



IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate

Executive Board Agenda

Tuesday, April 13, 2021 – WEBEX 3:00 p.m.

Present: Al Shihabi, D. (COD); Andreasen, C. (FDAR and CVM); Bennett-George, S. (Academic Affairs); Bratsch-Prince, D. (Associate Provost); Butler, A. (Secretary); Daniels, T. (COE); Dekkers, J. (CALs); Faber, C. (President); Freeman, S. (Governance); Oberhauser, A. (RPA); Perkins, J. (COB); 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)

Guests: K. Darr

1. Call to Order

President Faber called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m. when quorum was reached.

2. Consent Agenda

EB Agenda April 13, 2021

EB Minutes March 30, 2021

Senator Perkins moved to accept the consent agenda. Senator Bennett-George seconded. The motion was adopted.

3. Unfinished Business

3.1. Beef Cattle Production Management Certificate [20-25] – Bennett-George

3.2. Equine Science and Management Certificate [20-26] – Bennett-George

3.3. Swine Production Management Certificate [20-27] – Bennett-George

No comments

3.4. Preservation and Cultural Heritage Minor [20-28] – Bennett-George

No comments

3.5. Discontinuation – Masters of School Mathematics Program [20-29] – Bennett-George

No comments

3.6. Fashion Culture, History, and Social Justice Minor [20-30] – Bennett-George

No comments

3.7. FH 10.7.2 Student Outcomes Assessment [20-31] – Bennett-George

Secretary Butler asked for clarification about the clause before the bulleted items, “As general guidelines, assessment of our general education and program-level outcomes will.” She thought there was a tension between being “general guidelines” and “will,” which implies a requirement. Is each program required to satisfy every bullet point, or are they just guidelines? For example, we would like to require faculty involvement at every part of the process, but it’s not clear that multiple methods or external judgment is appropriate in every case.

Associate Provost VanDerZanden said that different departments can satisfy these requirements in different ways. “Multiple methods” means that there is not just one way that the assessment is done. The best ways will be determined by discipline and pedagogy.

Senator Wallace said that Outcomes Assessment Committee looked at ways of assessment in every discipline and in different colleges, where there are different levels of precision in the assessment. These guidelines are general principles and what each assessment should aspire to be. Ultimately, the committee is trying to attain some general standard for the university, so there is not this variance in precision or record-keeping. ABET has strict guidelines for engineering programs, whereas other disciplines are more lax. The challenge is to write the guidelines in language that is inclusive enough to involve all disciplines, but allow variation in how the data are collected and reported by disciplines.

Senator Freeman said that he viewed the overall bulleted list as a “must,” but not each bullet point is a “must.” Not every individual bulleted item needs to occur at every single assessment, but as a group, these things have to be there.

In the chat, Senator Dekkers suggested the following revision: “As general guidelines, assessment of university-wide education and...”

Senator Bennett-George said that Senator Freeman’s interpretation matched the discussion in AAC.

Secretary Butler also pointed out that there the bulleted items under “Program Assessment” did not each begin with a verb. She asked whether the link to “student learning outcomes” worked (it didn’t for her). She added a “cheeky” comment, that “summarize recommendations, identify opportunities for improvements (if needed)” implies that not every recommendation is oriented toward improvement.

President Faber said that the link worked for her.

Senator Bennett-George suggested removing the first three words in the non-parallel bullet item.

EB members agreed to leave the other sentence alone.

In lieu of using meeting time to come up with new phrasing, Secretary Butler offered to make the agreed upon changes. Senator Wallace said that the Outcomes Assessment Committee would

meet the next day at 2. Secretary Butler agreed to send the revisions to the appropriate parties before then.

Senator Wallace moved to put the item on the FS agenda, subject to the changes. Senator Bennett-George seconded. The motion was adopted.

3.8. Graduation with Distinction [20-32] – Bennett-George

No comments

3.9. Repeated Courses Policy [20-33] – Bennett-George

No comments

3.10. FS Bylaw Change: New Committee under AAC – US Diversity Course Requirement Committee [20-34] – Bennett-George

No comments

3.11. US Diversity Requirement [20-35] – Bennett-George

With the consent of EB, a subgroup met and crafted a revised version of the proposal. President-Elect Wheeler summarized the proposed changes. The biggest discussion was about diversity and inclusion, with some small changes about inclusion. In the second paragraph, the list of specific categories were removed, because the subgroup asked whether a diversity class is only concerned with race, ethnicity, and gender. They thought it would be exclusive to talk only about those categories. In the bullet points, changes were made around the idea of diversity, culture, ethnicity, race, and religion. In the last learning outcome bullet, equity and inclusion were added to diversity.

President Faber asked whether President-Elect Wheeler had a chance to discuss the proposal with students. President-Elect Wheeler said that she had met with a group of students yesterday. They are really positive that there will be change. They had some clear and interesting comments. One student really wanted syllabi to spell out clearly how the objectives were being met in those particular classes, so that students could make informed choices about which diversity class to take. Students also wanted to know how the new committee would operate to assess existing classes. Another student commented about how difficult it is to study systemic oppression, because who is marginalized can change. That student thought that it would be important to review classes on a continuing basis. Echoing comments from previous years, another student wanted there to be a question on course evaluations about whether the class met the learning objectives.

Senator Dekkers offered some suggestions of changes to wording. He recommended replacing “human beings” with “human populations.” He proposed “understand” instead of “analyze” systemic oppression. And he asked what type of analysis would be required in the learning outcome “be able to apply to analysis of the U.S.”

President-Elect Wheeler thought it would be a large task for students to “understand” systemic oppression instead of “analyze.”

In the chat, Senator Campbell wrote: “The 2nd learning outcome seems as if it should be two different objectives. Understand and apply are different levels of Bloom's taxonomy.” Senator Campbell also suggested: “can the word ‘bias’ be used instead of ‘prejudice?’”

Senator Bennett-George pointed out that the learning objectives are presented in their order in Bloom’s taxonomy: identify, understand, analyze, evaluate.

Secretary Butler asked how the subgroup decided to recommend that meeting three out of four learning objectives would make a class appropriate. President-Elect Wheeler said that in the subgroup there was dispute about learning objective #3. It might be only really able to tackle the topic of systemic oppression in a 400-level class. There could be really good diversity classes that meet just three of the learning objectives.

Secretary Butler expressed her disappointment in the revisions. She thought they strayed from the working group’s report. She thought that perhaps the subgroup’s revisions were made for political reasons, rather than curricular reasons. That is, the Catalog is a public document. If that’s right, perhaps it makes sense to remove the third learning objective and require all three learning objectives.

Past President Sturm asked whether President-Elect Wheeler discussed the revised or original proposal with the students. Do they agree with the revisions? Do they think it will be successful? He noted that “systemic oppression” is a trigger word. But faculty are permitted to delve into content that is controversial that is germane to the class’s subject matter.

Senator Bennett-George said that she did not share the EB revisions with AAC but discussed them with the Council. She thought it would be inappropriate to share with them before EB got a chance to see them, and because further revisions might be made after conversations with students. In AAC, they discussed in a general sense what changes had been made. A great deal of disappointment was expressed in AAC, because of the loss of specificity. It is possible – and probable – that there will be voices opposing the proposal in FS because the specificity was removed. She said that AAC did discuss that even with less specificity and just three out of four learning objectives required, it would be an improvement over what is currently in the Catalog. Having the new committee to review diversity courses is vital. It is hugely important to have experts interpret and apply the outcomes.

Past President Sturm said that he did not want to water down the proposal to the point that it’s not useful and not focused on an aspect of education important for preparing students to live in the 21st century. At the same time, he did not want to incur more wrath from the legislature. He offered a suggestion that “at least” be inserted in front of three in the clause introducing the learning objectives. That way, faculty know that they can meet all four learning objectives.

In the chat, Senator Oberhauser wrote: “I think the 'broad' way of talking about oppression and marginalization is better in applying this to the range of courses and different disciplines that will offer US Diversity reqmt.” She added: “Removing 'systemic oppression' will also water down the meaning and important way fo discuss the main points of US Diversity. This is a mainstream and broadly accepted academic way of looking at DEI.”

In the chat, Associate Provost VanDerZanden wrote: “There was discussion at AAC about the 3 outcomes being the minimum- could be all 4.”

Secretary Butler thought “at least” was unnecessary. If EB members are genuinely concerned about political ramifications, perhaps Senator Perkins’s suggestion from a previous meeting should be followed, on which the committee determines its own criteria and then reviews classes according to those criteria.

President Faber said she liked “at least.”

Senator Freeman didn’t think “at least” added anything. He added that at the previous EB discussion, members thought the list was limiting what topics could be discussed in a U.S. diversity class. Maybe after “social complexity” parentheses could be added and “such as” and the list of topics could be inserted. President-Elect Wheeler thought that that might be an appropriate compromise.

Senator Perkins suggested changing “an analysis of the U.S.” to “U.S. society.”

The majority of EB members agreed to change “human beings” to “population” and insert “such as” after “social complexity.” EB members rejected inserting “at least.”

In the chat, Senator Campbell wrote: “Perhaps this has already occurred; however, if not, it seems CELT should be consulted regarding the phrasing of the outcomes.” When asked to clarify by President Faber, Senator Campbell recommended consulting with teaching experts, such as CELT, on how best to write the learning objectives. She appreciated that they are scaffolded according to Bloom’s taxonomy. But “identify” is a basic task, involving multiple-choice or matching questions. “Experiences” are not the sort of topic that lend themselves well to such a task.

Senator Bennett-George pointed out that the second learning objective starts with “understand” and finishes with “apply.” This is a step up in the taxonomy. The further outcome is to “analyze.” Senator Bennett-George added that she thought such revision to the learning outcomes would be big changes.

President Faber asked whether EB members thought the matter should be referred to some further outside source for review.

Senator Dekkers said that he had expressed concern about the vagueness of the proposal. He liked Senator Perkins’s proposed change to “U.S. society.” That change was adopted by EB members.

Senator Freeman pointed out that Associate Provost VanDerZanden was involved in the process, and she has CELT experience. He thought it would be better to send the proposal to FS for discussion. If senators want to make changes, they can do so between the first and second reading.

In the chat, Senator Campbell wrote: “I am not opposed to sending it forward however, I strongly believe the learning objectives need to be revised to make them easier to evaluate. For example, "identify the contributions" can be evaluated however, "identify experiences" is tricky to evaluate.”

Senator Perkins moved to put the proposal on the FS agenda. Secretary Butler seconded. The motion was adopted with one dissent.

4. New Business

4.1. Masters of Healthcare Analytics and Operations [20-36] – Bennett-George

Senator Bennett-George said that the degree would be predominantly online.

Senator Andreasen thought that it would be good for the proposers to have a conversation with healthcare analytics and operations in CVM. The veterinary teaching hospital is a vast complex institution. The MyChart tool used by McFarland Clinic is 20 years behind state-of-the-art information systems. ISU works with UIHC on supply chain; UIHC has just one species to work with. Senator Andreasen said that CVM hires a lot of these experts, and thinks there is a opportunity for a really nice collaboration.

4.2. FH 5.4 Evaluation, Renewal, and Advancement of Term Faculty Appointments [20-37] – Andreasen

Senator Andreasen said that some of these recommendations came out of a workgroup chaired by Assistant Provost Jordan. They brought forward this document and another document with best practices. The effort is to broadly increase information in FH about the process for term faculty advancement. A lot of decisions are made at the college or department level, because of the diversity of term faculty positions across the university. This proposal finds the points of commonality and what is applicable broadly across campus. This proposal refers to other parts in FH, such as FH 3.3.2.2. The goal here is to make it a “one-stop shop” for term faculty advancement processes, keeping separate term faculty advancement form promotion and tenure processes. Senator Andreasen asked that comments be sent to her both on this document and the best practices document. She asked for clarifications about whether the best practices document would be forwarded to the Provost’s Office.

5. Faculty Compensation Discussion – Dawn Bratsch-Prince

Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince said that FH needs to be changed to include language about winter session. She said that Brenda Behling reviewed sections regarding faculty compensation to develop language as a first step in codifying what we do in compensation for winter session teaching. The proposal is currently with Governance Council.

Currently, FH does not address winter session. There needs to be clarity about 9 month faculty who take on additional teaching during winter session. Language about summer session has been updated, as well, as it has not been changed in decades. The terminology was updated to best reflect the current process. 9 month faculty are paid a flat-rate salary for teaching, if they choose to. In some cases, faculty can trade one semester’s teaching assignment for a winter teaching assignment. These are two options available to faculty who teaching during winter session. The

changes also clarify that teaching during the winter session does not count towards the total of 11 months maximum that a faculty member can receive compensation from the general fund.

Senator Freeman asked EB members for guidance on one issue. The proposal says that a winter session class can replace a spring class. But in her summary, Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince said that the replacement class could be from either semester. Governance Council thought it would be troublesome if a faculty member selects to replace a fall course with a prospective winter session course, and then the course doesn't fill. Governance Council thought that the reason the proposal specified spring was to ensure that the winter session class fills.

Provost Wickert suggested that it might require a few years of offering winter sessions before we have a clear idea of enrollments for different classes.

In the chat, Senator Oberhauser wrote: "Will winter session courses focus on gen. ed. and more 'popular' courses? Are we looking for courses that will draw big enrollment?"

Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince said that the courses that are approved for winter session offerings are likely to fill. They are not experimental courses, or ones that are not likely to have a robust enrollment.

In the chat, Senator Campbell asked: "What will be the minimum enrollments?"

Provost Wickert said that he thought this would be a good topic for caucuses to discuss with their deans and department chairs. It's not a problem that can be solved centrally. Furthermore, the selection of winter session classes is a few months away, so these conversations can take place now.

Senator Freeman said that the proposed change to FH is two choices: either additional compensation or a replacement for a course assignment in the spring. Governance Council also added language to stress that this required mutual agreement. A chair can request a winter or summer course to be taught, but the faculty member is not required to agree. A faculty member can request a winter or summer course assignment and the chair can say no. Or the chair can say yes, but if the course doesn't fill, it won't be taught.

In the chat, Secretary Butler wrote: "Is there a way to write this without committing to spring replacement: e.g. negotiated with chair?"

Senator Campbell clarified her concern in her chat comment. In her college, the minimum enrollments for a class to be taught depends on the salary of the faculty member assigned to teach it. But if those minimum enrollments are not met for higher-compensated faculty, a needed class may be canceled. While she appreciated that this might not be a topic for FH revisions, she thought that it was an important problem to address.

President Faber agreed that there needs to be discussion of that problem. She added that it cannot be solved completely without looking at local circumstances, including the college and the particular course.

In the chat, Senator Obehauser wrote: “Thanks for bringing this to the faculty senate - important to get input given the impact on faculty and our departments.”

In the chat, Associate Provost VanDerZanden wrote: “Christina, We can add that to the overall planning discussion for winter session 2021-22 planning.”

6. Discussion About In-Person Fall Instruction – Jonathan Wickert

Provost Wickert said that as the end of the spring semester is approaching, we need to begin to communicate expectations about fall semester. ISU President Wintersteen sent a communication to campus indicating that the default will be in-person instruction in the fall. Fall 2021 will be more like Fall 2019, with on-campus events and meetings and visitors coming to campus. Provost Wickert expects some Cyclones Care steps will be in place, perhaps with modification. Vaccines are becoming more widely available and distribution to ISU has increased from 100 Pfizer doses to over 1500 this week. IDPH and national agencies are projecting increased availability over the summer.

With that in mind, we need to plan for the fall semester. ISU President Wintersteen will send a memo to all members of campus to address what the fall will look like. Employees and staff need to return to work on campus over the summer. Faculty on 9 month appointments will be expected to be back on campus when their contracts resume in August. AWA program will expire in June. An *Inside Iowa State* article will follow.

Provost Wickert intends to send a memo (#26) to all faculty to discuss fall instruction specifically.

VP Darr said that the transition from on campus to remote was made very quickly in Spring 2020. In this reverse transition, we have time to plan and be thoughtful. People will have multiple layers to manage, including plans for their families. What should Cyclones Care 2.0 look like?

VP Darr added that ISU President Wintersteen will host a faculty and staff town hall on April 29 at 1 p.m. The topic will be return to campus. There are likely to be more questions than answers right now.

Provost Wickert added that the upcoming Provost’s Council will be conducted in a hybrid manner, in the Sun Room with masks, microphones, and social distancing. The goal is to get some experience in returning to in-person meetings. It involves a big change in mindset, as people have been isolated and working remotely. He added that if meetings are conducted in a hybrid manner, the technology has to work. How much effort should be expended on that? Of course, a lot of meetings could be conducted completely virtually instead of hybrid.

In the chat, Senator Campbell wrote: “We discussed this in our caucus meeting with the Dean. Senators expressed a strong interest in maintaining flexibility with attending meetings virtually.”

In the chat, Senator Daniels wrote: “I’d say our departmental faculty meetings at 3PM on Fridays are better attended and more productive online than they ever were in-person.”

Provost Wickert proposed scheduling a meeting with EB at 3 p.m. on Thursday to discuss the memo.

President-Elect Wheeler said that she was concerned about AWA going away. Some people may have health issues that are not within ADA but still make them anxious about being on campus. Can we be flexible with those people? Who would those conversations be with? Chairs? Deans?

Provost Wickert suggested UHR, especially for ADA or FMLA-type accommodations. Provost Wickert acknowledged challenges in bringing people back to campus. But currently, a lot of offices are empty and corridors are dark. In Beardshear, the ISU Card office has very specific hours it is open. The goal is to reopen campus in the fall. He added that we have been at the very flexible side of the spectrum, but it is not sustainable. We need to move more in the opposite direction in the fall.

Senator Oberhauser said that “return to work” carries the implication that we have not been working. She recommended “return to campus.” She added that some faculty, staff, and students have trepidation about returning to campus because of vaccine hesitancy. But we can’t ask people about their vaccine status. How can we deal with it?

Senator Daniels said that he is a big fan of returning to in person classes. But he added that meetings online after 3 p.m. is good for people with school-aged children. The schedule is easier to manage when children are in school from 8 to 3.

Provost Wickert said that that’s helpful feedback, and acknowledged that there are advantages to using technology.

Senator Wallace said that his advisees are very excited about getting back to classes. In selecting their classes, they want assurance that the class won’t be taught virtually and there will be no on-screen presence. For others, he said that the messaging needs to include assurance that these decisions are being informed by scientific and health care perspectives. There are guidelines in place for cleaning facilities. We need to allay apprehension about physically coming on campus, given that the message to this point has stressed isolation and distance.

Past President Sturm pointed out that there is a risk for faculty. We cannot accommodate all students. Someone will be inconvenienced or pressured to do something they would prefer not to do.

Senator Andreasen added that the pause on the administration of the Johnson & Johnson vaccine may fuel angst. It’s important to stress that ISU continues to work to protect health.

Provost Wickert said that Governor Reynolds had initially tapped three schools (public, private, and community college) to administer vaccines to their students. DMACC did not have many residential students, so they had trouble finding people to give the vaccine to. Then there was a manufacturing problem. And now a blood clotting issue. ISU has 100 Johnson & Johnson doses.

The original plan was to administer those this week, but that will not happen. Typically, ISU has a couple hundred Pfizer doses per week, to give to police, Thielen Center, and front line workers. This week, we had 1500 doses. Provost Wickert said that he expects availability to increase over the next months.

Secretary Butler asked about the possibility of mandating the vaccine. Other universities have issued a mandate, undercutting the argument of a legal obstacle. Provost Wickert replied that there has been more analysis of the legality of the vaccine. Early on, the understanding was that a vaccine authorized for emergency use could not be mandated. In the chat, Senator Freeman asked: "Will Iowa change once the emergency authorization is removed?" Provost Wickert pointed out that the universities that are issuing mandates are not public universities in the state of Iowa. We are. We need to follow the state's approach on vaccine requirements, including direction from IDPH, the legislature, and the governor.

7. Announcements

7.1. President

President Faber reminded EB members that council chair nominations are due soon.

7.2. President-Elect

None

7.3. Past-President

None

7.4. Senior Vice President and Provost

Provost Wickert thanked Past President Sturm for the invitation to the faculty recital. He complimented Past President Sturm and his accompanist.

Legislative Update

The tenure bill is dead, but the free Speech bills remain and are likely to pass. There are two versions. The House version includes language that applies to student governments (likely in response to a situation at UNI). There are penalties for violating the provisions. The bills will go through a reconciliation process.

The legislature cannot cut state appropriations to BOR, because of the federal stimulus money restrictions. The Senator proposed to appropriate an \$8 million increase. The governor proposed \$15 million. The House is proposing holding appropriations flat. Further, the legislature is proposing to freeze tuition at BOR universities. The proposal has moved out of the Appropriations Committee to the House floor.

Vaccine Clinic

There is a mass vaccine clinic in State Gym. There was a great response to the call for volunteers last week. Over 750 shifts were filled in two days. CVM stepped up with veterinarians and students, and others from Story County Health and Thielen Center are pitching in.

Secretary Butler pointed out that at the last EB meeting, Provost Wickert had said that he had instructed units to no longer plan for a 5% reduction for the next fiscal year. Is that advice being revisited in light of the uncomfortable discussions in the legislature? Provost Wickert said that senior leadership is continue to look at options.

Senator Andreasen asked whether the legislature has the ability to authorize themselves to set tuition. Provost Wickert said yes.

7.5. Council Chairs Reports

None, in the interest of time

7.6. Caucus Chair Reports

None, in the interest of time

8. Approval of the April 20, 2021 Faculty Senate Agenda

Senator Perkins pointed out that the assigned times for business needed to be fixed.

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

9. Good of the Order

Senator Perkins said that he received notice that as a faculty marshal for commencement, he is eligible to receive a vaccine tomorrow at State Gym. Provost Wickert said that that was an excellent suggestion from Senator Wallace.

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, April 27, 2021 – 3:00 p.m. – WEBEX