



IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate

Executive Board Agenda

Tuesday, November 3, 2020 – WEBEX 3:00 p.m.

Present: Al Shihabi, D. (Design); Andreasen, C. (FDAR and CVM); Bennett-George, S. (Academic Affairs); Bratsch-Prince, D. (Associate Provost); Butler, A. (Secretary); Campbell, C. (CHS); Daniels, T. (COE); Day, T. (J&A); Dekkers, J. (CALs); Faber, C. (President); Freeman, S. (Governance); Perkins, J. (Business); Sturm, J. (Past President); VanDerZanden, A.M. (Associate Provost); Wallace, R. (LAS); Wheeler, A. (President-Elect); Wickert, J. (Senior Vice President and Provost)

1. Call to Order

President Faber called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. when a quorum was reached.

2. Consent Agenda

EB Agenda November 3, 2020

EB Minutes October 6, 2020

Senator Andreasen moved to take item 6.7 (documentation of EDI activity) from new business and move it to Council Chair reports (item 5.5). Senator Freeman seconded.

Senator Bennett-George moved to adopt the modified consent agenda. Senator Wallace seconded. The motion was adopted without dissension.

3. Special Topics for Discussion

3.1. Syllabus statement beginning Spring semester – Wickert/Bratsch-Prince

Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince recounted an incident at the start of the year when a faculty member mentioned in her syllabus that students could not voice opinions that did not support, among other things, Black Lives Matter or pro-choice stances. A student took a screen shot of the statement and shared it publicly. The faculty member was attacked in social media, and the university received phone calls. This created bad press for the university and the faculty member.

Ultimately, this led to the conclusion that the First Amendment entails that ISU cannot prohibit students from expressing their opinions or viewpoints in an academic setting. This prompted the verbiage that students will “not be penalized for content.”

Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince said that in an earlier version of the syllabus statement, language was included that referred to ISU's principles of community. After talking to faculty, department chairs, and VPDI Reg Stewart, that reference was removed because it gave the impression that there is a tension between freedom of speech and EDI.

President Faber asked whether the syllabus statement is a requirement for all syllabi. Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince confirmed that it is. She added that CELT has a number of syllabi statements on their website, some of which are also required.

Secretary Butler asked whether this policy prevents an instructor from responding to speech that is delivered in a way that creates a chilly climate. For example, an ethics student defends the legitimacy of slavery or genocide and delivers it while staring at a student of color. Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince asked how Professor Butler would ordinarily respond. Secretary Butler said that she would call it out, say that genocide is not a policy option to be considered among others because it violates the dignity of human life. Provost Wickert thought that such a response would be appropriate under the new syllabus statement. Secretary Butler asked whether the Provost's Office would "have my back" if a student complained about such a response. Provost Wickert said that yes, the Provost's Office would support faculty. They received thousands of emails and phone calls about the faculty syllabus statement referenced earlier. But no FRB was formed and no disciplinary action was taken against the instructor. The hope is that this language protects faculty. There is another matter currently under discussion. Provost Wickert stressed that he wants complicated topics discussed in classrooms. But we also need students to stop contacting the university to say that they're not allowed to express themselves in class.

Senator Perkins said that he appreciated how "short, sweet, and to the point" the statement is. But he observed that syllabi are already very long. Does this statement need to be included in the syllabus? Provost Wickert replied that he honestly believes that it has to be in the syllabus.

Past President Sturm said that many people regard the syllabus as a contract between faculty and their students. He observed that this statement is oriented to *student* freedom of speech. Faculty are protected elsewhere. But wouldn't it be better to say that any authorized member of the classroom will not be penalized? That is, faculty will not be penalized for saying things that students don't want to hear. Provost Wickert thought that was important. But FH has a section on academic freedom, and it protects faculty right of expression in class.

Senator Wallace asked whether the blue underlined text were hot links. President Faber confirmed that they refer to the BOR statement on academic freedom and ISU's Student Code on freedom of speech.

Senator Campbell asked about a possible chilling effect on faculty. She said that she didn't want to discuss controversial topics in her class, because she is concerned about when she might be overstepping. She suggested that CELT (or somebody) might help faculty understand what it means to have academic freedom in the classroom as a faculty member, and conversations about freedom of speech in particular areas. Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince said that Mike Norton (University Counsel) has led good workshops on the public classroom. There was one in October with great participation. She agreed that the syllabus statement doesn't help faculty to understand

triggers or where a conversation should stay relative to a discipline. She said that her office is seeing more instances of students calling out faculty. She is working on a resource document for faculty (still in draft phase) about what to do if subjected to trolling or doxing attack: What does it look like? What should one do for safety? Who should one contact? What will the university do?

President Faber asked whether the Provost's Office needed a vote on this proposal. Provost Wickert said that he would like EB's support to begin requiring this statement with Winter session.

Senator Freeman moved to adopt the proposal. Senator Perkins seconded. The motion was adopted with some opposition.

3.2. Ombuds search/contract – Wickert

Provost Wickert said that the current ombuds team is an external company that provides services virtually. Under reorganization, the ombuds was moved from the President's Office to the Provost's Office, and the expectation was that a search would be conducted to hire someone to occupy the ombuds office in Gilman. The current company is on a short-term contract through the fall. Now we have to decide what to do next. We could hire an on-campus ombuds but have them work remotely during the pandemic. Or we could continue with the current team. We could have an open bid, in which the current team could compete with other companies for a two-year contract for remote ombuds services. P&S Council said that they like the remote services and would endorse having an RFP for a two-year contract. GPSS concurred.

Senator Freeman said that he would prefer a face-to-face ombudsperson after the pandemic. But he thought that a two-year contract for remote services would be the best way to move forward now.

Senator Day asked how to assess their performance, given the confidentiality of student and employee use of ombuds services. Provost Wickert said that he didn't have any specific data. But people have reported good experiences.

Senator Wallace supported a two-year term contract. He added that his department had a good experience.

Senator Bennett-George said that she supported the two-year contract. She supplied another report of a good experience, from beginning to end.

Secretary Butler expressed concern about offloading services to contracted consultants, rather than having services performed by members of the ISU employees, on campus and with benefits. She worried that it would erode our sense of community.

3.3. Spring reading day(s) – VanDerZanden

Associate Provost VanDerZanden said that this proposal came out of the Academic Continuity workgroup. The proposal is to have university-wide "wellness days" (reading days) that provide "pauses" during the spring semester, one on a Wednesday and the other on a Tuesday. A number

of peer universities (including Purdue, Ohio State, and Wisconsin) are doing this. On this proposal, students would still be responsible for class work, but they would not be required to be in class on these days.

There has been some support for this proposal, but not unanimous. One concern is labs. There are 740 sections of labs that are held on Tuesday or Wednesday and that is the only time they meet. Department chairs expressed concern about the impact of canceling these labs.

Senator Bennett-George asked how many non-lab classes that meet once a week on Tuesday or Wednesday would be affected. Associate Provost VanDerZanden replied that they are included in the 740 figure.

Senator Wallace asked why the proposal was not for a Monday or Friday, which would create a three-day weekend. Associate Provost VanDerZanden said that the workgroup was concerned that people would use that time to travel. That would work counter to the strategy of canceling spring break to minimize travel.

Past President Sturm noted that the spring semester has already been shortened by one week, which requires faculty to excise three class periods or cover more material in less time. He thought that faculty who have already struggled with that change would be adversely affected by these wellness days. Associate Provost VanDerZanden said that this was one concern that people have raised. She added that students have concerns too.

Senator Daniels said that the impact is not just on the labs that meet on those days, but all of the other labs, because lectures are coordinated with labs. He suggested that wellness days could cancel all other classes except for labs. Associate Provost VanDerZanden thought that that might be a good compromise. 18,000 students would be impacted by the wellness days. Senator Daniels added that in COVID times, they have tried to provide in-person support for students who are especially struggling. Computer activities can be conducted without labs, but faculty think that that is a disservice to students. Associate Provost VanDerZanden said that she had heard that many faculty and students value the face-to-face components.

Senator Perkins said that he had already “wrung out” whatever could be. If there were wellness days, students would be required to cover the material in fewer days. He thought that the benefit of wellness days would not be worth the cost.

President Faber said that she created “Open Studio day” in her class this semester, a Wednesday when students could do work without coming to class. She thought faculty might have a better time incorporating this if they could pick which day to designate.

Senator Dekkers said that this would impose an additional burden on faculty. He thought that with some planning, students could plan their own wellness days. He thought that that would better treat them as adults.

Senator Campbell asked about the possibility of a week of classes where no major assignments could be due, like Dead Week. Associate Provost VanDerZanden said that that possibility was

considered. But the worry was that that would cause more assignments to be due in the week before or after wellness week.

Senator Al Shihabi said that she worked “pause time” into her class schedule. She thought that faculty might be more receptive to the proposal if they could fit it into the rhythms of their own classes, between modules. Associate Provost VanDerZanden said that the workgroup felt that if it were not a university-wide wellness day, but different days for different classes, it wouldn’t provide as great of a benefit to students.

Senator Bennett-George said that she is scheduled to teach a course that meets only on Wednesdays. The prospect of losing an entire week is “anxiety-inducing.”

Past President Sturm asked whether it would be possible to tack on two extra meetings at the end of the semester to compensate for university-wide wellness days. (There would still be 90 class meeting days, but they would span fourteen and a half weeks.) Associate Provost VanDerZanden said that such a change would require a change to the final exam period, which would require BOR approval for the change to the academic calendar.

President-Elect Wheeler said that instituting wellness days would communicate ISU’s recognition of the importance of wellness and the impact of stress on students. She thought that students need to be encouraged to be attention to their health.

President Faber asked when the matter needed to be decided by. Associate Provost VanDerZanden said that there is no deadline. If there is broad support for wellness days, we can move forward and give faculty time to adjust their schedules.

A straw poll was taken, in which two hands were fully raised in support, and one kinda sorta raised.

Provost Wickert asked whether there would be more support for keeping labs but canceling all other course meetings.

Senator Perkins repeated his point that such an adjustment would be very difficult.

Senator Freeman reported that he has never taken attendance. He encourages students to take care of themselves first. If they need to take a day off, they should take it off and work with him to make up the material they missed. He thought the best way to promote this would be to encourage faculty to work with students. Associate Provost VanDerZanden agreed about the need for faculty to be flexible with students. There are some faculty who don’t acknowledge the importance or mental health or don’t care and who would not give such a level of grace and understanding. She added that students do not always have a good experience with how faculty choose to manage their classes.

3.4. Spring computer labs and field trips – VanDerZanden

Associate Provost VanDerZanden said that in the fall, overnight field trips were not allowed because of COVID. Day trips were allowed so long as protocols were maintained at the

destination. There are a number of programs (including GEAT, NREM, and programs in the College of Design) that have overnight field trips. Adopting protocols will affect the cost of transportation and sleeping accommodations. The university is working with Public Health for recommendations and guidance. From an academic standpoint: is there value in finding a way to resume overnight field trips?

Senator Campbell said that she would be uncomfortable asking students to travel together or pay to be all alone. She recommended continuing to prohibit overnight field trips.

Associate Provost VanDerZanden noted that faculty do need to provide an equivalent academic experience for students who can't or won't participate in overnight field trips. This may be a problem in some cases.

Associate Provost VanDerZanden said that the vast majority of computer labs on campus were closed this fall. Students have used spaces in the library. The current proposal is to open labs, using our knowledge about safety protocols and cleaning. This would provide students with access to software and other digital material germane to their classes. This would create an additional cost for cleaning and perhaps monitoring at night.

Senator Campbell said that in her class, only half of the students have a printer or access to a printer. She thought that making more printers available would be helpful, even if the students are not using the computer or software. Associate Provost VanDerZanden said that this was part of the idea: spread out the density all over campus, to de-densify the library.

President Faber said that the College of Design provides students access to software and printing, even if the labs are open for limited hours.

Senator Bennett-George said that this might help to balance the fact that the online testing centers are not open. Some students have poor internet connections in their apartments and take exams on poor wifi connections.

Secretary Butler asked whether there was concern about COVID for students who spend hours in computer labs. President Faber replied that her lab has not encountered problems. Associate Provost VanDerZanden said that the labs would follow guidelines about reduced capacity and would have additional cleaning.

3.5. Teaching Evaluations – Bratsch-Prince

Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince said that evaluation of teaching has been a “real stressor” for faculty, who are teaching in “less than ideal” circumstances. When students are in quarantine, they can't be in class. The document is a proposed campus-wide instrument, and there is no overall rating of instructor. Departments can add other questions, appropriate to their accreditation or other needs, but they are not permitted to reintroduce the overall rating of instructor question. This evaluation could be used in winter term and spring term, and possibly even fall 2021.

Senator Al Shihabi said that a Design caucus member reported that the Course Formative Feedback working group had “strong consensus” for everything but the last question. They cited biases in feedback for women, minorities, and people for whom English is not their first language. The instrument does not differentiate classes that are small, large, taught for the first time, already established, required, elective. She added that she has heard complaints about teaching evaluations from many people. Large history classes with TAs get different responses about how helpful the instructor was to the student’s learning than small studio or seminar classes.

Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince replied that this is a hot topic, with many different opinions. But we need to have an instrument. ISU did not include spring semester evaluations as part of annual faculty review, but these evaluations will be included. We will continue to move forward. ISU needs to do more work on assessment of teaching that is not grounded on course evaluations. This is a bigger campus-wide project.

Secretary Butler pointed out a change in the formulation of the first two questions from the spring instrument. She also expressed concern that it was difficult to assess the instrument without knowing what direction evaluators will receive on how to use the informed gained.

Past President Sturm reminded EB members about the Student Ratings task force report, which is currently stalled. He thought there needs to be a clear supportive statement from the Provost’s Office to faculty. Instead of saying that the evaluations do not count at all, perhaps the Provost’s Office could say that they will count, but not as fully as they do in ordinary semesters. Without such a statement, faculty will be really, really stressed out. They will complain that they did not have any input on the questions and yet are being held accountable.

President Faber appreciated the point and thought that it underscores that there are multiple ways to assess teaching. Everyone has done more work in their teaching responsibilities than ever. That effort needs to be looked at and evaluated too. Maybe that could be reported in a self-assessment, but the point is that evaluators need to consider more than just student ratings.

Senator Wallace thought that faculty could come to embrace this instrument as a stopgap measure to provide some student feedback, provided that it is presented to faculty in the right way.

Secretary Butler said that some faculty have expressed concern about the extent of absenteeism. Although opportunities are provided for student engagement, these students are not taking advantage of them. If there were some way for students to indicate how much they attended synchronous activities and the comments could be separated into those two groups, faculty might have more confidence in the results.

Senator Campbell thought it was important for evaluations to reflect the role of the student in their own learning.

Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince said that faculty can include statements about curriculum development and teaching materials. They are empowered to set their whole year of work in context of the impact of COVID.

Senator Andreasen asked whether department chairs could be provided that information too. If faculty understand that they need to document and advocate for themselves in these ways, it could set the tone and expectations for faculty.

Senator Perkins suggested that guidance from administrators that student ratings cannot be the sole basis for the evaluation of teaching. Past President Sturm said that the guidance would need to say more than that: students ratings from last semester can have no impact on the evaluation of teaching. He suggested that we ease our way back into using student ratings. For example: now, no more than 30% of the evaluation can be based on student ratings.

Senator Day said that everyone agrees that there are problems with how we use student ratings. He suggested that we might use COVID as an opportunity to try something novel.

Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince thanked EB members for their comments. She said that she had a small timeframe to act: the instrument needs to be loaded into the system tomorrow. Next, the Provost's Office will work on guidance for department chairs about how to use these ratings.

4. Announcements

4.1. President

President Faber reminded EB members that the next Campus Leaders Luncheon is November 17, and questions need to be submitted to her by Friday.

President-Elect nomination forms will be included with FS materials.

There will be a special EB meeting on December 15. The agenda will concern summer and fall 2021.

There has been a Workday improvement for faculty recruiting. Not everything has been resolved, but there have been a lot of updates and corrections. This was brought up as a concern by College of Engineering. A satisfaction survey will be released soon.

4.2. President-Elect

President-Elect Wheeler said that the Representative Committee compiled responses from faculty in their caucuses. The report shows the difficulty and frustration that faculty have encountered with the pandemic, and they want to be their best selves.

There has been a lot of anxiety about faculty performance reviews, including the P&T process. Faculty are concerned about time, effort involved in adjusting to teaching, and work-life balance. Faculty want recognition from administrators that they have been challenged. The question is: what can EB do?

President Faber asked how many faculty participated in the survey. Senator Andreasen replied that it's difficult to know, because sometimes senators reported on behalf of their departments, and sometimes individual faculty responded.

President Faber thought that the question of how best EB can respond should be conducted at another meeting.

Senator Campbell asked whether the Provost's Office read the report and what they thought of the feedback.

Provost Wickert said that he appreciated the amount of work involved in collecting the information, and that all feedback is helpful. He said that the results were not surprising: faculty are clearly under stress and pulled in a lot of different directions. There are concerns about teaching, research, evaluation and advancement, family life, caring for children, etc. It all comes out, and it's helpful to be reminded of that.

Provost Wickert said that there were opposite responses: there's too much communication and not enough. He rejected the claim that the administrators answered only the "easy" questions at town halls. And he expressed concern about its representativeness, given that it's an unscientific survey; instead it's a "temperature pulse" of the faculty. He added a word of caution about including verbatim quotations. Did respondents know that they would be quoted?

President-Elect Wheeler said that caucus chairs told faculty that their comments would be anonymized. Provost Wickert asked whether they were told that the comments would be publicly shared. President-Elect Wheeler said no. But Representative Committee wanted EB to see those comments.

Senator Andreasen said that the point of the survey was to find big-picture commonalities and across-the-board concerns. She issued caution about taking the comments out of context and viewing faculty negatively. Instead, faculty are frustrated and want to do their best, but they're not in a position to do so right now.

Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince said that once the document is sent via email, it becomes a public document, for anyone to access. She thought the comments about Athletics Director Pollard were out of line. She expressed concern about inclusion of raw comments. But she appreciated the concerns raised about graduate students and communication.

4.3. Past President

Past President Sturm said that a year ago, FS was consumed with Workday and ISD. Now we don't hear about it as much. Have faculty adapted to ISD and Workday? Are they satisfied? Or is it still a problem, but overwhelmed by COVID?

Second, there is a perception that administrative numbers are expanding while faculty numbers are decreasing. Is this accurate? FS should explore it more carefully.

President Faber replied that Workday and ISD continue to be issues. Fixes have been made in response to problems, but it continues to be worked on.

4.4. Senior Vice President and Provost

Provost Wickert said that he had shared the report with RPA on Thursday. The study began in 2018, with salary data from FY18. The goal was to analyze the data to see if there are inequities in gender, race, or ethnicity at all ranks, term and tenure-track. ISU created “job groups” so that the groups were big enough to make statistical sense. So the analysis is at the college level rather than department or program. However, the data from 1912 faculty needed to be corrected manually, to adjust for factors such as administrative positions (department chair, associate dean, center director) or other salary bumps (including FISIPs, summer salary through grants or contracts), 9 month or 12 month appointments, length in tenured rank, and time since earning the terminal degree.

The bottom line is that at the institutional level, Aon found no evidence of systemic bias. Aon did flag two areas that warranted further analysis: a gap for female faculty in CVM and a gap for nonwhite faculty in COD. In response, the Provost’s Office asked the deans to work with UHR develop their own college-level salary studies. COD made adjustments to 17 salaries in 2019. CVM made 15 adjustments in October.

The project took a long time because it was suspended by the Department of Labor conducted an audit. That federal audit closed with no findings and no violations found on protected categories. The Aon study was resumed. The Provost’s Office received the report in mid-February.

No questions or comments.

4.5. Council Chairs Reports

FDAR: Senator Andreasen said that FDAR is working on a document to make a change to FH to provide faculty the opportunity to document and get credit for their EDI work. This documentation would be optional, not required. All advancement decisions hinge on performance in areas of position responsibility. FDAR considered three options, and support was split between two of them. Senator Andreasen said that many peer institutions have a statement in their faculty handbooks about expectations and encourage EDI activities. ISU does not. This would remedy this. Senator Andreasen related a story about a prospective candidate who opted not to apply for faculty positions at schools that do not have out-treatment programs. Senator Andreasen said that her primary concern is lost opportunity to recruit and retain these excellent faculty. She added that ISU is the largest employer in the area, and what we do has a huge impact on the community’s EDI work. She asked EB members to review the document carefully and make recommendations to FDAR. FDAR would like to move this out of their council before the end of the semester and begin discussion in FS.

4.6. Caucus Chair Reports

None

5. Unfinished Business

5.1. FH 3.3.2.3 Ranks and Lengths of Term Faculty Appointments [20-2] – Freeman

Senator Freeman incorporated wording changes. There was also a substantive change since last reading, concerning hiring industry professionals. A task force was created within Governance Council to address the issue.

Senator Perkins moved to accept the changes. The motion was adopted.

Senator Freeman advised President Faber to alert senators to these changes in the email message that accompanies FS meeting items.

Past President Sturm said that he wanted to send a proviso with the motion. Senator Freeman said that he did not disagree with the suggestion. But he said that it does not belong in FH. It needs to be negotiated with the Provost's Office. Past President Sturm said that he wanted to make sure that the changes are not simply adopted going into the future, but retroactively apply too. He expressed concern about faculty disenfranchisement. President Faber asked whether FS has authority to do so. Past President Sturm said that he consulted Parliamentarian Rippke, who said that it was acceptable. Senator Freeman said that this motion addresses changes from the summer. He said that he would be uncomfortable saying that it goes back previous to that. Past President Sturm repeated that he wants to help faculty who are applying for advancement.

The motion was adopted.

5.2. MS Artificial Intelligence [20-3] – Bennett-George

No comments.

5.3. Discontinuation of M.S. and Ph.D. in Biorenewable Resources and Technology [20-4] – Bennett-George

No comments.

6. New Business

6.1. Non-Substantive FH Changes – Gender neutral language – changes made by FDAR with Governance Council approval [20-5] – Andreasen/Freeman

Governance Council worked with Sherri Angstrom to find and make these changes.

Secretary Butler asked about language like “emeritus” and “emerita.” Senator Andreasen said that not all possible changes have been made. It’s not clear what the best thing to do is in some cases.

6.2. AESHM Beverage Management Minor Proposal [20-6] – Bennett-George

Senator Bennett-George provided a brief summary of the proposal. No comments.

6.3. Name Change: Child, Adult, and Family Services Major [20-7] – Bennett-George

6.4. Name Change: Child, Adult, and Family Services Minor [20-8] – Bennett-George

Senator Bennett-George provided a brief summary of the proposals. No comments.

6.5. Ethics Minor Proposal [20-9] – Bennett-George

Senator Bennett-George provided a brief summary of the proposal. Academic Affairs Council unanimously approved the proposal on the condition that letters of support were received. They were provided in 24 hours. No comments.

6.6. Graduation with Distinction [20-10] – Bennett-George

Senator Bennett-George said that the basic issue was that distinction was determined based on the cumulative GPA from the semester prior to the final semester, rather than the totality of the student's work. Second, an adjustment was made so that students in programs that have fewer required credits may still graduate with distinction. Third, commencement programs will still indicate graduation with distinction based on the cumulative GPA in the semester prior to the final semester. However, such designation in the commencement program is not a promise or guarantee.

Secretary Butler asked whether it might make sense to reorder the different bachelors degrees, listing the two exceptions first (BLS and BSN) and then the policy for all other bachelors degrees. Senator Perkins agreed. Senator Freeman disagreed: anyone who satisfies the general requirement is guaranteed to graduate with distinction, and then here's another way for people in Liberal Studies and Nursing to graduate with distinction.

Senator Campbell asked whether this proposal takes into consideration the change in the BSN program from three semesters to one year. Senator Bennett-George asked whether students still have to take 32 credits. Senator Campbell said she was unsure whether it's 30 or 32 credits. She offered to find out.

6. Approval of the November 10, 2020 Faculty Senate Agenda

Senator Wallace called EB members' attention to the report from ISD Advisory Committee that he shared. President Faber asked whether he wanted it added as an agenda item. Senator Wallace thought that it could be announcement in the president's announcement.

Senator Perkins moved to adopt the FS agenda. Senator Freeman seconded. The motion was adopted.

7. Good of the Order

None

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:23 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, December 1, 2020 – 3:00 p.m. – WEBEX