



IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate

Executive Board Minutes

Tuesday, October 6, 2020 – WEBEX 3:00 p.m. – 5:07 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); Rippke, S. (Parliamentarian); 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 3:02 when a quorum was reached.

2. Consent Agenda

EB Agenda October 6, 2020
EB Minutes September 8, 2020

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

3. Special Order on Process Change: AAC Recommendation to EB: Period 2 Drops – Bennett-George

Senator Bennet-George reminded EB members that FS had engaged in extensive discussions about period 2 drops. We had discussed removing the instructor's signature entirely. But that discussion centered on pink slips, not electronic documents. The Registrar's Office created an e-form so that neither the advisor nor the instructor had to meet in-person with the student. This created a huge headache for academic advisors. The process is initiated by the advisor through AccessPlus. The document is never routed to the instructor for signature. What used to take five minutes is now taking five days.

The current proposal would not be a change of policy, but a recommended process for college student services offices. Once the advisor sees that the instructor has received the e-mail, the advisor can fill out the drop form. Instructors will still receive notification of the drop.

Senator Bennett-George added that advisors are concerned about potential problems around the October 23 drop deadline. Students will request drops, but they can't be processed in a timely manner while they wait for the instructor's acknowledgment.

Secretary Butler pointed out that there were senators who didn't simply want to be notified about the drop, but wanted the opportunity to talk with the student, perhaps to alleviate concerns and prevent the drop. Of course, those senators acknowledged that students have the final say, but sometimes their decisions are based on misjudgment of their situation.

Senator Campbell said that the electronic form is a lengthy process. (Senator Wallace added that it's a terrible process.) She said that the form needs to be "student-centric," in which the student bears the responsibility for ensuring that the deadline is met. The current form assigns that responsibility to the advisor. So who's responsible if the form is not processed in time? What are the consequences? Furthermore, what happens if the form is filled out incorrectly, e.g., the wrong section number or failure to include a section number?

Senator Dekkers added that it is a burden to ask advisors to supply information that the Registrar's Office already possesses. Once they have the student name, university ID, and course number, why does the advisor have to supply classification or college? President Faber replied that the student completes that information. Senator Dekkers replied that only advisors have access to the form to fill it out.

Senator Bennett-George said that she agreed with Senators Campbell and Dekkers that the form needs to be "student-centric." There is a new form for spring 2021. The Registrar's Office didn't introduce it mid-semester, because everyone is fatigued by new changes.

Senator Wallace suggested talking to Registrar Suchan about the major pinch points in the process. How can we re-establish the discussion between the student and the instructor? The instructor can be informed by being cc-ed on an email. Is there some way to reduce the amount of information that advisors are required to supply? Once the student's name and ID are entered, the remaining fields should populate. Senators Campbell and Dekkers agreed that the Registrar's Office should be able to determine which section the student is enrolled in.

Senator Bennett-George said that the Registrar's Office is overloaded with work setting up the winter session.

President Faber said that although this is not a perfect solution, it will help to address the current problems. This will be moved forward without a vote by FS.

4. Announcements

4.1. President FS Meetings

President Faber said that she was looking to improve FS meetings. She observed that we run out of time around the announcements portion of the agenda. She suggested alternating which non-

FS groups report to meetings. She also said that it is difficult to run slides and conduct the meeting.

The calendar for spring 2021 meetings will not be changed, although the academic calendar has been changed. FS bylaws say that elections for president-elect take place in January.

Faculty Adjustments to COVID-19

Caucus chairs have been asked to collect data about faculty experiences. We will also look at developing a COVID Impact Statement. Maybe there are ways that faculty can report how COVID impacted their performance of responsibilities in annual reviews. She asked EB members to think about ways to remain flexible in this time of great change.

4.2. President-Elect

President-Elect Wheeler said that Representative Committee met and caucus chairs have collected the survey responses. The committee has not had a chance to review the responses yet. Additionally, caucus chairs were asked what issues are bubbling up from the colleges. It is clear that morale is quite low. Faculty are feeling that their workloads have gotten heavier. They are expressing anxiety about how they will be evaluated at performance review.

4.3. Past-President

None

4.4. Senior Vice President and Provost

Budget Update

Provost Wickert said that the state provided \$227.4 million. \$50 million has been targeted for line-item appropriations; the remaining \$175 million is for general fund appropriations. Tuition revenue is now almost twice the revenue of general education state appropriations. Tuition is \$322.6 million (down from \$348.3 million in FY20.) Enrollment decreased from 33,391 to 31,825. We are feeling the effect of declining enrollment and BOR's tuition freeze. However, the actual tuition revenue exceeded the projected numbers for budgeting.

Student Information System

We are in the early stages of studying and conducting due diligence for a new student information system (like the new system for HR and finance). This would render obsolete the forms that we currently use. The planning committee is scheduling virtual site visits at Rochester, Brandeis, Ohio State, and others who are in various stages of implementing Workday Student.

Senator Daniels asked whether faculty or advisors are included in the planning committee membership. Provost Wickert said he did not know; he would have to look.

Student Engagement in Classes

Provost Wickert said that he has received a number of complaints centrally from students and from some parents, regarding the quality of online instruction. They are not challenging the fact

that classes are being conducted online. Instead, they're complaining about the low quality of the online experience. For example, some faculty refer students to YouTube videos to learn material. Some classes have no live synchronous interaction: no recitation, no breakout rooms, no online office hours. Some classes have material that has poor audio or video quality. Some sessions are regularly canceled.

Provost Wickert acknowledge that this is not representative of all faculty. But there are faculty who are not putting a lot of energy into teaching, and it's becoming more apparent, with greater scrutiny and a fair number of complaints.

Provost Wickert said that ISU President Wintersteen has expressed a concern that we are at risk of losing students in the spring semester. This is bad for us reputationally. And it might create new external pressure on us from BOR or Iowa legislature.

How do we communicate out to faculty to do their best with online learning and make sure to have some kind of engagement? One year ago, before the pandemic, there were lots of opportunities for student engagement: student clubs and councils. These activities contribute to the ISU experience. But now there is not much student engagement outside of the classroom. And if the quality of the virtual instruction is low, engagement in learning will go down. Then we will have a cohort of students with low engagement, and who will be at risk of not returning to ISU.

At the beginning of the summer, Associate Provost VanDerZanden distributed information to faculty about best practices for engaging students online, at least one hour per week in live interaction. It might be a good idea at this mid-semester point to recommunicate that to faculty. Going forward, what kinds of things can we go on?

Provost Wickert said that he will meet with department chairs tomorrow and make them aware of this student and parent feedback. Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince is working with her team to create end-of-semester course evaluations. There will be a question about the level of engagement in online classes.

Secretary Butler recommended against this mid-semester communication; she thought faculty would not receive it well. Many faculty are working extra hours and focusing their effort on teaching. Many are also managing caretaking responsibilities, schooling for children, and depression and anxiety. To then hear that they are not doing enough would create resentment. Secretary Butler recommended a more "surgical" approach conducted by chairs with their faculty who are not offering enough opportunities for their students to engage.

Senator Wallace added that faculty have experienced memo fatigue. Faculty are exhausted by the amount of effort they are having to put into teaching. If this concern comes in a memo from the Provost's Office, it would be from too far up the administrative chain; Senator Wallace thought that it would either not be heard by the parties who need to hear it, or create resentment by the parties who do not need to hear it. Instead, the discussion has to take place between faculty and chairs or others lower in the chain who understand the situations of individual faculty (what they're doing and how they're doing). A blanket statement will not likely change anything. For

faculty who are currently teaching face-to-face classes, it's not clear what more they can do to increase student engagement.

Past President Strum recommended changing the tone of memo. Begin by providing a general overview about the issue of teaching at this particular university – a research university that obviously values teaching. Under these unprecedented circumstances, because student clubs are unable to continue in their usual manner and because faculty-student interactions have changed because so much education is taking place online, students are being kept away from each other and are focusing on different aspects of their experience. For the time being, it is prudent for faculty, administrators and staff to find the most effective ways (if we are not already doing so) to address the current situation. Should things change, we can re-evaluate. Past President Sturm thought that focusing on the negative would anger people who are already overworked and doing the best they can. Such a message would set the stage for department-level work with faculty who need more prodding.

President-Elect Wheeler said that Representative Committee repeatedly commented that faculty genuinely feel overwhelmed and morale is low. Students are also overwhelmed, tired, and stressed.

Senator Bennett-George said lack of structure from poor online teaching contributes to this stress. They are not just having too much work and multiple deadlines, a lot of the work is meaningless. They miss the structure of having to show up for class. More synchronous online instruction would help students with time-management problems. It would also create community and structured engagement.

Senator Al Shihabi recommended against the memo. She said that it assumes that it's the faculty member's fault that they are teaching the way they are. In COD, the department chair schedules the class and the modality. In some cases, there were mistakes. Students whose classes were designated WWW arranged assumed that it was asynchronous when the faculty member intended to teach it synchronously. Then the faculty member had to change the delivery to accommodate those students, because the students double-scheduled other obligations (work, other classes, etc.). Doing so required faculty to reconfigure the entire class and record lectures – during the semester!

Senator Campbell said that the reports of student perceptions made her sad. She has taken to hear how to be the most effective educator she can be in an online setting. Senator Campbell pointed out that administrators have continued to emphasize that we are a residential campus and face-to-face learning is what we do; we have online learning only because of this situation. This sends the message to students that online learning is not as good as face-to-face. But this false. It might not be ideal, but it has to potential to be as amazing and effective as face-to-face learning. Instead we should communicate that online learning is good and different from face-to-face.

Provost Wickert thanked EB members for their feedback. He offered some more examples of the variety of comments he gets from students and parents. One parent who monitors ISU's COVID dashboard asked why classes aren't all being moved to in-person now that the positivity percentage has decreased below 5%. Students are using the phrase "lied to" about the quality of

instruction. They are asking for tuition refunds. Central administration has managed the situation for now and insulated faculty from the comments; but if a critical mass develops, BOR or the legislature may try to get involved.

Provost Wickert said that he liked the suggestion of charging chairs, but he also wanted to provide cover to chairs. They're doing important and hard work. He doesn't want them to have to do another difficult thing without knowing that the Provost's Office has their back. This point is not about assigning blame. He appreciated the comment about classes being slotted the wrong way, and the suggestion about changing the focus to moving forward and keeping students and parents with us. He will share these comments with his team.

Senator Freeman said that there has always been a huge variety in face-to-face teaching, some of which is good and some of which is poor. Students know that. We should reinforce the point to students that faculty are generally trying. There are lots of resources on campus for faculty to help teach online in a more effective manner. Chairs can reach out to faculty and remind them of these resources. If faculty don't do anything to improve, then chairs can take the first step to hold them accountable.

4.5. Council Chairs Reports

AAC: Nothing additional to new business

FDAR: Senator Andreasen said that a draft written by EDI committee of an FH statement had been submitted to EB. It would codify a practice already in place in some departments, where a faculty member can document their equity, diversity, and inclusion work. There was a strong feeling from caucus chairs and faculty that no overarching statement should be included in the PRS or faculty performance review. So the committee is re-examining the proposal. It will not come forward in its current condition.

A workgroup has been formed to work on issues related to advancement of term faculty. They will make recommendations about FH changes and best practices.

Senator Andreasen and Ms. Angstrom are working to include gender-neutral pronouns in FH. This will go to the Document Committee. They will also meet with nicci port.

GOV: None

J&A: None

RPA: None

President Faber also pointed out that the Title IX changes do not require any changes to FH 7.

4.6. Caucus Chair Reports

CALS: Senator Dekkers said that the caucus reviewed their survey results at their second meeting on Thursday. The dean was also present, and this created the opportunity to discuss

issues that need to be addressed at the college level. The equity advisor will talk about the ADVANCE program and how senators can help move those objectives along.

ICOB: Senator Perkins said that the caucus discussed feedback on EDI with Senator Rosa at the meeting yesterday. They are working on the college governance document.

COD: Senator Al Shihabi said that caucus met on October 2. They asked about the new ADVANCE promotion checklist. It lists a new requirement to discuss how the candidate's activities fit with the university's land grant mission. Senators weren't sure how to apply that. Are they looking for something in terms of EDI or the land grant mission in general?

Faculty have reported that they are exhausted, concerned about their salaries, and don't want their benefits cut.

Faculty also asked how flexible they are supposed to be with students who fail to meet deadlines because of mental health this semester. Some students have not submitted any work. Are we supposed to work with them over break to get caught up? Where can faculty draw the line?

COE: Senator Daniels said the group met yesterday and on the 2nd. They are working to get a budget advisory committee in place in the college. They continue to discuss the lecturer and teaching assistant professor proposal. There is concern about using lecturer positions for short-term needs for people who do not intend to seek a promotion.

CHS: Senator Campbell said that the caucus met weeks ago and will meet again next week.. Historically, the caucus has always had meetings with dean and the agenda has been driven by the dean. Tomorrow the caucus will meet without the dean to determine what they want to discuss and work on as action items.

LAS: Senator Wallace said that LAS Representative Assembly has proposed bylaw changes to bring more recent changes about how the college conducts its business into alignment with the requirements set by FS Document Review Committee. The proposal is undergoing a college-wide vote.

Senator Wallace said that he is trying to arrange a time to meet with the dean to catch up on additional questions as result of the Representative Committee's survey. When the report is compiled, it will form the center of discussion.

CVM: Senator Andreasen said that the caucus discussed the Representative Committee survey. There were positive comments as well from survey. But the overarching concern is the impact of COVID on faculty performance reviews.

Senator Daniels pointed out that when he combined the survey results, he anonymized the comments to present to the dean. This was helpful for planning purposes. He recommended that other caucuses do so too.

5. Unfinished Business

5.1. FS Bylaw Change [20-1] – Freeman

Senator Freeman said that “ex officio” had been changed to “non-voting” and “limit” was changed on page 8. No comments.

6. New Business

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

Senator Freeman said that when FS passed the changes to term faculty policies, the policy made lecturers and teaching assistant professors the same rank. In FH 3.3.2.2, they are still the same, because it is not an advancement. But in FH 3.3.2.3, for the sake of clarification, bullet points were introduced. Some people are interpreting that as indicating that they are separate ranks. This creates a huge disparity: Teaching term faculty have to go through additional advancement and spend more time in rank in order to get multiyear contracts. This was not FS’s intention. The proposed change returns FH to what FS intended. (Senator Freeman also said that cosmetic changes were made, in that ranks are not capitalized in FH.)

Senator Freeman added that some departments (he knew of departments in COE) have different degree requirements for lecturers and teaching assistant professors. That was not the intention of the original term faculty policy. Once hired, advancement is based on performance in the position responsibilities as defined in the PRS. No additional degree is required. This also reveals classification problems for hiring instructors for industry. If the instructor stays on, their classification does not fit with our current teaching professor ranks. There is a subcommittee (including Senator Freeman, Governance representatives from COB and COE, and Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince) working to propose changes to make these hires fit within our categories.

Senator Daniels said that many departments in COE would like to hire from industry. It is hard to find people to do these very specific things. Such hires have a very low teaching load, maybe just one class while they continue to work in industry or even if they’re no longer in industry.

Senator Freeman added that other colleges use professor of practice for these kinds of hires. COE disallowed assistant and associate professor of practice ranks, and boxed themselves out of a natural fit.

Senator Daniels said that COE thought that “lecturer” would be the appropriate title.

Past President Sturm offered another concern. Is there any language here or elsewhere that grandfathers people in who have already been negatively affected by this interpretation?

Senator Freeman said that if this passes, we need to discuss how it is implemented. In Governance Council, people thought the Provost’s Office could address these matters outside of policy. Time in place as lecturer counts toward advancement. We shouldn’t recommend restarting clocks at 2019, but the clock shouldn’t start at 2019. Ultimately, there will need to be language about how to implement these changes.

Past President Sturm said that it would be a quick way to tank morale by disenfranchising people we intended to support. If we can reach good faith handshake agreement with the Provost's Office, Past President Sturm said he would be fine with that. Somehow, he said, we need to feel confident that people are not disenfranchised who have already gone through this process.

Senator Freeman said that Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince supports that viewpoint. He said that some comment could be added to the rationale. But he would be uncomfortable inserting something into FH that has an expiration date.

Past President Sturm said that it becomes a budget issue. There should be no surprises that cannot be budgeted.

President Faber asked Past President Sturm to repeat his comments at the FS meeting.

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

Senator Bennett-George said that this was uniformly supported by AAC.

Senator Daniels asked whether this went through the Computer Curriculum Committee. Senator Bennett-George pointed to the end of the document.

There was no opposition to bringing this forward to FS.

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

Senator Bennet-George said that this program began in 2002. At the time, people thought biorenewables would save world. The program was funded through external funding, but that funding no longer exists and therefore there is no longer the budget to support the program. There are a small number of students who are still enrolled in it.

There was no opposition to bringing this forward to FS.

7. Resolutions

7.1. Resolution on Renewal Reviews for Term Faculty from Padgett-Walsh [20-5] – Faber

President Faber said that EB can provide feedback to Senator Padgett-Walsh, but he does not have to take it. EB members might recommend alternate ways to proceed, such as sending it to a council instead.

Senator Andreasen said that she really liked the nonrenewal and budget paragraph, which she thought was well-written and could be the introductory paragraph. She would recommend that the primary impact statement be closer to the beginning summary. She observed that some statements are not specific to term faculty. She recommended that the statements specific to term faculty should be first in order. Of course, some of these issues affect all faculty.

President Faber observed that resolutions are just a moment in time. They have no force of policy behind them.

Past President Sturm said that the change to tenure clocks was not the result of a resolution, but the product of discussions with the Provost's Office. Past President Sturm added that he was surprised that some faculty think we need a resolution at this point. There hasn't been a collaborative discussion between administrators and faculty leaders. If student evaluations are not to be counted at this point (on the argument that most of the work of teaching professors is teaching and evaluation is conducted principally on the basis of student evaluations), then there's a fairness issue about whether teaching can be evaluated at all, because the number one data point has been removed. If it's unfair to evaluate, then extend the process for another year for that cohort. It's the logical thing to do, and it's the most efficient, collegial and productive thing to do. Past President Sturm said that he supported the resolution, but he thought we could achieve better without the resolution.

Senator Perkins said that he supported the comments made by Past President Sturm. In his college, faculty said that tenured faculty should get an additional year before the next post-tenure review. It seems logical to adopt these changes to treat term faculty in a parallel way.

Senator Freeman said that he liked most of what is written, but he disagreed with its premise. When tenure-eligible faculty were offered a one-year extension, the reason concerned the disruption to scholarship. But there hasn't been a corresponding disruption to teaching. Of course, there are different ways we evaluate teaching now. But he would be disappointed if a chair chose not to renew based on the limited information about teaching. As a faculty senator, we should be upset were that to occur. But these are not parallel situations. Nobody got a break from teaching. Everyone is teaching in different ways and doing what needs to be done. He said that he agreed with Senator Andreasen that some of these issues affect all faculty. But the disruptions to teaching and scholarship are not the same.

Senator Dekkers said that he agreed with Senator Freeman. The disruption needs to be taken into account. That can and should be done, rather than granting an extension.

Senator Andreasen asked for and received clarification: we can make recommendations to Senator Padgett-Walsh, but he may still bring it to FS floor.

Senator Wallace said that the "whereas" clauses get lengthy. There number could be reduced by combining sentences. He was concerned about improving readability.

Past President Sturm noted that peer review is a critical aspect of research, which confers value on the research conducted at this institution. Similarly, if we don't use student evaluations, then term faculty are not being reviewed. Isn't this similar enough of a situation?

Senator Freeman replied that he didn't want to have this conversation on FS floor. He didn't think it would be positive for FS or for term faculty.

President Faber asked whether there was a committee or council that it would be best to refer this to.

Past President Sturm volunteered to talk to Senator Padgett-Walsh about EB's concerns.

7.2. Student Government Resolution [20-6] - Faber

President Faber said that this resolution goes against shared governance.

Senator Bennett-George said that she was surprised by the call for moving instruction online. This isn't what she's hearing from her students, who wish there were more face-to-face classes. She noted Senator Campbell's caution about how we talk about online classes. She said she was upset that students wanted to take the decision about course modality away from faculty.

Senator Freeman said that he had talked to SG President Fritz. She had said that this was a small group of students and not representative of student opinion as a whole. He didn't think that FS was obligated to take it up.

Senator Day said that not only should FS not take up the resolution, he disagreed with the sentiment.

Senator Wallace pointed out that FS could vote against the resolution to send a message.

Senator Daniels recommended against that, to prevent it from becoming a bigger story.

Past President Sturm said that the resolution claims to be acting to make campus safer. But all of the reports indicate that faculty and administrators are not contributing to the increased rate of COVID transmission.

Senator Campbell thought that we needed to be careful about how this point is made. Some faculty are teaching online, some are face-to-face. This matches the spread of student interest in different course modalities.

Past President Sturm said that procedurally the way to stop this would be to postpone indefinitely.

Senator Day pointed out that FS could vote against it.

Secretary Butler asked whether its having a docket number required EB to do something with it. President Faber replied that the docket number could be taken off.

The consensus was not to support this resolution.

8. Approval of the October 13, 2020 Faculty Senate Agenda

President Faber resumed her question about announcements. Do we want to include everyone to be supportive of their groups?

Senator Wallace pointed out that the practice is not very old; FS President Hendrich wanted to allow a voice to talk to faculty. P&S Council has traditionally invited FS president to their meetings to make a report. But this is a courtesy, and these are guests at our meeting.

Secretary Butler thought that it was an important practice to continue, to communicate faculty good will towards these groups.

Senator Day said that the leaders could be told what the schedule is, and they could petition to be included at off-schedule meetings.

Alternatively, Senator Perkins suggested, they could let President Faber know if they have something to report. President Faber said that that's how P&S Council schedules FS remarks.

Past President Sturm suggested asking Ms. Angstrom to coordinate these remarks.

Past President Sturm asked whether FS agenda should include the resolution about term faculty clocks on it. Senator Freeman replied that the consensus was to leave it off. Senator Padgett-Walsh can introduce it if he wants. But it isn't a formal docket item.

Senator Wallace suggested that the governments and council could submit written reports like committees and councils.

Past President Sturm recommended leaving the announcements as scheduled this time. Ms. Angstrom can reach out to leaders for future meetings.

The agenda was adopted.

9. Good of the Order

None

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

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