

Faculty Development and Administrative Relations (FDAR)

Minutes

22 Sep 2021

10:00 A.M. – 11:00 A.M.

107 Lab of Mechanics

Minutes Recorder: Brian Hornbuckle

Minutes Summary: Diane Al Shihabi

Council Members Present

Diane Al Shihabi [ARTID], Claire Andreasen [V PTH], Brian Hornbuckle [Agr], Carmen Gomes [ME], Jose Rosa [MKT], Ann Smiley [HSC], James Vary [LAS], Dan Andersen [ABE], Eliot Winer [M E], Firat Erdim [ARCH], Dawn Bratsch-Prince [SVPP], Tera Jordan [SVPP]

Council Members Absent

None

I. Introduction – Diane Al Shihabi, Chair

Diane reviewed the charge (purpose), scope, structure, process, and responsibilities of FDAR (Faculty Development and Administrative Relations) Council

The first meeting was in-person. By request we will have meetings hybrid going forward, providing there are no issues.

Members were requested to listen to faculty issues relevant to FDAR in respective college caucuses and/or from the faculty that each council member represents and bring concerns to FDAR.

II. Innovation and Entrepreneurship – Faculty Handbook Changes for Reporting

Guest Speaker: James (Jim) Reecy, Associate VP for Research and Professor in Animal Sciences, spoke on behalf of Research Planning and Policy (RPP) Committee. The RPP Committee is recommending changes to the Faculty Handbook changes in relationship to innovation and entrepreneurship. They brought together faculty on campus to discuss, including Matt Darr, Lisa Schulte-Moore, Shelby Moore, Dara Wald, Carolyn Lawrence-Dill and continue to meet. Faculty consulted have innovation as a core part of their portfolio.

RPP's work presents a potential change in promotion and tenure policies to be inclusive of entrepreneurship and innovation. Other universities have been discussing this and some universities already have it in their faculty handbooks. The RPP Committee seeks to develop a document of best practices. It is not intended that everyone would do this. Faculty are evaluated by their PRS. This is something for which faculty could be evaluated for advancement.

Elevating these activities is similar to equity and diversity activities.

It is not exactly research, but more like creative activities. For example, maybe a faculty member created a new pedagogical method. May have a publication about it, but the pedagogical method has an impact. How do we assess this value?

An example of innovation could also be designing a new database to power a consortium of 30 universities. Essentially, this would only be one line in a publication. Everyone would say it was innovative and valued. Goal is to take a new look at what we value for promotion and tenure and how to assess its impact. Scholarship and creative works blur but are still separate from each other. We brought in scholarship of teaching, but we are still hearing about what that is. This type of recognition is something that ISU has struggled with. Should there be impact somewhere in the definition of innovation?

Perhaps each discipline would have a different way to evaluate innovation. So judging what is innovative would be up to the organization, i.e. department, college. Must document it in some way how the work has been innovative. Needs to be audit-able so there is evidence.

Defining, documenting, and assessing the value and impact of innovation and entrepreneurship is a priority for President Wintersteen. At the national level there is a push to take the knowledge that we have created on campus and translate it into benefit. Many new faculty want to work in these areas, so it is important for recruiting. Currently, colleges are trying to define what innovation and entrepreneurship is. Want to make sure that all contributing faculty get recognized.

Questions from governance reflect that it comes down to a cultural change. Governance pointed out that it is something relating to venture capital work, will need to be careful about some similar things. In business we often don't take the time to define creativity, we often just go to money, which is not always the best way. There is a long history in the academy valuing what we are discussing here. We will need to have these discussions within each of our colleges. Need some guidelines on how to report these activities. Some guidelines available, e.g., from Oregon State. For use to evaluate faculty for promotion and tenure.

A question is, "What is the separation from extension and outreach?" It could be innovative/creative in all areas, research, teaching, and extension. Must show impact on society. It is important to write this in a way that is inclusive. Right now the language is more oriented towards science/technology. What about social practice? Need to expand what innovation means as a benefit to society. We have to be able to see it so it is there without explicitly stating all the variations that exist across campus.

What is suggested for the Faculty Handbook needs to be worked on. The language will be really important. Currently, it is not consistent: all things (teaching, extension, etc.) need to be defined. Current definition says something about processes. It is too restrictive. Word choice is really important here. Generic terms like "changing the way we do things" is not enough. There is a concern about culture.

Scholarship is supposed to be a critical review. A faculty member creates a database used by a bunch of people. So what? Are they really critically reviewing it, or is it because perhaps they paid me to do it?

Worry that it will get boiled down to “Look, the company who funded it is using it, but maybe the employees don't like it. Faculty needs to provide evidence that this product has merit. Is it enough that a company used the work?” For example, the Elizabeth Holmes trial. Holmes was getting all that money, so it must be good. Turns out it was a bunch of lies. Faculty insist that there must be documentation.

All of these activities already fall under what we call scholarship. We are already working on this. What is really new here?

FDAR will summarize views and suggestions and forward them to Governance Council.

III. Guidelines for Optional Reporting of EDI Activities – Carmen Gomes

The initial goal of the document was to gather general guidelines for faculty for documenting EDI work for advancement that might differ for faculty who have EDI in their PRS versus those who do not. Originally, the document was to be used for a workshop, which was delayed, partially because of House Bill 802. Over the summer of 2021, the Provost's Office modified the document and it longer reflected its original language or intended use.

It is important to understand that work in EDI is optional. As edited over the summer, revised document appeared as if EDI activities were being required for all faculty for advancement. FDAR members suggested taking out language about putting EDI activities in all PRSs and removing language about administrative roles. If some faculty want to include EDI activities on their PRS that is great, but we want to make sure proposed guidelines are inclusive of all faculty. Work in EDI should be considered on a case-by-case basis in each college.

Provost's Office feels that if we start with administration, it will trickle down to colleges. We have associate deans in charge of EDI, should have them look at this. Guidelines could help departments have the conversation that is needed to evaluate this. Alienating some faculty may have a positive effect of pushing faculty forward, to make changes that need to be made. Still want to move this forward but need the right language. Make clear that it is valued and can count for advancement but is still optional, recommended but not required

Should this document be on a website, where it would become a public document? This is a national discussion. We have colleagues interested in what we decide to do. We need to decide where this document is going, what the end-use is. If this is going public, it needs lots of review. Still not clear on the intended use of the document should be. We need to be careful about what we are signaling with this document. If faculty are doing this work, are they furthering the land-grant mission, because if not, how is it relevant? Are we disproportionality impacting those doing this work, if we don't elevate the importance? Just trying to understand the main drivers. Providing examples of optional faculty reporting is great, worry use in unintentional ways. May mean keeping it as an informational document, opportunities for reporting, not making it a recommended procedure.

Results: Will continue discussing at the next meeting.

- IV. **Faculty Mentoring Initiatives** – Tera Jordan
Update on COACHE survey and current initiatives for ISU faculty and colleges
(postponed)

Committee Reports

- V. **Equity, Diversity, Inclusion Committee** – Chair Carmen Gomes
Previously submitted revised guidelines.
- VI. **Facilities and Educational Resources Committee** - Chair Firat Erdim
Have not yet met.
- VII. **Faculty Senate Recognition and Development Committee** - Chair Dan Andersen
Have not yet met.
- VIII. **Good of the Order**