number of activities included in the faculty’s trip, the primary activity for the trip are listed in Table 5. The most frequent activity in the past five years is presentation of a contributed paper (164) followed by invited paper or speaker (94).
Table 4. Destination of approved applicants for the past six years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antarctica</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Activities of approved applicants for the past five years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invited papers/speakers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed papers</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing committees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting/teaching/artistic performance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FTG Program Summary

The Foreign Travel Grant program remains very active and relevant today. There are more applications received than can be funded and those that are not funded are normally worthy applications with valuable activities planned by faculty. The committee made modifications to the application form to help distinguish between an invitation to give a keynote speech or to make a special presentation, and invited to present a paper that was submitted to a conference organizer. The committee determined that an air fare expense cap to allow more faculty to be funded by the Foreign Travel Grant program would not be successful and discontinued that adjustment. Lastly, the committee is still preparing a supplemental evaluation report of past Foreign Travel Grant program participants’ scholarly efforts that can be attributed to their foreign travel.

II. BIG 12 FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

Big 12 Fellowship Program Details

Iowa State University participates in the Big 12 Faculty Fellowship program that has connections to the Big 12 Athletics Conference. The institutions engaged in this program are Baylor University, Iowa State University, Kansas State University, Oklahoma State University, Texas Christian University, Texas Tech University, University of Kansas, University of Oklahoma, University of Texas-Austin, and West Virginia University. Application dates of this program match the Foreign Travel Grant program and the applications are typically reviewed at the same time. The Faculty Senate Committee on Recognition and Development makes the decisions to support or not to support the applications and provide ranking of priority when necessary. The Committee reports their decisions to the Senior Vice President and Provost. Funding decisions are made by the Senior Vice President and Provost.
In 2015-2016 academic year, the Faculty Senate Committee on Recognition and Development received 6 applicants. There was one application in October 2015 cycle, three applications in January 2016 cycle, and two applications in April 2016 cycle. The committee provided the unanimous recommendation to fund all applications and provided a ranking for those applications in a cycle with multiple applications to the Senior Vice President and Provost.

III. REGENTS AWARDS PROGRAM

Regents Award Program Details

The list of candidates nominated by their colleges for a Regent Award will be provided to the Faculty Senate Committee on Recognition and Development by the Senior Vice President and Provost. This list can consist of up to twelve candidates. The Committee will use the six criteria listed on the Senior Vice President and Provost website to identify the top five nominees and forward the recommendations to the Senate Executive Board.

Regents Award Program Summary

A total of five Regents Award nominees were submitted to the Faculty Senate Committee on Recognition and Development for review. The Committee on March 28, 2016 made the unanimous recommendation support four nominees with a ranking for the Regent Award to the Faculty Senate Executive Board and the Senior Vice President and Provost. The fifth nominee did not receive unanimous support, was identified as such, and was not ranked by the committee.

IV. COMMITTEE

The Faculty Senate Recognition and Development Committee is comprised of a representative from each college and a non-voting chair appointed by the Faculty Senate President. This committee acts upon policies and programs relative to the professional development of faculty. The committee makes the awards for the Foreign Travel Grant funds. It also makes recommendations to the provost and Faculty Senate Executive for other recognition and awards. The committee members for this academic year were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Term Ending Date</th>
<th>College/Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles Schwab</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Acker</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>CALS – College of Agriculture and Life Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Janvrin</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>BUS – Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulrike Passe</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>DES – Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Chumbley</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>ENG – Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana Paula Correia*</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>HSC – Human Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajesh Singh</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>LAS – Liberal Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans Coetzee**</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>VET – Veterinary Medicine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Ana Paula Correia did not participate in the 1st, 2nd and 3rd cycles and was replaced by Spyridoula Vazou.
** Hans Coetzee did not participate in the 1st cycle and was replaced by Karl Kraus.

The Chair wishes to recognize the committee members’ valuable service during this year because their terms end in May 2016.

Charles V. Schwab
Chair, Faculty Senate Recognition and Development Committee
During 2015-16 committee members were Annmarie Butler (LAS), Veronica Dark (chair), Radford Davis (VET), Steven Hoff (CALS), Ellen Rasmussen (SVPP) and Ann Smiley-Oyen (CHS). ENG, DES, and BUS did not appoint members nor did SG and GPSS.

The committee's primary goals this year were to provide faculty input into plans for remodeling of classroom spaces and to provide a faculty perspective on course scheduling/classroom space issues.

The committee spent the year developing a better understanding of the course scheduling/classroom assignment process. Katie Baumgarn from room scheduling attended the last two of the spring meetings and will be invited again in the fall. The committee will work with the Provost Office to identify how the course scheduling/classroom assignment process might be made more efficient.
The Equity, Diversity and Inclusion committee met three times during the 2015-16 year, in October, February and May, and the February meeting brought the new Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion (VPDI) to the committee to share ideas and create an initial liaison between faculty and this administrative office.

At each meeting the conversations oriented to the reality that ISU is at an inflection point and our faculty need to respond affirmatively to student concerns and be proactive in building opportunities to educate the ISU community toward a welcoming environment across the campus and in classrooms. We agreed that any discussion of diversity and inclusion needs to educate all people. We acknowledged that any population can initiate a non-inclusive environment. This discussion should not be limited exclusively to the traditionally empowered segments of American culture and society, but also to minority and recent immigrant populations as they also gain an understanding of what an inclusive culture is and needs to become in America.

Action plans were discussed, and ideas presented, including:

a. more forums are a good idea—including students, faculty and administration
b. consider creating a volunteer pool of faculty/staff across the campus who identify as “safe liaisons” for students. Functioning like a “Safe Place” does, they would agree to some training that would allow them to serve confidentially as a trustworthy and empathetic link between a student who needs to share a concern and (if needed) a more official and qualified official, such as in psychological services or HR; this pool of faculty/staff could be posted online and updated annually or periodically
c. we need to work with the new VPDI to identify best practices in D&I.
d. we need more omnipresent and visual statements of awareness across campus—signage, posters, web content, sound bites—as well as events and opportunities for the community at large to become more aware of the transformation in our culture that is happening
e. we need faculty-only discussions as well as more open discussions across the community
f. we need to find ways to foster a more open and inclusive faculty/staff space as well so that faculty/staff from all cultures, backgrounds, beliefs also are welcomed on campus and feel safe to work here
g. we need to find appropriate ways to decrease the fear of missteps in this process—for example the fear that a gaffe carries a stigma that cannot easily be erased
h. we need to encourage a climate of appropriate forgiveness as we grow toward a more universal mode of healthier and enlightened human interaction
i. we need to consider developing more internal grants/mini-grants with a specific emphasis upon supporting diversity and inclusion projects that propose ways to increase the welcoming and inclusive aspects of our campus
j. we need to support increased “train the trainer” workshops and also greater awareness training for graduate students
k. we should consider having a comment wall—essentially an opportunity to leave appropriate messages in a public space to bring awareness to the issue at hand
l. the students indicated a need for a better infrastructure to report issues, and a more diverse and inclusive police force on campus

At the final meeting of the year it was decided, looking to next academic year, to make monthly meetings a priority, to get more data on how members of our community from under-represented classes are treated in P&T decisions and also more generally, to advocate an adjustment to the equity pot for salary adjustments that can be used to address salary inequities for women and faculty of color particularly, to work toward a series of “Courageous Conversations” meetings that bring topics challenging older traditional beliefs and the feelings of marginalization felt by some members of the community to a discussion point; we hope to work with VPDI toward a possible signage or ad campaign, and we would support a spontaneous art-on-campus space periodically that focuses upon expressions from the community relevant to D&I; we intend to work to understand better what the current preferred vocabulary is so that we can address each other in respectful and welcoming ways.

We talked at length about how the culture in America has shifted from the racist environment of the 1960s and earlier. While outright aggressions still persist in our country, many times the conflicts exist in micro-aggressions that also alienate members of a community without physically harming them, and this disenfranchisement and alienation are just as hurtful to our colleagues and students and we need to educate them out of our culture.

We discussed the perspective that the ISU curriculum is too Euro-Centric, and that we could address this university-wide by advocating for faculty to modify their syllabi not only to emphasize more inclusive language, but also more diverse and inclusive topics.

We also discussed getting ISU out in front of the LGBTQ and open bathroom issue, and ensuring we are communicating well with the college deans and bringing their support to this topic.

We concluded the last meeting by electing Mark Looney to the chair of this committee for the 2016-17 academic year.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Sturm, chair, 2015-16
Professor of Music
One focus of our committee this year was discussing the problem of academic dishonesty. Several options were discussed and proposed to appropriate groups. No action was taken.

A second focus this year was discussing Dead Week. Several proposals were written in conjunction with the undergraduate student government. Student Affairs Committee approved and sent forward to the Academic Affairs Council two mutually agreed upon proposals. They voted both down. No further action has been taken.

Respectfully submitted,

Ann L. Smiley-Oyen, chair
The Governance Council of the Faculty Senate started the year with its first meeting on 9-22-15. At each meeting the Governance Council heard reports from each of the three committees that report to the Council. These committees are:

1) Committee on Committees: Jonathan Sturm, chair. Throughout the year Jonathan kept the council up-to-date on committee openings and progress in filling the openings.

2) Senate Documents Committee: Veronica Dark, chair. Throughout the year Veronica discussed with the council any handbook changes that would be forthcoming and any issues with the handbook that she thought we should discuss.

3) College and Departmental Document Review Committee: Jeffrey Kushkowski, chair. Jeffrey discussed the schedule the CDDR committee had for the year. The year was to be spent with finishing up college review and doing the first round of department reviews. The Governance Council requested an end of year report from CDDR that summarizes the reviews completed and the results (such as areas of non-compliance) and a plan for following up on any non-compliance areas that are found.

This year the council continued its focus on various issues dealing with Non-Tenure Eligible (NTE) appointments. A subcommittee was continued from last year to move action items concerning NTE topics forward. The members of this NTE subcommittee were: Carol Faber, Brett Sponseller, Martha Selby and Dawn Bratsch-Prince.

Summary of NTE subcommittee action:

Three meetings of the subcommittee were held: 2/4/16, 2/18/16 and 3/3/16. The focus of these meetings was to draft a proposal to bring to the council concerning Clinical Professor Titles.

The full Governance Council had eight meetings this year: 9/22/15, 10/6/15, 11/17/15, 1/28/16, 3/10/16, 3/24/16, 3/31/16 and 4/14/16. Agenda and minutes from each of these meetings are available on the Faculty Senate website.

Action items that came from the council this year:

1) S15-13 Visiting, Collaborators, Affiliates Appointments. Handbook changes to sections 3.3.5, 3.3.6, 3.3.7, 5.4.3, 5.4.4, and 5.4.5. This was a new business item on the Faculty Senate agenda on 4/5/16 and was voted on and approved on 4/19/16.

2) S15-14 Clinical Professor Titles. Handbook changes to sections 3.3.2.6 and 5.4.1.6. This was a new business item on the Faculty Senate agenda on 4/19/16 and could be voted on at the 5/3/16 meeting.
The Governance Council oversaw another successful election of senators and council chairs and appointments to the Athletic Council. Overall, the Governance Council had a busy year and tackled some very complicated and sometimes controversial issues.

This report is respectfully submitted by:
Martha Selby, Chair of Governance Council, (College of Engineering, Materials Science and Engineering department)

Members of the Council are:
Martha Selby, chair
Andrew Manu (CALS), Yoshi Suzuki (BUS), Carol Faber (DES), Chris Williams (ENG), Patricia Leigh (HSC), Rebecca Jackson (LAS), Brett Sponseller (VET), Veronica Dark (Senate Documents chair), Jeff Kushkowski (CCDR chair), Jack Girton (Ex-Officio – AAUP), and Dawn Bratsch-Prince (Ex-Officio – EVPP)
2015 - 2016 Report to Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate Judiciary and Appeals Council and Committee on Appeals

The activities in Faculty Senate Committee on Appeals continue a trend that began several years ago; questions and appeals increased in 2015-2016. Increasing student enrollment resulting in stress on the professoriate attributable to greater teaching loads and increasingly larger student populations in classes coupled with declining faculty numbers continue and likely contribute to the questions from faculty and the number of appeals. Ten faculty have been involved with appeals, inquiries about appeals or concerns about administrative action that could eventually result in an appeal. In the 2015-2016 reporting period, five of the inquiries have resulted in appeals or have been addressed with mediators.

The Faculty Senate Committee on Appeals was or will be convened five times during 2015-2016 to act upon Ad Hoc Investigative Committee reports and make recommendations to administration. Two appeals are currently in process. There were several inquiries about putative appeals.

One significant change in the appeal process was initiated in 2015-2016; Iowa State University legal counsel now participates with the Ad Hoc Investigative Committee prior to the first investigative meeting. University Counsel meets with the Ad Hoc Investigative Committee and provides an orientation to make sure that the process is duly focused and appropriate. Reports indicate that this orientation has been extremely helpful during the course of appeals investigation. Finally, the need to increase the membership of the Faculty Senate Committee on Appeals continues and Faculty Senate Caucus chairs have been alerted to the importance of greater membership to this important committee.
Council Charge: Develops and maintains a system of shared governance to ensure communication between faculty and administration in relation to resource policies and allocations; advances proposals consistent with Faculty Senate initiatives and priorities; recommends initiatives to the senate pertaining to resource policies and allocations; works with the university president and other administrators to implement approved policies.

The Faculty Senate Resource Policy and Allocations Council met eight times in the fall of 2015 and eight times in the spring of 2016.

In addition to the Council meetings themselves, the Council also consists of the following committees:

- Faculty Senate Compensation Committee (report attached)
- Business and Finance Committee
- Research Planning and Policy committee (report attached)
- Information Technology Committee (report attached)

The Council held regularly scheduled meetings with Senior Vice President and Provost Jonathan Wickert to discuss academic budget priorities, salary policies and processes, university budget allocations, and other resource-related issues that impact the academic functions of the university. The discussions were confidential and minutes were not taken, but the agendas for all meetings with the provost are posted on the Faculty Senate website.

During the course of the year, the Council in collaboration with the committees made a number of important budget and policy recommendations:

- Budget Allocation Recommendations
- Recommendations for the Implementation of the IP Assignment
- Suggestions for Optimizing an Inclusive Campus Environment
- Comments on the TIER Academic Affairs Response from ISU
- Recommendation for Revision of Peer-11 Universities

The Council held regularly scheduled meetings with Chief of Staff Miles Lackey to provide input to university level budget and resource allocation decisions. In addition, the Council met with Associate Vice President for University Human Resources, Julie Nuter, to discuss university level compensation and benefits. Once again, because of the confidential nature of the discussions, minutes were not taken but the agenda for all meetings with the Chief of Staff and the Associate Vice President for University Human Resources are available on the Faculty Senate website.
The Faculty Senate Compensation Committee (annual report attached) deliberated on salary and benefits issues. The Business and Finance Committee was dormant because of the current review of the office and the forthcoming restructuring of the office of Vice President for Business and Finance. The Information Technology Committee was active (annual report attached) and met with Interim Vice President Jim Kurtenbach. The Research Planning and Policy Committee was active and met regularly with Vice Present for Research Sarah Nusser.

The Council took its charge to develop and maintain communication between faculty and administration seriously, and we will continue to address pertinent issues that fall within the charge of the Council.

2015-2016 Council Membership: Peter Martin (HSC, Chair), Jamie Brown (BUS), Mike Owen (CALS), Kimberly Zarecor (DES), Jim Hill(Eng), Arnold van der Valk (LAS, B&F Chair), Mark Ackerman (VET), Julia Badenhope (Research Chair), Hridesh Rajan (IT Chair), Vernon Schaefer (CCE E) Ellen Rasmussen (Provost Office)
The 2014 and 2015 faculty compensation committee reports provided detailed information regarding salary comparisons; salary compression; changes in faculty numbers with student enrollment; and faculty morale related to work/life balance, benefits and overall impressions about working for Iowa State University. Developments in 2015 did little to modify the trends noted in previous reports.

In the spring of 2015 there were indications that reasonable salary increases would be provided to faculty for FY 2016. At the conclusion of the legislative session, the hopes for such an increase were dashed and faculty soon learned that an across the board 1.0 percent salary increase would be provided, with the possibility for a mid-year adjustment if the budget picture improved. The mid-year adjustment never occurred. ISU’s benefit package of retirement contributions, medical insurance and disability income continues to rank high among peer institutions, somewhat ameliorating the low salary concerns. The low salary increase had a definite negative effect on faculty morale.

The one percent salary increase did nothing to address the long-standing issue of salary compression detailed in previous reports. This remains a serious issue both between faculty ranks as new hires are brought in at market rates while long-term faculty do not maintain market salaries, and between colleges with the colleges of Agriculture & Life Sciences, Engineering, Human Sciences, and Veterinary Medicine faring well in peer institution comparisons and the colleges of Liberal Arts & Sciences, Design, and Business not faring well at all in peer institution comparisons.

Faculty numbers did increase in FY 2016, but so did student enrollment, with ISU setting a record in Fall 2015 with the much heralded 36,001 students. Despite the effort to increase faculty numbers, the pressures upon faculty to teach greater numbers of students, accrue research support, and fulfill extension/outreach obligations continue to wear upon the professoriate and negatively impact general faculty morale. The pressures on faculty with the ever increasing enrollments of the past several years have not been alleviated by the net increase in faculty numbers. Faculty from many departments and colleges continue to express dismay over ISU salaries and work load increases.

In summary, faculty at Iowa State University are dedicated, hardworking and concerned about providing students an excellent educational experience. However, faculty continue to be challenged by the economic climate, lack of support and continuing “requests” to do more with less. Faculty continue to be concerned about their ability to continue to perform at historic highs and then sustain these levels given increasing student enrollment and only modest increases in tenure track faculty numbers. With the low level of compensation when compared to the peer institutions and issues reflecting faculty wellbeing and work life balance, there is increasing concern about the future morale for faculty at ISU.
Faculty Senate Research Planning and Policy Committee

This year the committee worked in an advisory role with the Vice President for Research Office on strategic planning, open access data and publication, and protection of intellectual property rights and copyright.

**Strategic Planning for Research Activities**

The VPR completed an internal strategic plan summer and fall of 2015, bringing the draft result to the committee for consideration and comments prior to official adoption. The committee appreciated several aspects of the plan, including the foundational orientation to faculty support and provision of appropriate support and guidance research activities initiated by the faculty and the various centers, research groups and project teams they participate in. This higher vision unifies the work of various units within the VPR enterprise around the higher purposes of research and education, promoting a seamless and communicative mode of operation for the unit. This approach also suggests that faculty are responsible for defining grand challenges and research concepts, working with the VPR office and other administrative units for defining future directions rather than the VPR office directing intellectual directions and content. Colleges would pursue strategic planning understanding that they can partner and focus research activities “upstream” with administration and “downstream” with faculty, providing more focus and constructing synergistic relationships between research and other collegiate activity areas to achieve strategic priorities. The committee found that this approach best supports individual and organized faculty research initiatives while still allowing guidance at the college and university level to achieve institution wide and college focused strategies.

Two members of the committee also participated in the President’s Strategic planning effort on the Research Profile subcommittee- Julia Badenhope, DES and Michael Kimber, VetMed.

With the support of the VPR and the Research Profile Co-chairs, Kan Wang and Beate Schmittmann, the committee reviewed the draft plan of the university and discussed integration/impacts of the plan concepts on the broader research enterprise. The conclusion was that the strategic priorities were complementary, with the institution level plan identifying more defined goals around research excellence and reputation, and involving many units including the Graduate College, VPR, etc. The information provided by the Research Profile subcommittee was helpful to the committee and VPR in that it conveyed a broad based reflection of faculty and institutional support needs to increase the research activity, quality, and support structures. The committee and VPR will use this insight as we consider changes and refinements in research planning and policies in the future.

**Open Access**

Open access data and open access publication were discussed as the research communities of the world seek to connect and leverage the knowledge we have created to investigate and solve complex and emergent problems. Jonathan Sturm led a discussion of open access publication, noting that it is the faculty who provide the intellectual insight and service necessary to curate the peer reviewed publication enterprise, but the financial benefits and intellectual rights seem to accrue more to the publishers. At a time when library budgets are diminished and the communication context is accelerating to digital sharing, the increasing costs of publishing for faculty and gaining access seem untenable. The committee concurred, with one member noting that while he was studying overseas, he had to purchase a subscription to a journal as a graduate student to gain access to one article his university library did not carry. This case vividly illustrates the financial and access problem. The committee recommends that the University and the library support publication in open access journals and promote the formulation of credible open access peer reviewed journals. We can do this by considering publications subvention support, if consistent with legal restrictions and purposes; as well as
participating as faculty by placing our scholarship in the ISU library digital repository. Interestingly, the University can be assigned copyright through the digital repository in order to support faculty who resist the copyright claims of for profit publications. Prior assignment allows the institution to act on behalf of faculty. If needed, Sturm noted, the University can and will relinquish these rights but only as the request of the faculty member.

The committee also reviewed the operation and interface of the digital repository, which provides metrics as well as real time information about downloads of items by clients around the world. The committee concluded that if quality can be assured and validated, open access publication and distribution through the digital repository will support the reputation and impact of faculty scholarship.

Open access research data is a hot topic globally, and has been a significant factors in the ability of researchers to quickly solve research problems. According to VPR Nusser, open access is a new frontier in global research culture. The Royal Society recently published a report on the topic, Science as an Open Enterprise, accessible online at https://royalsociety.org/topics-policy/projects/science-public-enterprise/report. The report highlights six key actions, including developing standards for open access data sharing, publishing data in a reusable form and developing support personnel and software to support open access data. The committee discussion is scheduled later this academic year. Some important takeaways that are emerging from these policy frameworks surrounding open access is that the world is changing around us- and we must consider how we plan to adapt to remain relevant, maintain and improve research impacts, and provide necessary support to thrive in the global research community.

**Intellectual Property**

The committee discussed the issue of intellectual property rights and advised the Resource Policy and Allocation Council and VPR Nusser to adopt a voluntary surrender of IP rights to better protect the faculty and the university from future claims by others for royalties. This issue is important because the laws surrounding IP shifted with Stanford Vs. Roche, a case in which Stanford and the faculty lost IP rights to a company on a the point that faculty must overtly assign rights, not just consent to do so. Why should we care? One issue is that when faculty and staff attend industry sponsored technical training, they are often asked to sign nondisclosure agreements that include IP assignment in the fine print. All work that uses this technology, even years later, must honor the agreement. Assuming the university has made a “substantial investment” in the IP development, beyond salary and regular research support, Faculty royalties, rights, etc. will be protected by the university in the event of a challenge if the IP rights have been assigned. Assignment of IP preemptively may prevent claims, even when university investment has not been substantial. Currently, all PIs and co-PIs assign IP when the “Gold Sheet” is submitted to OSPA, but staff and grad students are not included. Thus, the university is asking that all staff and faculty involved in research assign these rights.

More information is available in the meeting minutes dated October 2015.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Badenhope
Chair, RPP
Professor of Landscape Architecture
Information Technology (IT) Committee Report
April 22, 2016

Committee Members: Larry Booth, Alex Braidwood, Ana-Paula Correia, Robert Hartzler, David King, Ralph Napolitano, Hridesh Rajan (chair), Kris Stacy-Bates, Wallapak Tavanapong

The stated charge of this committee according to the Senate’s Bylaws is “Represent faculty interests regarding IT; coordinate information of standing and ad hoc IT committees; address IT issues and policies of importance to the faculty and administration; serve in an advisory capacity to the CIO.”

This committee was recently reactivated, and so members of the committee have little experience on this committee. A new chair (Hridesh Rajan) was appointed in September 2015 after previous chair (Ralph Napolitano) stepped down, but generously agreed to continue to serve on the IT committee as the college of engineering representative.

The committee met twice in Fall 2015 on October 22 and on December 3 and three times in Spring 2016 on February 26, on March 25, and on April 22. During all of these meetings, the committee received input from ISU CIO Jim Kurtenbach. During March and April meetings we also had Dianne Brotherson as a guest from ITS.

The committee has engaged in two major activities this year. First activity was aimed at increasing faculty engagement in IT matters. Committee members reached out to their college caucuses to seek input. Second ongoing activity relates to studying the current usage of evaluation technologies, e.g. blackboard quizzes, in-class bubble sheets, etc., at Iowa State University. CIO and ITS team presented data on current usage of these evaluation technologies across campus. This study is expected to continue in Fall 2016.

Apart from these major activities, the IT committee also received updates from the CIO on IT matters such as the data classification guidelines, backup processes, storage processes, etc. and provided input.