FDAR Minutes  
Oct 28, 2019  
3:00 - 4 p.m. 107 Lab of Mechanics

**Attending:** Claire Andreasen [V PTH], Jose Rosa [MKT], Carmen Bain [SOC A], Diane Al Shihabi [ARTID], Dan Andersen [ABE], Ralph Napolitano [MSE]

**Absent:** Jan Lauren Boyles [GSJC], Panteleimon Ekkekakis [KIN], Eliot Winer [M E], Dawn Bratsch-Prince [SVPP]

Introductions of FDAR members

- Documents also are in Cybox; however, email also will be used for direct correspondence and notifications.

FH revision for term emeritus faculty – 2nd reading at Faculty Senate November 12, 2019

*Note - in the following minutes, there were numerous experiences and aspects discussed among attendees; therefore, the questions and opinions are not to be interpreted as committee consensus.*

**Review Collegiality Statements and relation to PRS**

- Some ISU departments and colleges have collegiality or similar statements in the PRS; not uniform across the university
- Outcomes may not have been assessed
- Civility, collegiality, citizenship are all positive attributes; important to recognize that each has a different definition; need to apply equitably

FH 3.4., 3.4.1., 3.4.1.2., 5.1.1.2. PRS

- Review Faculty Handbook (FH) to assess if collegiality statements in PRS may violate the FH
- Discussion points: Not a specific statement in FH related to not having or having a collegiality statement; may be implied and/or subject to various interpretations
- FH 3.4.1. General Description - Appears subject to some interpretation and/or implied meaning
  - Indicates contents of PRS: “The PRS description itself should be general and include only the significant responsibilities of the faculty member that are important in evaluating faculty accomplishments especially in the promotion and tenure process for tenure-eligible/tenured faculty or for advancement for term faculty.”
  - Indicates additional information that may be added: “If the parties agree to more specific language beyond a general description of areas of position responsibilities, that specific language shall not be understood to be a checklist or constraint on the faculty member’s freedom to choose areas and methods of inquiry appropriate to the discipline.”
    - **Specific language** is not defined and may imply a reference to the prior PRS description or other information may be added
  - PRS is a public document: “Because it outlines the expectations for faculty members in carrying out their duties in accordance with Iowa State University’s public land-grant university mission, the PRS shall be understood to be a public document.”
- FH 3.4.2. The Form of the PRS
  
  ...“Colleges may require additional statements or information to clarify the nature of faculty position responsibilities.”
  - The word “clarify” may imply a reference to the above list of required PRS elements, but also may be subject to a broader interpretation, since there is no reference to what additional statements may include
• FH 5.1.1.2 Annual Reviews and 5.2.2.1. Standards for Promotion and Tenure, Introduction
  o States which portions of the PRS are used, specifically in 5.2.2.1.
  “...A key tool in the promotion and tenure review process is the position responsibility statement, which describes the individual's current position responsibilities and activities in the following areas: (1) teaching, (2) research/creative activities, (3) extension/professional practice, and (4) institutional service.”
• Additional general concerns regarding the interpretation of collegiality were discussed including:
  o How are collegiality statements used?
  o Differences in how collegiality is defined
  o Steps to assure a transparent or equitable implementation; how assessed
  o Faculty Handbook states what will be used for advancement
  o Accountability should be the same for administrators
  o Faculty feedback via some college caucus chairs aligns with concerns of how collegiality is defined and the accountability
• Discussions with some college deans and department chairs via faculty caucus members:
  o Some deans and department chairs favor collegiality or related statements in the FH, possibly in PRS
  o These statements can be favored since these are positive attributes for a department or college to have and maintain
• President Sturm will decide the pathway for PRS and Collegiality statement steps by Faculty Senate
• Current summary for collegiality statements in the PRS from those in attendance:
  o Modifications regarding the PRS and collegiality statements (to contain or not) may be done via a resolution versus changes in the FH
  o Collegiality statements may be best in hiring letters, a statement of core values, best practices document, other mechanisms
  o Some faculty noted a statement on citizenship may be easier to define, possibly in a PRS
  o Collegiality, civility, citizenship differ in meaning and scope
  o Reference to AAUP Collegiality 2016 report


Institutional Service
• Citizenship also is a part of institutional service
• Suggested to review institutional service for advancement in FH (since briefly stated compared to other sections) or consider a resolution with emphasis on importance of institutional service
• Possible need to gain feedback if this is adequately rewarded and recognized
• Institutional service (focus on administrative and committee work) is separate from evaluation of outreach/extension/professional practice
FH 5.2.2.6 Institutional Service
  “Faculty members are expected to play a vital role in the functioning of the university at all levels by participating effectively in faculty governance and in the formulation of department, college, and/or university policies; or by carrying out administrative responsibilities. Therefore, to be promoted and/or tenured, faculty members are expected to have been involved in institutional service. The level and amount of service are expected to be higher for those seeking promotion to the rank of professor. However, institutional service alone shall not serve as the central basis for promotion and/or tenure. As citizens of
the university, faculty members may also make other direct and indirect contributions to their departments, colleges, and university communities.”

Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) committee- José Rosa

- Update on discussion of proposed FH modification by EDI in: 3.4.2.2., 5.1.1.2., 6.7.1.
- Background: one method to address the Campus Climate survey concerns and improve departmental interactions
- Rationale points in document (2 examples):
  - “…the definitive inclusion of developing and sustaining a civil and equitable climate as an essential part of faculty performance is proposed.”
  - “Affirming a civil and equitable climate may have been an implicit expectation at land grant institutions for over a century, but it has now become an essential component of what it means to be a faculty member in good standing, and should hence be recognized as such.”
- Therefore, a goal to improve work climate and create “a civil and equitable departmental and institutional climate.”
- Meeting with Department Chairs Council (May 2019) and Deans Council (June 2019) to discuss FH proposal to include language for PRS and annual performance reviews to augment creating a work climate with emphasis on Equity, Diversity and Inclusion
- EDI proposal to add similar phrases to 3.4.2.2., 5.1.1.2., 6.7.1.: “responsibility for developing and sustaining a civil and equitable departmental and institutional climate.”
  - The Dean and Chair meetings were pre-Workday and prior to discussions of collegiality statements in the PRS
  - Emphasis that a civil and equitable departmental and institutional climate is everyone’s responsibility.
  - Overall Deans and Department Chairs favor statements regarding “a civil and equitable departmental and institutional climate” in the FH
    - Could help need for accountability, benchmarks, and methods to assist in creating a positive work climate
    - To implement, Deans and Chairs may need further training to know best practices to benchmark/assess; how to measure; how to engage faculty in the process/communication
  - There were some requests regarding the revised FH proposal by EDI committee, for more specific definitions and possible further clarification
- José will take FH proposal back to EDI to review in context of current Faculty Senate discussions
- Numerous initiatives are occurring regarding a focus on collegiality, citizenship, civility, diversity, and inclusion across ISU

Annual reviews containing Diversity and Inclusion requests

- Attempts to document and assess Diversity and Inclusion (D&I) activities has led to additional questions in some department and/or college annual performance reviews, asking to list individual faculty activities related to the promotion of Diversity and Inclusion
- This is not known to occur in all departments, colleges, or to have consistent language
- Historically, some colleges use this information to assist:
  - Compiling the annual ISU report that goes to the BOR
  - Acquire a D&I baseline for comparison in determining the usefulness of initiatives or programs
- The discussions with faculty in departments and colleges seems to vary from very informative to minimal when statements or questions are added to annual performance reviews
- For some faculty, can rise questions as to why documentation is needed
Augmenting Communication

- Our discussion reflects a need for:
  - A more uniform process of communication to faculty with changes in the PRS, annual performance reviews, or any tool for faculty assessment/review to explain the significance, purpose, relevance, assessment, and impact gained for faculty and the university
  - Communication regarding outcome goals and use of the information

Not time to discuss further:

Work Climate

- Mentoring of faculty, please review feedback document from one college from agenda
- Please survey/discuss for feedback with college caucus regarding faculty mentoring as per Sept 30, 2019 minutes for future FDAR meeting discussion

Memo from President Wintersteen- Childcare Task Force
Claire Andreasen is a representative; had initial meeting to start organizing committee, updates will come forward at next FDAR meeting, process for input. Dawn Bratsch-Prince is a co-chair of the task force.

Committee reports- pending next FDAR