Faculty Development and Administrative Relations (FDAR)

Minutes
20 Sep 2022
10:00 AM– 11:00 AM

Location: 107 Lab of Mechanics

Council Members
Diane Al Shihabi [ARTID], Dan Andersen [A&BE], Carolyn Cutrona E [PSYCH], Grant A Dewell [VDPAM], Brian Hornbuckle [AGRON], Ann Smiley [HSC KIN], Eliot Winer [M E], Dawn Bratsch-Prince [SVPP], Tera Jordan [SVPP]

I. Call to Order, Diane Al Shihabi
Approval of Minutes
Motion to Approve: Second:
Minutes Approved

Link to 2021-2022 FDAR Annual Report was provided for new members.

II. Intellectual Property University Task Force Overview, Dawn Bratsch Prince, Update

Problem: Faculty concerns about Intellectual Property brought to FDAR in Fall 2021 and Spring 2022 include online courses and courses with online presence (Canvas) developed by faculty members were given by Chairs to other faculty members for use without the creator’s knowledge or permission and administrators blocking faculty members access to their own courses. This violates current policies on Intellectual property rights at ISU, created prior to digital platforms.

Results: The Provost’s Office is forming a university task force to update Intellectual Property language in Chapter 10 of the Faculty Handbook, related to educational materials. The charge will be to address intellectual property in online teaching. The task force will not be reviewing research intellectual property because it has a different set of issues. Goal is to limit work this year to be more productive. The Provosts Office and FDAR Chair have met and agreed on a list of participants including University Council, CELT, library staff, faculty (all colleges), and others.

III. Service Evaluation in P&T, Diane Al Shihabi, Update

Problem: Lack of equity in faculty service loads, lack of value of service in shared governance, and lack of accurate/ meaningful service evaluation in promotion and tenure. COACHE Survey indicates concerns related to Service, noting that it is a particularly strong issue for smaller departments. Colleges report that some Council Chair positions were not filled in Spring 2022 due to high time commitment and low value in advancement.

Results: FDAR and Provost’s Office decided in Spring 2022 to form a university-wide committee to define institutional service and what significant service means at different ranks. Will implement in Fall of 2022. Preliminary goals are to develop guidelines for faculty to document/demonstrate impact of institutional service and to recommend updated training for P&T committees and councils evaluating service.
Faculty Work-Life Advisory Committee has been meeting for a few years. In 2019-2020 started talking about work-life issues including service. August 2020 sent a survey (open-ended questions) to leadership across campus about how service could be re-imagined. The purpose was just to gather some initial information. It addressed three general themes, Clear transparent consistent communication, Structure of Committee Work, and Policy. Some issues identified are 1) Chair needs to be able to counsel faculty member about service, but 2) Sometimes Chair is bypassed by service requests and does not understanding committee work until performance reviews, 3) committees and councils have different time commitments and there is no consistent or correct way to measure service. Limitations: (FWLAC) only surveyed administrators but not faculty. FDAR could poll the Faculty Senate.

Discussion:
Faculty can be weak in service and still get promoted. Research/scholarship must be well documented and analyzed in P&T, but there are no criteria for assessing service. The last sentence of Faculty Handbook 5.2.2.6 makes it unclear what service is, which if undefined makes it unclear how to evaluate it. Is giving a presentation that raises the profile of ISU service? Is it institutional service? We need clear definitions of “institutional service” and “significant institutional service.” We need more effective guidelines on how to report service work and training to help faculty members document impact, effectiveness, and participation. Also need training for supervisors and P&T committees, and a better definition of service required for promotion. Committee should review faculty activities currently defined as institutional service and determine if there are more or should be less. Consider the following questions. What is appropriate service for each rank? What service is expected after full promotion? What happens with faculty and staff shortages in departments? How can increased levels of service be rewarded in salary and advancement as opposed to having no influence or reducing the possibility of promotion?

Distrust between faculty and administrators is at all-time high. There is no consistency between how administrators and faculty support each other across colleges. The two groups need to engage and start a conversation. Committee needs to have faculty representation from all colleges, and representative leadership from the university at Chair, Associate Dean, and Dean rank. While the COACHE survey did not reveal a big gap in trust between faculty and administrators, data could be separated out by college. Could put in a COACHE data request, through Tera, must be approved by the dean of respective college. The 2023 Faculty Activities Survey will have information about faculty service and how many faculty PRSs have service. In prior years, the Provost’s Office was surprised to see that many faculty have 0% service. Committee should consider removing/revising last sentence of Faculty Handbook Section 5.2.2.6; work to make sure all PRSs have a nonzero percentage for institutional service. To improve equity and trust, committee could consider making service expectations more uniform across the university and in documenting for annual reviews. Workday would allow a uniform faculty evaluation. Would be part of a larger conversation about workload.

Committee could invite an expert to speak to Faculty Senate about service. Provost’s Office recommends Kerryanne O’Meara, Faculty Workload & Rewards Project.
IV. Faculty-Administrator Relationships, Dawn Bratsch-Prince

Progressive Corrective Action

Faculty are asked to review the proposed Progressive Correction action change in the Faculty Handbook that was presented for first reading at the last Faculty Senate meeting. It replaces Letters of Non-Disciplinary corrective action which were frequently disciplinary, assuming the accuser was correct and the accused was wrong, without faculty member having the right to give their point of view. It led to several faculty appealing the letters through J&A.

Questions: Will the initial conversation continue to be one way or does the faculty have a right to give their perspectives? What does the language say? Does this policy apply to faculty in administrative roles? What goes in the faculty personnel file? Kayla Black in provost office is the contact person for guidance on guidance on where faculty decision documents are stored and whether they are part of an official record.

Committee Reports

I. Equity, Diversity, Inclusion Committee – Chair (no representative yet)

II. Facilities and Educational Resources Committee – Chair (no representative yet)

III. Faculty Senate Recognition and Development Committee - Chair Dan Andersen

Travel grants - Faculty should ask for approval for their travel destination first because there have been a lot of changes to where people have been traveling.

IV. Good of the Order

FS Meetings This Semester

FDAR Meetings
Nov 2

EB Meetings
Oct 11
Nov 8
Dec 6

Faculty Senate Meetings
Oct 18
Nov 15
Dec 1