Members of the Governance Council include:
Kathleen Delate (CALS), David Cantor (BUS), Carol Faber (DES), Chris Williams (ENG), Gary Phye (HSC), Rebecca Jackson (LAS), Brett Sponseller (VET), Veronica Dark (Senate Documents chair), Tim Day (CC Chair), Jeff Kushkowski (CCDR chair), Jack Girton (Ex-Officio – AAUP), and Dawn Bratsch-Prince (Ex-Officio – EVPP)

The full Governance Council had eight formal meetings this year: 9/30/16, 10/14/16, 11/11/16, 12/1/16, 1/26/17, 2/16/17, 3/9/17, 4/6/17 (informal) and 4/13/17. A record of the agenda and minutes from each of these meetings is available on the Faculty Senate website (http://www.facsen.iastate.edu/councils/governancecouncil).

The Governance Council of the Faculty Senate first met September 30, 2016. Reports from the Committee on Committees (Tim Day, Chair), Senate Documents Committee (Veronica Dark, Chair) and the College and Departmental Document Review Committee (Jeffrey Kushkowski, Chair) were provided routinely at each meeting.

1) Committee on Committees: Throughout the academic year, Tim Day (President-Elect) kept the council up-to-date on committee openings and progress in filling the openings; the year started with no vacancies.

2) Senate Documents Committee: Throughout the year Veronica Dark discussed with the council any handbook changes that would be forthcoming and any issues with the handbook that she thought we should discuss. She drafted and assisted in reviewing language intended for Faculty Handbook revisions.

3) College and Departmental Document Review Committee: Jeffrey Kushkowski reported that the committee was embarking on outlining a better mechanism for conducting reviews of departmental and college governance documents. More detail in improvements in guiding and reviewing departmental and college governance documents is included later in this report.

The Higher Learning Commission, the primary accrediting body of the university, mandated faculty review and participation in determination of qualified faculty for hire through HLC’s criteria for “Accreditation and Assumed Practices”; the conformity deadline is September 1, 2017. The Higher Learning Commission is expected to evaluate the standards and policy governing exceptions to defined criteria. An ad hoc committee was formed (Kathleen Delate, Jack Girton and Veronica Dark) to develop a paragraph in Chapter 3 of the Faculty Handbook on appointment policies and procedures, including a hiring statement for minimum requirements substituting experience. This language was adopted by the Faculty Senate (Docket Number S16-16, Table 1) and meets HLC requirements.

This year the Governance Council continued its focus on various topics concerning Non-Tenure Eligible (NTE) appointments. Non-substantive changes to the Faculty Handbook were required to fully incorporate the recent NTE Clinical Faculty line (Docket Numbers S16-19 and S16-20, Table 1).

One substantive change included changes to the Faculty Handbook in Section 6.4, making NTE Faculty eligible for Emeritus Faculty Designation – (Docket Number S16-23, Table 1). This passed the FS floor with a unanimous vote.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Docket Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Executive Board</th>
<th>Senate Status</th>
<th>SVPP Status</th>
<th>President Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S16-16</td>
<td>FH 3.1 Appointment Policies</td>
<td>2/7/17</td>
<td>For Vote 3/7/17</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Approved 3/10/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16-19</td>
<td>Non-substantive Changes to FH 5.4.1 (NTE Faculty)</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>For Vote 3/7/17</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Approved 3/10/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16-20</td>
<td>Non-substantive changes to fully incorporate Clinical Faculty into FH Chap 3 and 5</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>For Vote 3/7/17</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Approved 3/10/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16-23</td>
<td>FH 6.4 Emeritus/a Professor</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>For Vote 4/18/17</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Summary of changes to the Faculty Handbook involving the Governance Council, FS Docket, Academic Year 2016-2017.

The Governance Council worked with CDDR and Jeff Kushkowski (Chair, CDDR) in efforts to improve the review process of departmental and college governance documents. The outlined approach includes a revision of the CDDR procedures, a questionnaire to determine needs/ gaps by the units to effectively maintain their governance documents, a “best practices” document that includes required elements in governance documents and a check-list that serves as an index for locating elements in governance documents under review.

In addition to policy changes to the Faculty Handbook, the Governance Council oversaw another successful election of senators and council chairs and appointments to the Athletic Council.

At the end of the spring semester, several matters remained incomplete. Ongoing attention by the Governance Council needs to be focused in the following items:

- Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer as these pertain to the Faculty Handbook vis-à-vis review and advancement, etc.
- NTE Task Force proposals for Governance Council review
- Supportive efforts of CDDR in the review process of departmental / college governance documents.
Senator Veronica Dark has indicated a willingness to continue to chair the Senate Documents Committee for the upcoming year; however, it will be important for a new senator to become familiar with this role during the upcoming year to be prepared to (potentially) assume this responsibility.

This report is respectfully submitted on behalf of the Governance Council by:

Brett A. Sponseller, Chair of Governance Council, (College of Veterinary Medicine)
**Annual Report of the Senate Documents Committee for 2016-17**

Committee Members: Dawn Bratsch-Prince (VPP), Eric Cooper (LAS), John Cunnally (DES), Thomas Daniels (ENG), Veronica Dark (Chair), Janice Friedel (HSC), Russell Jurenka (CALS), Chris Minion (VET), Rob Wallace (Past President).

This report covers the August 2016 and the January 2017 Faculty Handbook updates and the known changes for the August 2017 update.

The “August” update to the handbook was posted on July 26, 2016.

The Committee actions regarding the update were as follows: A draft was distributed to the Committee on 7/14/16. The draft included incorporation of language adopted in S15-13 and S15-14. S15-13 distinguishes between paid and unpaid visiting professor categories, describing procedures for appointment and possible duties; it gets rid of collaborator and clarifies nature of affiliate status including evaluation, appointment, renewal and advancement. S15-14 establishes the clinical professor track including evaluation, appointment, renewal, and advancement. The Committee considered a request to change the term “Office of the Dean of Students” in the final bullet of FH 10.6.4 on Dead Week with the term “Director of Student Affairs”. This bullet concerns the appropriate office to which Student Clubs must appeal in order to get permission to have an activity during Dead Week. The Committee decided instead to change “Dean of Students” to the “Senior Vice President for Student Affairs”, a non-substantive change to Handbook language that recognized the organizational changes while also keeping final authority at a senior level.

The “January” update to the handbook was posted on January 9, 2017.

The Committee actions regarding the update were as follows: A draft was distributed to the Committee on 12/29/16. The draft included changes reflecting the organizational switch from a VP of Business and Finance to a Senior VP of University Services and a Chief Financial Officer (CFO). It also included changes to FH 5.2.4.4.5 Appeals as outlined in S16-3. The changes clarified the time window for filing an appeal. There were also minor changes in wording reflecting decisions made by the Board of Regents regarding the time window in which they will accept appeals.

The legislation passed thus far in Spring 2017 requiring modification of the Handbook include S16-10, a modification of the Dead Week Policy; S16-16, requiring departments to define minimal qualifications for faculty and for colleges to have a procedure for granting waivers; and, if approved, S16-23, allowing emeritus/a status for NTE. There are also non-substantive changes in headings in Chapters 3 and 5 to include Clinical Faculty and a clarification in FH 6.4 concerning possible emeritus status for professors not meeting the 10-year criterion.
The College and Departmental Document Review Committee (CDDR) is responsible for reviewing governance documents for consistency with the Faculty Handbook. The committee’s charge is to:

“Conducts ongoing reviews of college and department governance documents for consistency with the Faculty Handbook, assists the Provost Office in informing the departments and colleges of new legislation to be included in governance documents, and provides assistance to units on questions regarding governance policy issues.”

CDDR spent this year strategizing ways to improve the review process for reviews and help manage the work of the committee. Key to this improvement is involving units and their faculty senators at the first stages of the reviews by having them complete a checklist for CDDR about their governance document. CDDR will then review that document and suggest improvements for the unit’s document.

Reviews of governance documents will start again in Fall 2017. Communication to units about review schedules and procedures will be released in early summer.
FDAR Council Annual Report 2016-17

April 27, 2017

Council Members:
Tim Derrick, HS/chair
Carmen Bain, CALS
Steve Kim, BUS
Emily Godbey/Joseph Muench, DSN
Sarah Ryan, ENG
Eric Weber, LAS
Jeff Zimmerman, VET
Chuck Schwab, R&D chair
Mark Looney, EDI chair
Veronica Dark FER chair
Dawn Bratch-Prince, VPP office

FDAR met 4 times during the Fall semester. There were 2 major items that the council took up that were not part of committee business. The first was the issue of which items in the portfolio a candidate for promotion has the right to review and which items are confidential. This was meant as a review and clarification of section 5.2.4.2.6 of the faculty handbook. Ultimately a recommendation was submitted to the Executive Board but no action was taken. The second issue was a review of Rob Wallace’s statement of Faculty Core Values. Several versions of the statement were reviewed and forwarded to the executive board where it was approved.

FDAR met 4 times during the Spring semester. As part of the committee charge a member (Tim Derrick) participated in the review of the Office of the President until the President resigned and the review was terminated prematurely. Two other issues were begun this semester. The first issue grew out of a desire to increase membership by underrepresented groups in Faculty Senate and Executive Board. The second issue was to increase communication between faculty senate and the departments. Meetings with current faculty president Dr. Jonathan Sturm and Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion, Dr. Reginald Stewart, gave direction and spawned new ideas for these initiatives.
2016-17 Report of the Facilities and Educational Resources Committee (FERC)

During 2016-17 committee members were Annmarie Butler (LAS), Katie Baumgarn (FP&M), Veronica Dark (chair), Radford Davis (VET), Benjamin Dirks (SG), Jim Hill (ENG), Steven Hoff (CALS), Ellen Rasmussen (SVPP) Yoshi Suzuki (BUS), and Ann Smiley-Oyen (CHS). DES and GPSS did not appoint members.

The full committee met twice, once in Fall and once in Spring. At the fall meeting, Katie Baumgarn was officially recognized as an ad hoc member from FP&M.

Katie served as the primary conduit for informing the committee about renovations. She also served as the main conduit for informing the committee about changes to how room scheduling and the registrar’s office are working to make the course scheduling process more efficient. Members of the committee noted that there had been improvement by a couple of weeks in alerting departments of the need to change rooms/times for the next semester’s course offerings. In the fall, FERC also discussed a situation in which DPS enforced a new policy disallowing any access to buildings locked on weekends and after hours, a change never communicated to faculty. In response to an enquiry from the FERC chair, Kate Gregory, Senior VP for University Services, agreed that such policy changes should be widely vetted before implementation and that had not occurred. Given feedback from room scheduling and others, the new policy was not adopted.

In the fall, Katie and Ellen described an ad hoc committee headed by Dave Holger that is looking at room scheduling and utilization. Over the summer this committee sorted through data looking for patterns about classroom utilization and examined room scheduling guidelines and policies of peers. The committee has members from room scheduling, the Registrar’s Office, CELT, and the Provost Office. At our request, two members of FERC attended the fall meeting of this committee and were also invited to the spring meeting. Among other things, FERC representatives were asked to provide input on how/whether facilities and scheduling supported/hindered faculty ability to employ new pedagogy and to do things “outside the box”. The ad hoc committee may recommend a room scheduling policy similar to one that was in place at ISU until about 15 years ago. FERC believes it is very important that we be part of this discussion as the representatives of the faculty.
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 used a total budget amount of $80,092 for the 2016-2017 academic year. The committee appreciates the contributions from the President’s office of $25,000 and the $15,000 from the Senior Vice President and Provost’s Office. These resources were distributed between three travel cycles (Cycle 1 – 16 August 2016 - 13 May 2017, Cycle 2 – 17 January 2017 - 15 August 2017, and Cycle 3 – 16 May 2017 - 16 January 2018) 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 10 years with an average of 99 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 80%.

<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>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80%</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 (2016-2017) all colleges had 71% 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>14</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VET</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>9</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 average cost of air fare per applicant for 2016-2017 was $1,321.

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>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>$137,389</td>
<td>$103,042</td>
<td>$1,321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FTG Program Destinations and 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 224 and Asia with 104. All the other continents combined had only 80 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 (192) followed by invited paper or speaker (99).

### 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>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</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>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FTG Program Summary

The Foreign Travel Grant program remains vital to the professional development of Iowa State University Faculty. Every cycle there are more applications received by the program than can be funded. There are worthy applications not being funded because of budget constraints. The Committee divided the budgeted amount used each cycle differently this year from the equal portion of past years. The amount allocated each cycle was based on volume of previous year applications. This year distribution was approximately 23, 33, and 44% for cycles 1, 2, and 3 respectfully. The committee also made modifications to the application form to help distinguish how to count two years required period between funding. The original rule just stated 2 years between grants. The new rule specifically states how to count the 2 years between travels. The committee expects to have fewer applications that violated the 2 year rule.

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.

**Big 12 Fellowship Program Summary**

In 2016-2017 academic year, the Faculty Senate Committee on Recognition and Development received 2 applicants. There were two applications in October 2016 cycle, zero applications in January 2017 cycle, and zero applications in April 2017 cycle. The committee provided the unanimous recommendation to the Senior Vice President and Provost to fund all applications. The committee provided a ranking for those cycles with multiple applications.

**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 seven Regents Award nominees were submitted to the Faculty Senate Committee on Recognition and Development for review. The Committee Chair presented the Regents Award review results to the Executive Board of the Faculty Senate on March 21, 2017. The committee recommended supporting the top five nominees with rankings for the Regent Award.

**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 2019</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>Spyridoula Vazou</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>Karl Kraus</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>VET – Veterinary Medicine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Diane Janvrin did not participate in the 2nd cycle and her substitute was John Wong.

The Chair acknowledges the committee members’ valuable service for the academic year.

Charles V. Schwab  
Chair, Faculty Senate Recognition and Development Committee
The following are the actions the committee took this year, and significant items which were discussed but no action was taken.

Not on this list of actions are the special GPA and Grade Requirements that were proposed by programs and then withdrawn when asked for the justification. Within the mission of the ASAC is to ensure that there is not an escalation of grade or GPA requirements, which would essentially redefine the grading scale at ISU. Gates have been established in the Catalog editing process as well as the Degree Audit Programming to catch requirements that have not been properly vetted. Greater awareness is needed of the need for ASAC approval of any GPA, grade or other requirement that controls the admission or progression of students to their degree. The recommended procedures are attached here to raise awareness.

1) **Communication Proficiency for LAS Majors** – Approved C or higher in ENGL 250 for all LAS majors. This had been in place, but had slipped from the Catalog.

2) **Computer Science Prerequisite Change** - Approved C- or higher in Math 165 for CS 309, 321, 327, 342, 362, 363 and a minimum of C- for CS 228 as a prereq for CS 327. This largely clears up requirements and language that was already in place for the program. Data shows that these prereqs are important for future success.

3) **Journalism/Mass Communication prerequisite change**  Approved C+ or better in JL MC 201 for JL MC 462. This clears up confusion as C+ in JL MC 201 is already a program requirement for graduation.

4) **AESHM 270 prerequisite change**. Approved 2.00 minimum GPA as a prereq for AESHM 270, which is a work experience course.

5) **Communication Proficiency for all Majors** - Approved C or higher in ENGL 250 for all majors at ISU. Approved unanimously.

6) **Guidelines for determining term of course offering** – Approved procedures presented by the Registrar’s office on the definition of the course offering. In general, the start and end date defines the term the course is offered. If course is offered in two terms, course should be offered the term the majority of the content is delivered. If course is offered in 2 terms, program select the term the course is offered.

7) **Elementary Education** -- Approved minimum grade requirement for all classes that satisfy the degree requirements for Elementary Ed. This is an unusual request in that it is for all course; this typically would not be approved by the committee. However, in this case, all course are mapped to a requirement of the license. Also, approved this retroactively to the 2017/2018 Catalog that is already published, but no students have chosen this Catalog yet.

8) **Changed the time periods for responses to student grievances**. Currently there is no time limit for students. Approved a 45 day window for students and lengthened the time that the University can respond from 10 to 15 days.

Respectfully Submitted,

Frank Peters  .... Chair ASAC –2016-2017
------Addendum to ASAC Report------

Procedures for Approval of Special GPA, Grade or other Special Requirements

The Faculty Senate Academic Standards and Admissions Committee has responsibility to approve all special GPA and grade requirements that an undergraduate program wishes to impose. Some examples of such requirements include:

- A minimum grade for a prerequisite course
- A minimum GPA in a set of courses to advance in the degree program or graduate
- Minimum grades in a set of courses to advance in the degree program or graduate
- Restrictions on how many times a student can take a course
- Requirements to take examinations outside of course requirements to proceed in a degree program.

While there are legitimate needs for such rules, the ASAC needs to grant approval so that rules that unduly restrict students’ progress or effectively change the ISU grading scheme are not allowed. Requirements that mandate a minimum grade in each of a set of classes are generally not acceptable without significant justification; a preferred mechanism is a minimum GPA for that set of courses.

A program that wants to implement a special rule needs to develop and provide adequate justification. Examples of justification include:

- Statistics on past performance of students that would be restricted versus those students who would not be restricted by the proposed rule
- A need for the restrictions based on specific knowledge that is critical for future performance as dictated by required internships or accreditation

Consideration on whether this rule would unfairly impact certain groups of students needs to be included in the proposal.

Approval process:

- Proposal and justification developed by the program that wants to establish special rules
- Approval by the Academic Standards Committee (or equivalent) of the respective College (or Colleges if program is jointly administered)
- Approval by the Faculty Senate Academic Standards and Admissions Committee
- Rules that are significantly different from past precedence may need to be approved by the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Council (as determined by chair of ASAC in consultation with the chair of the AAC).
- The approval will be communicated to the Registrar’s Office such that the Catalog changes can be included and the rule change be coded into the Degree Audit System (if needed).
FACULTY SENATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

Annual Report – Academic Year 2016-2017

Membership: Charles Schwab, CALS; Travis Sapp, BUS; Sung Kang, DES; Doug Jacobson, ENG; Suzanne Hendrich, HSC; Gordon Miller, LAS; Alex Ramirez, VET; Karen Žunker, SVPP; Char Hulsebus and Diane Rupp, Registrar’s Office; Judy Strand, Grad College

FSCC Activity:

Curriculum approval: A majority of the actions taken by the committee was the approval of several minors, undergrad certificates, and degree programs.

Board of Regents report: The FSCC prepared the annual course and new program report for the Board of Regents.

Review of Diversity requirements: The FSCC working with AAC created a survey to assess the current diversity courses at ISU to see if the courses still met two of the five outcomes. The survey was sent to course supervisors of the diversity courses. We received surveys from many of the courses, however a number of faculty from the courses did not reply. It was decided to let the newly created Faculty Senate Committee (members: Mark Looney, Chair; Awoke Dollisso; Barbara Caldwell; Monica Lamm; Janice Friedel; James Tener; Catherine Logue) work with faculty to complete the survey and prepare a report.

Doug Jacobson, Chair
Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee
April 27, 2017
Annual Report for the Student Affairs Committee

We met electronically throughout the year. Our primary order of business was working with leaders from the student government to adjust the Dead Week policy in the Faculty Senate Handbook. To that end, changes were passed such that exams and quizzes cannot be given on Thursday or Friday of Dead Week.

Respectfully submitted,

Ann L. Smiley-Oyen, Chair
2016 - 2017 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 are frequent. 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. Nine faculty have been involved with appeals, inquiries about appeals or concerns about administrative action that could eventually result in an appeal. In the 2016-2017 reporting period, four of the inquiries have resulted in appeals or addressed with mediators.

The Faculty Senate Committee on Appeals convened four times during 2016-2017 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.

Reports indicate that the orientation initiated in 2015-2016 for Ad Hoc Investigative Committees 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 are 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 twelve times in the fall of 2016 and twelve times in the spring of 2017.

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

- Faculty Senate Compensation Committee (report included)
- Business and Finance Committee (changed to University Services)
- Research Planning and Policy Committee (report included)
- Information Technology Committee (report included)

Because of the administrative changes to the Office of the Senior Vice President for Business and Finance, the Council suggested changes to the RPA Committee structure and recommended to change the Business and Finance Committee to the University Services Committee. The change was approved by the Faculty Senate on January 17, 2017.

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 discussed a number of important issues:

- Budget allocation,
- Salary equity study,
- Learning management system (LMS),
- Workday,
- Open access resolution,
- Center of Excellence for the Arts and Humanities (CEAH).
The Council held regularly scheduled meetings with Chief Financial Officer/Chief of Staff Miles Lackey to provide input to university level budget and resource allocation decisions. In addition, the Council met with Interim Vice President for University Human Resources, Kristi Darr, to discuss an update on benefit programs, the fair labor standards act and the wellness portal for faculty and staff. The Council also met with Vice President for University Services, Kate Gregory, to discuss goals and priorities for University Services, and with Vice President/Chief Information Officer Jim Kurtenbach to discuss IT concerns. 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, the Vice President for University Services, and the Interim Vice President for University Human Resources are available on the Faculty Senate website.

The Faculty Senate Compensation Committee (annual report included) deliberated on salary and benefits issues. The Business and Finance Committee was dormant and changed to the University Services Committee. The Information Technology Committee was active (annual report included) and met with Interim Vice President Jim Kurtenbach. The Research Planning and Policy Committee was active (annual report included) 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.

2016-2017 Council Membership: Peter Martin (HSC, Chair), Jamie Brown (BUS), Mike Owen (CALS), Kimberly Zarecor (DES), James Hill (ENG), Arnold van der Valk (LAS, B&F Chair), Claire Andreasen (VET), Julia Badenhope (Research Chair), Hridesh Rajan (IT Chair), Vernon Schaefer (CC Chair), Jonathan Sturm (Faculty Senate President), Tim Day (Faculty Senate President-Elect), Robert Wallace (Faculty Senate Past President).
Faculty Compensation Committee Report

Introduction

The Faculty Compensation Committee report focuses on four general but impactful topics that affect the Iowa State University Faculty. The first topic is salary comparisons. The second topic addresses enrollment growth. The third topic discusses gender/minority salary equity. Fourth is an overall summary of faculty economic and morale issues. The most current information available to the committee was utilized throughout this report.

Salary Comparisons

The total average salary increases at Iowa State University since the Great Recession of 2008-2009 are shown in Figure 1. These numbers reflect all salary adjustments including performance retention, market, and promotion. Salary increases have bounced around considerably and averaged 2.3 percent during the time period shown. The low increase in 2015-2016 was countered with the 3.8 percent increase for 2016-2017. ISU faculty were appreciative of the administration’s efforts in providing the 3+ percent average salary increase for 2016-2017. Given recent budget developments the salary increase for 2017-2018 is unknown and is represented in Figure 1 with a dashed line headed downward.

A comparison of ISU salaries with our Peer Land Grant Universities is shown in Table 1. A number of trends can be discerned in this table. At the university level ISU salaries continue to be below the average of the Peer group, at only 93% of the peer average for 2015-2016. While some gains were made in 2010 to 2012, these gains were given back in subsequent years with ISU losing ground compared to its peers from 2009/2010 to 2015/2016. For each of the colleges the trends generally were that of losing ground during the time frame shown, with the exception of humanities, design and human sciences. Most of the colleges stayed rather consistent over the seven year time frame, with the exception of

Figure 1. Annual salary increases at ISU from 2009 to present.

A comparison of ISU salaries with our Peer Land Grant Universities is shown in Table 1. A number of trends can be discerned in this table. At the university level ISU salaries continue to be below the average of the Peer group, at only 93% of the peer average for 2015-2016. While some gains were made in 2010 to 2012, these gains were given back in subsequent years with ISU losing ground compared to its peers from 2009/2010 to 2015/2016. For each of the colleges the trends generally were that of losing ground during the time frame shown, with the exception of humanities, design and human sciences. Most of the colleges stayed rather consistent over the seven year time frame, with the exception of
Agriculture & Life Sciences, which lost 8% relative to the peer group. ISU has historically been at the bottom of the Peer 11 group in salary comparisons.

Table 1. Faculty Comparative Index, Peer Land Grant Universities Faculty Salary Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AY 09/10</th>
<th>AY 10/11</th>
<th>AY 11/12</th>
<th>AY 12/13</th>
<th>AY 13/14</th>
<th>AY 14/15</th>
<th>AY 15/16</th>
<th>Change from 09/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Life Sciences</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Math</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet Med</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Sciences</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enrollment Growth

Since 2009 ISU has had eight consecutive years of record enrollment. As Figure 2 shows, there are nearly 10,000 more students attending ISU in the fall of 2016 than in the fall of 2009, an increase of over 30 percent. During this time the administration has made great efforts to increase faculty numbers also, to try to keep the student to faculty ratio from exploding higher. Despite these efforts the student numbers have been increasing faster than faculty hiring. Over the past few years much discussion has occurred about enrollment management to address the increasing numbers. Despite increasing faculty numbers and enrollment management discussions, the pressures upon faculty to teach greater numbers of students, to accrue research support, and to fulfill extension/outreach obligations continue to wear upon the professoriate and negatively impact 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.
Perhaps no graphic shows the quandary better than Figure 3, which shows the increasing student numbers at ISU along with the change in state appropriation per resident student from 2008 to 2016. From $12,705 per resident student in 2008, state appropriations have dropped to $9,421 per resident student in 2016, a 26 percent drop. Although total state appropriations have increased over the time frame considered, when viewed in light of the great growth in the student numbers, the declining appropriations per resident student have not kept pace with the costs of educating those students. Although the dollars per resident student have been fairly steady over the past six years, it is clear that the state appropriation is not in line with past support.

Figure 2. ISU enrollment growth versus state appropriation per resident student from 2008 to 2016.
Gender/Minority Equity in Salaries Study

At the beginning of the fall 2016 semester, the Compensation Committee discussed having a focus on gender and minority salary issues due to the perceived salary variations of this group. In concert with administration efforts, a Gender/Minorities Equity in Salaries study was proposed to be conducted during the academic year by hiring a professional group to conduct the study. A professional group was desired due to the intricacies involved in determining the reasons for variations in salaries in colleges and departments affecting women and minorities. Although efforts to obtain an outside consultant to conduct the study began rather early in the fall semester, as of early April 2017 a vendor has not been brought on board to conduct this study. The committee is dismayed that this study has not progressed during the year.

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 perform at historic highs and then sustain these levels given increasing student enrollment and only modest increases in tenure track faculty numbers. The low level of compensation when compared to our peer institutions and issues reflecting faculty wellbeing and work life balance, leads to increasing concern about the future morale for faculty at ISU.
Information Technology (IT) Committee Report

Committee Members: Larry Booth, Alex Braidwood, Eric Cochran, Robert Hartzler, David King, Rose Martin, 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 fully active during this academic year (recall that it was recently reactivated) and met regularly during Fall 2016 and Spring 2017. The committee met three times in Fall 2016 on August 25, October 21, and November 18, 2016. The committee met four times in Spring 2016 on January 25, February 22, March 22, and April 26. During all of these meetings, the committee received input from ISU CIO Jim Kurtenbach. During some of these meetings we also had other guests from ITS.

The committee has engaged in four major activities this year.

Interacting with the Electronic Testing Committee (ETC). In Fall 2016 we had regular discussions with the ETC committee.

Interacting with the Technology Enterprise Advisory Committee (TEAC). The stated charge of TEAC¹ is “The committee is charged with reviewing ISU’s enterprise technologies, integrating existing software platforms, and communicating relevant enterprise items to our campus community. The committee reports to the IT Executive Committee (ITEC) that consists of the Senior Vice Presidents and the Chief of Staff for the President.” Interaction with TEAC was especially important this academic year because Iowa State University was seeking a new enterprise resource planning (ERP) and student information system (SIS). During this academic year, Workday was selected as the vendor for ERP and SIS.

Interacting with the Learning Management System (LMS) review and replacement team. According to the LMS team², “The current configuration of Blackboard Learn as a locally hosted (on ISU servers) LMS product is reaching an end of life state. The current license with the Blackboard vendor ends December 2017. If ISU continues with Blackboard as the LMS a new configuration to a Blackboard cloud hosted situation will be required. There is opportunity to review other LMS options from October 2016 - May 2017 to determine the future direction. A change will have to be made: either to the cloud hosted version of Blackboard, which will be a product with a very different look and feel; or to a different LMS product.

In addition to the LMS review at ISU, Regent Universities continue to partner and implement efficiencies that support recommendations in the TIER report in 2015. The University of Iowa migrated to Canvas in summer 2017 (from Desire to Learn) in part because of their involvement with the Unizen consortium. The current Blackboard Learn contract the University of Northern Iowa expires on September 30, 2019 and they are also reviewing LMS options. Actions taken at ISU will include discussions with and inclusion of the Regent institutions.” The IT committee interacted with the LMS team to offer faculty input. The committee also encouraged the LMS team to seek faculty input on a regular basis prior to LMS selection.

Interacting with the Workday ERP and SIS team. The IT committee also heard from the ISU project manager for the Workday project. A 30 minutes demo of the working system was presented during the committee’s March 2016 meeting. This was followed by a Q&A session. The IT committee encouraged the ITS leadership and project managers to present a similar demonstration at a faculty senate meeting.

¹ http://www.committees.iastate.edu/comm-info.php?id=164 (retrieved on April 18, 2017)
² https://www.lms.iastate.edu (retrieved on April 18, 2017)
Apart from these major activities, the IT committee also received regular updates from the CIO on IT matters such as the data classification guidelines, backup processes, storage processes, security, etc. and provided input.
Faculty Senate Research Planning and Policy Committee

Charge:

“Reviews issues of long term and short term importance to the ISU research efforts. Serves as the advisory committee to the vice president for research and economic development (VPR/ED), and prepares reports and recommendations on items of importance to the faculty and/or the VPR/ED.”

This year, the Research Planning and Policy Committee focused on providing feedback on strategic plan implementation, the evolution of the Center for Excellence in Arts and Humanities, and faculty involvement, recognition and sustainable support for interdisciplinary research.

The committee reviewed the strategic plan initiatives developed by the Vice Provost for Research during autumn, as a follow-up to university strategic planning efforts in the prior year. The committee provided feedback on the continued development of proposal review, grants hub provided support, as well as communication strategies to assist faculty connect to research services and seed grant opportunities.

The re-formulation of the Center for Excellence is an important enhancement to the research enterprise. In spring 2016 various campus leaders proposed to explore integration of work at the interface of the arts and humanities and science and technology, as well as articulating the role of the arts and humanities in society. Increasing support for research and creative work remains an issue, and college administrators as well as the interim director see this as a need for long-term success. The VPR office organized a visioning process, and invited members to participate. Badenhope was invited to represent the faculty senate research planning and policy committee. In December, Interim CEAH Director Michael Bailey presented to our committee and the VPR, noting the range of support at similar entities nationwide at peer institutions. This analysis indicated that there is room for growth in support at ISU, particularly in the amount of support, range of support activities, and visibility of programs. In January, the formal visioning process began and is on-going. The process will conclude in May with a “white paper” that outlines an inclusive vision for the CEAH, programming concepts, and benefits or outcomes. In 2017-8 the VPR office will examine opportunities and strategies for review, refinement, and implementation. The broader faculty body are anticipated to be engaged at that time.

RPP committee members requested consideration of some practical consequences surrounding interdisciplinary research. Among these issues are the promotion and tenure review process for tenure track faculty who tend to be encouraged into core disciplinary activities; as well as documenting intellectual contributions in collaborative teams and the equal support for collaborators across disciplines, including the arts and humanities. VPR Nusser and her team are aware of these concerns, and would like to work with Faculty Senate and the administration to facilitate proper support. Committee members also noted the need for balanced investment, as discipline specific research is still relevant; and core research support in the colleges and university is vitally important. Our recommendation to the VPR office is to discuss these issues relative to promotion and tenure with the Senior Vice Provost Wickert and Dawn Bratsch-Prince, as well as college research administrators. Equitable support for participants in research activities is being forwarded to the CEAH visioning team by Badenhope.

In addition to follow up on research support for arts & humanities and grand challenges, the committee proposes to review policies and mechanism for graduate student involvement in research next year. We plan to ask the Graduate College, VPR, and others to meet with us. Specific topics will be developed prior to fall to facilitate planning the discussions and desired outcomes from our engagement.