

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING MINUTES  
DECEMBER 6, 2016  
3:00-5:00 P.M.  
107 LAB OF MECHANICS**

**Present:** Bigelow, T. (Academic Affairs); Brown, J. (Business); Butler, A. (Secretary); Day, T. (President-Elect); Derrick, T. (FDAR); Freeman, S. (CALs); Holger, D. (Associate Provost); Kimber, M. (Veterinary Medicine); Martin, P. (RPA); Owen, M. (J&A); Padgett Walsh, C. (LAS); Rippke, S. (Parliamentarian); Russell, D. (Human Sciences); Schaefer, V. (Engineering); Sponseller, B. (Governance); Sturm, J. (President); Wallace, R. (Past President); Wickert, J. (Senior VP and Provost); Zarecor, K. (Design)

**Guests:** Dark, V.; Delashmutt, A.; Ogilvie, C.; Smiley-Oyen, A.; West, C.

**I. Call to Order**

President Sturm called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m. when a quorum was reached.

**II. Consent Agenda**

**A. Agenda, Executive Board Meeting December 6, 2016**

**B. Minutes, Executive Board Meeting November 1, 2016**

Senator Owen moved, and Past President Wallace seconded. The motion passed without dissension.

**III. Special Order: Craig Ogilvie, Graduate Diversity Climate Report**

President Sturm recommended orienting the discussion to the future, and not dwelling on the past.

Professor Ogilvie said that two climate surveys of graduate students were conducted in Spring 2014 and 2016. The results were pretty much the same, although the latter survey included a broader representation of graduate students (LGBT, Asian/Pacific Islander).

Between 30% (2014) and 35% (2016) of graduate students reported experience of something negative and discriminatory based on personal characteristics. The largest item was gender (12%); then race/ethnicity (10%); followed by age and country of origin. Within that category, just under 40% experienced negative verbally offensive comment. Approximately 30% reported research group disregarded because of personal characteristics. 13% felt threatened (verbally or physically) at some point in their graduate students (25% of women felt threatened). In these discriminatory behaviors, Half involved graduate students, 1/3 faculty and graduate students, and 1/3 undergraduate and graduate students.

Professor Ogilvie said that respondents were not asked when the negative experiences occurred, but did ask how often they occurred. Verbal negative behavior had a mode of once per semester.

From the numbers and open-ended comments, it is clear that there are some very good research programs that have positive research climates, but there are instances (reasonably large) of negative behavior. The impact is that graduate students cannot do their best work.

The responses include running graduate inclusion workshops inside programs. Professor Ogilvie is PI on a major NSF grant to expand the workshops. Thirty graduate programs have indicated interest in running such (ongoing series of) workshops. The aim is to generate discussion about identifying problems and making systemic and structural changes to the program. How can we better onboard new graduate students and post-docs?

Professor Ogilvie would like a FS representative involved in the design of workshops, and would like EB's help in advocating for getting faculty to participate in the workshops. The major obstacles to participation are the time commitment and the discomfort such subjects create (discussions about difficult issues about climate in research group or department). Wisconsin found that if 25% of faculty attended these types of workshops, it made a noticeable difference in the culture of the program.

Senator Bigelow thought it would be helpful to identify the programs that are the greatest areas of concern and concentrate efforts on those. Professor Ogilvie said that a vast majority of programs have problems. Some have between 50-70% reported problems, then there is a large plateau of departments with 35%. Few programs have very little. Senator Owen opined that training would be beneficial to all departments. If this is an important issue, faculty of all departments need to be engaged.

Senator Russell asked about the response rate. Professor Ogilvie said that 20-25% responded. Senator Russell expressed concern about the extent to which there is a sufficient number of observations to determine the rate of these events. Professor Ogilvie said that his confidence in the results stems from the similarity of results from the two different surveys. He added that the grant is a collaborative effort across nine universities (including Yale and Michigan) with results similar to ours.

Senator Freeman said that student-on-student behavior is hard for us to control. But the faculty-on-student incidents are unacceptable (1/3 of complaints, of which 54% were gender-based; 41% race; 41% country of origin). But he asked what is actionable. When students say they have been harassed or discriminated based on gender, what behavior or action made them check that? With that information, we can know what type of training to offer. Otherwise, faculty will look around and say not me. Professor Ogilvie replied that it is counterproductive to begin with survey results, because it engenders defensive postures. Instead, the goal is to have a conversation about implicit bias, microaggressions, and inclusive excellence in a research group, focusing on the lived experiences of grad students in our research groups, aiming at steps we can take to be a more supportive environment for grad students. Examples of bad behavior include talking over students, not using welcoming phrasing. Students also expressed concern about the processes for allocating which students go to conferences to present results. Professor Ogilvie and

others will draft scenarios of real lived experiences at ISU for the workshops to start conversations.

President Sturm asked whether the group will work with CELT and the Inclusive Classroom initiative. Professor Ogilvie said that CELT, VPDI Stewart, and Kenyatta Shamburger from Multicultural Student Affairs are included. The other universities also have similar workshops, which will provide a rich source of comparison.

Senator Sponseller expressed concern about misunderstandings based on cultural differences between students and faculty. Professor Ogilvie agreed: we are all creatures of our cultural upbringing, which affects how we treat gender and cultural backgrounds.

#### **IV. Special Order: Aaron Delashmutt, Interim Director and Chief of Police**

Chief Delashmutt provided a handout about policies and practices with body-worn cameras (BWC). He demonstrated that when the BWC is on, a green light appears. All officers are assigned a BWC and they are required to wear it when in uniform, but it need not be on at all times. The cameras can run for 4-5 hours of recording. Some newer versions may have longer running time.

Officers are required to turn on BWC at a call for service (e.g. report theft, car collision), but not when walking through central campus. But if a conversation becomes heated or something results, the officer has the option to turn on if he or she anticipates law enforcement action. Iowa is a “one party” state, meaning that notification is not required when recording; only one party needs to know that the record is being made. Sometimes, announcing that a record is being made de-escalates the situation. Private dwellings (resident hall or room) may be recorded if there is a legal reason for the officer to be there (e.g. medical reason, passed out, fight, report bike was stolen) or if there is a search warrant for the room. Generally speaking, medical facilities (Mary Greeley, McFarland Clinics) are not recorded; exceptions would be cases where fights have broken out. Senator Owen asked about Thielen Center. Chief Delashmutt replied that the university has discretion about how to operate. But for the other medical facilities, the officer has to ask permission.

Senator Butler asked how long recordings are kept. Chief Delashmutt replied that the contracted company keeps BWC videos, like car videos, on the server for one year. The majority of such videos are speeding tickets and minor infractions. After a year, if the case is not serious, the videos are deleted.

Senator Butler asked whether the videos would be used to compile a database of faces. Chief Delashmutt replied that the software does not have that capacity. ISU intentionally declined the ability to edit video, but the county attorney’s office does have that ability.

President Sturm asked whether videos are automatically segmented each time the battery is turned on or off. Chief Delashmutt replied that each time on/off is a separate recording.

President Sturm asked whether recorded entries into homes need to be announced. Chief Delashmutt said that officers need to ask permission to enter the residence, but do not need to inform the occupant that it is being recorded. President Sturm expressed concern about violation of Miranda rights. Chief Delashmutt replied that Miranda pertains to custody and interrogation. The recordings are made as the officer is trying to figure out what happened, and does not have the intention to arrest anyone, and therefore there is no custody. Of course, the matter is murky, if three officers corner someone and ask him or her questions, that may be custodial.

President-Elect Day said that if the video is retained, it's ISU Police's property. How can copies be obtained? Chief Delashmutt said a public records request should be filed with University Counsel. Provost Wickert asked whether someone could issue a general request for videos for the past six months. Chief Delashmutt said not in general, because the videos are investigative files and therefore not available. There is not much settled law on this, however. DPS would work with University Counsel and HR.

Continuing in the same vein, Senator Freeman asked about a parent's complaint about interaction between his or her child and an officer. Could the parent request to see the videos of an officer's interactions for the past six months? Chief Delashmutt said that requests are dealt with on a case-by-case basis. In some cases, the individual may be invited to DPS to view to video. Senator Freeman said that the video would be limited to interaction with the parent's child, not all of the officer's interactions. Chief Delashmutt said in general, yes. But if there is a bigger problem, University Counsel will be involved.

President Sturm said that the lack of video editing software prevents DPS from blurring out other people's faces. Wouldn't showing that video violate the other people's privacy? Chief Delashmutt said that University Counsel would need to advise. If the incident is out in the open, there is no presumption of privacy; but if it is in a resident, University Counsel would need to advise. He added that videos will not be posted to YouTube. (Some departments have YouTube channels.)

Senator Martin asked how often BWC are used. Chief Delashmutt said that their primary use is in preparation for court and writing reports. Chief Delashmutt added that there are 1800 arrests per year. Since June, there have been approximately 1000 videos.

President-Elect Day asked whether the views are used internally in performance reviews. Chief Delashmutt said that this may be tweaked in the future. Lieutenants review two records per month. Chief Delashmutt would like to expand the process to ensure that the same people are not picked each month. Videos are also used for training.

Past President Wallace asked whether the goal is to create a BWC policy suitable for the Policy Library, or whether this is an internal document. Chief Delashmutt said that the current plan is to revise and refine, get feedback, and then release it to the public. Provost Wickert asked who is involved (e.g. students, particularly from diverse backgrounds) in the feedback and the nature of their feedback. Chief Delashmutt replied that the feedback was pretty positive. He suggested that students are used to everyone having a camera.

Senator Sponseller asked whether the security officers at Veterinary Medicine will have BWC. Chief Delashmutt said only police offices are assigned them currently.

**V. Announcements and Remarks**

**A. President**

The Open Access proposal has gone thru RPA, who made suggestions. President Sturm will edit the proposal and solicit recommendations from the Library Advisory Committee. He expects it will come to EB in January.

BOR did not even consider the comprehensive differential tuition proposal. President Sturm intends to write a considerate reply to that. EB members asked to see a draft of his letter.

**B. President-Elect**

None

**C. Senior Vice President and Provost**

Provost Wickert circulated images of the proposed Student Innovation Center.

**BOR Report**

BOR appointed ISU alumnus Mark Nook (MA, Astrophysics) as new president of UNI. BOR discussed tuition. They approved FPDAs for next year.

**Onboarding New Students**

The Provost's Office with working with Student Affairs to form a committee to review (JW: revise or re-implement) how we onboard new students at all levels to ISU (direct from HS, transfer students, graduate and professional students). Many different programs take place (in departments, colleges, residence halls, dining, EO, and Provost's Office), and nobody knows all of them. (Some of the information may be contradictory.)

Michigan State found that students get more than 400 emails between their initial expression of interest to their first day on campus. This is especially confusing for students who are first-generation or who are not familiar with how universities work.

The group will include people with functional expertise (including experts from industry). Associate Provost Holger and Associate Dean Robinder are running point on this. Faculty and student representatives will be included, as well as representatives from admissions. There will be staff support and corporate support (donated time from companies known for the quality of their lean manufacturing and lean process design; expertise in finding pinch points in a process and how to redesign administrative processes to be as efficient as possible and minimize the likelihood of errors.) The timeline is approximately 18 months. They will map out our current practice and then ask what we want. Provost Wickert thinks this will have positive effects on retention and student success numbers.

President Sturm asked what the monthly time commitment will be. Associate Provost Holger thought it would be similar to strategic planning. Senator Freeman said that that took 10-15 hours of face-to-face meetings plus homework and other conversations.

#### **Student Innovation Center**

Senator Owen asked whether the composition of the Center violates the principle of clay brick in central campus, sandstone in the ring outside of that, and red brick on the outer ring. Associate Provost Holger said that that pattern does not hold. Provost Wickert offered a description of the principles behind the glass design, emphasizing the importance of highly visible student activity.

Senator Bigelow expressed concern about a net loss of space for the College of Engineering. Provost Wickert replied that the Center is intentionally slated for cross-disciplinary use. The process by which programs can obtain access to space has not been settled.

#### **D. Council Chair Reports**

Three council chairs need to be filled (J&A, RPA, and FDAR). Senator Derrick may be eligible for further service.

#### **E. Caucus Chair Reports**

None

### **VI. Unfinished Business**

#### **A. FH 5.2.4.4.5 Appeals [S16-3] – Owen**

No comments

#### **B. FH 5.2.4.2.6 Factual Information - [S16-11] – Derrick**

Three motions were discussed: FDAR's proposal, an alternative from Professor Dark, and an alternative from Senator Butler.

Professor Dark expressed concern about the imposition of a university-wide standard for "factual information." This violates FH's explicit permission for departments to define factual information and the implicit right for departments to determine which information is reviewable by candidates. Professor Dark asked for justification for the demand for university-wide consistency. What problem would such consistency solve? What evidence is there that there is a problem? Professor Dark wrote her version with the assumption that the problem is that not all departments define factual information. Thus her proposal offers a minimal default definition and process that may be modified and expanded by departments in their promotion and tenure documents.

One difference between FDAR and Professor Dark's proposal is that the letter from the chair may be reviewed by the candidate if the department's promotion and tenure

document permits it. Professor Dark said that FH does not define the letter as confidential.

Senator Butler described her alternative motion as achieving similar goals as Professor Dark's motion, but sidestepping the controversial topic of distinguishing factual and evaluative claims. EB members expressed concern that too much flexibility is permitted on that version: FH explicitly states that external letters are confidential.

President Sturm expressed concern that no resolution of the debate was in sight. He proposed ending debate and postponing discussion to the next EB meeting. Senator Butler thought ten more minutes might reveal consensus. President Sturm's motion passed, 8-7.

Senator Derrick, Professor Dark, and Senator Butler agreed to meet to attempt creation of a compromise motion. Senator Freeman recommended that the group answer Professor Dark's question about the problem that this motion solves. (Senator Owen said that it addresses issues when a candidate takes exception to what is sent forward as misrepresenting the candidate's performance.)

## **VII. New Business**

### **A. 2017-18 College Curriculum Reports – [S16-5]**

Senator Zarecor said that the information from her college was not correct. She was instructed to get correct information to Senator Bigelow by Thursday. Senator Butler moved to forward the reports with corrections. Senator Martin seconded. The motion passed without dissension.

### **B. FS Bylaw Change: Committee on University Services – [S16-8] – Martin**

Not discussed

### **C. Merchandising Undergraduate Certificate – [S16-9] – Bigelow**

Not discussed

### **D. FH 10.6.4 Dead Week – [S16-10] – Bigelow**

Students reported that in some classes, unit exams are given late in Dead Week, followed by final exams in finals weeks. Professor Smiley-Owen said that the key amendment (#2) prohibits unit exams on Thursday or Friday of Dead Week. New content may be given. The third amendment goes beyond this, prohibiting any exams in Dead Week, cumulative or not.

Senator Freeman asked whether his course would violate the policy: the last course content is on Wednesday, the unit exam is on Friday, and the summary of semester-long projects is during finals week. Now he would have to move presentations up because the unit exam would have to take place during finals week. Professor Smiley-Owen said that his understanding was correct.

Associate Provost Holger said that passing both the second and third amendments would increase confusion about Dead Week. It is already against Dead Week policy to administer final examinations during Dead Week. He added that it is not uncommon for students to end up with a lot of exams in most of their classes on Thursday and Friday with final exams the following week. No amount of advanced planning will help to manage the workload, because the exams are all concentrated in the 1.5 week timeframe, unlike midterm exams.

Senator Kimble and Senator Zarecor thought that exceptions would have to be made for laboratories and studios. Senator Martin asked about take-home examinations. Professor Smiley-Oyen replied that they could not be due on Thursday or Friday. Senator Bigelow said that they would involve an exception similar to that for the testing centers. Associate Provost Holger said that there would need to be exceptions for performing arts, but thought that scheduling performances during Dead Week should be discouraged.

Professor Smiley-Oyen emphasized that the second amendment is the most important. The subcommittee would accept dropping the third amendment.

Senator Brown asked about the arbitrariness of percentages. Senator Bigelow said that the committee was trying to avoid having to define “exam”; if a faculty member calls it a “quiz,” would the policy still apply? President-Elect Day observed that bad actors will continue to find ways to avoid compliance. Provost Wickert recommended prohibiting assessments on Thursday and Friday of Dead Week, and leave the current policy about finals week. This avoids having to specify a percentage threshold. Senator Bigelow expressed concern that the absence of any assessments will encourage students to skip class. Senator Schaefer said that he gives vital information for the final examination on the last meeting of class.

Mr. West said that the third amendment came from Academic Affairs Council. The second amendment came from student compromise with the faculty. Professor Smiley-Oyen confirmed that the strongest interest from students was eliminating assessments on Thursday and Friday of Dead Week.

Senator Owen moved to postpone the discussion to the next EB meeting. Senator Padgett Walsh seconded. The motion passed without dissension.

**E. Statement on Faculty Core Values – [S16-12] – Wallace**

Not discussed

**F. FH 9.2 Appeal through Administrative Channels – [S16-13] - Sponseller**

Not discussed

**VIII. Approval of the December 13, 2016 Faculty Senate Agenda**

New Business items A and B should be kept, as well as F, because it is mandated by BOR’s policy. Senator Owen moved to accept the modified agenda, and Senator Bigelow seconded. The motion passed without dissension.



**IX. Good of the Order**

President Sturm reminded EB members of CLB.

**X. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m..