IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
NOVEMBER 9, 2021 – 3:30–5:00 P.M.
GREAT HALL, MEMORIAL UNION


Guests: Wickert, J. (SVPP); VanDerZanden, A.M. (Assoc. Provost); Bratsch-Prince, D. (Assoc. Provost); Jordan, T. (Asst. Provost); Knief, A. (Parliamentarian); Iennarella-Servantez, C. (GPSS); Campbell, J. (SG); Roberts, E. (SG); Kealey, K. (ISU Daily); Budlong, J. (Univ. Relations); Small, C. (VPDI); Peters, D. (Sociology); Sitter, P. (Ames Tribune); Owusu, F. (CRP)

1. Call to Order
   Seating of Substitute Senators

President Wheeler said that she would speak without a mask so that she would be audible, but was not doing so to set an example for others. She encouraged senators and visitors to spread out in the Sun Room. She asked senators to show respect for others, including guests. She said that
questions should be directed to the chair. She reminded everyone that FS is a collaborative, collegiate, and cooperative body engaged in shared governance for the university.

President Wheeler called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m. and seated the substitute senators.

2. **Consent Agenda**
   - FS Agenda November 9, 2021 – [21/A/3]
   - FS Docket Calendar – [21/C/3]

   Senator Stalder made a motion to place the announcements ahead of unfinished business, because there are a lot of changes on the national scale, and Senator Stalder wanted to hear ISU administrators’ response. Senator Freeman seconded. The motion was adopted by majority vote.

   Secretary Butler moved to add FS minutes from October 12, 2021 to new business. She said that FS may depart from Robert’s Rules, as it does when distinguishing new and unfinished business. FS has adopted longform minutes for well over ten years, so there is precedent for their format. President Wheeler checked with the parliamentarian that this motion was in order.

   Parliamentarian Knief said that the motion was in order, pending a second and majority vote. Senator Padgett Walsh seconded. The motion was adopted, with 33 votes in favor and 20 against.

   There were no objections to the modified agenda, which was adopted.

3. **Announcements**
   3.1. **Faculty Senate President**

   President Wheeler said that the ISU Strategic Plan launch meeting was held with senior leadership and a consultancy group. Workgroups are being established and populated. There will be further meetings in November and December to take the first steps to updating the strategic plan.

   President Wheeler met with ISU President Wintersteen about safety on campus, new appointments to the VPDEI’s Office and Office of Equal Opportunity. They also discussed faculty well-being, P&T during COVID, and agreed to revive Campus Leaders Conversations (formerly Campus Leaders Luncheons or Campus Leaders Breakfasts). The Campus Leaders Conversations provide an opportunity for senior leaders to meet with FS and P&S Council leaders to address important questions. Senators should bring questions forward to their caucus chairs in advance of the next Conversation on November 18.

   President Wheeler regularly meets with Provost Wickert. They have discussed COVID mitigation, moving into the winter, DEI initiatives, and specific items of ongoing interest to FS council and committee work.

   President Wheeler reports on FS work to P&S Council.

   On November 3 and 4, the Board of Regents (BOR) met at UNI. President Wheeler and President-Elect Perkins gave concise three-minute statements. They requested to have more time added to BOR schedule for comments, as well as more opportunities to collaborate, speak, and present.
President Wheeler is exploring the possibility of training sessions for FS committee and council chairs to develop skills to create safe spaces of mutual trust, which will ensure that all perspectives can be heard.

President Wheeler called senators’ attention to the nomination form for FS president-elect.

3.2. Faculty Senate President-Elect
President-Elect Perkins said that he serves on the Library Advisory Committee. Dean Seo asked him to give a presentation to FS about a library initiative called “Tracing Race at ISU.” This program supports digital scholarship, centers the history and experiences of BIPOC at ISU, and engages with the history of race, racism, and activism at ISU. There is a biannual call for proposals. This year, there are Student Scholar Awards for proposals that have a student lead (undergraduate or graduate, but an undergraduate student must have a mentor). The deadline is November 24. Selected proposals will be notified by the end of December.

3.3. Senior Vice President and Provost
Provost Wickert offered an update on BOR Free Speech Committee, which was created last year. Its charge is to evaluate and strengthen support of free speech on the three university campuses. They recommended conducting a survey of faculty, staff, and students with respect to the status of free speech on the campuses; and conducting training on each campus. An email was sent yesterday, cosigned by President Wheeler and Provost Wickert, announcing the survey. Today, BOR President Richards and Free Speech Committee Chair Rouse sent an email with a link to a Qualtrics survey. Provost Wickert encouraged everyone to complete the survey and to encourage students and colleagues to do so. The survey is short, with approximately four questions. The deadline is December 1.

Provost Wickert thanked faculty for their high rate of participation (81% at ISU, leading all three universities) in the Faculty Activities Survey, whose results were shared with BOR. The results provide an accurate and fulsome picture to BOR about the depth, breadth, and quality of the more than 55 hours of weekly faculty activities.

Free speech training will begin in 2022. The training will be designed to be compact, and will likely include looking at free speech through the lens of academic freedom; reviewing time, place, and manner restrictions on allowed speech; the distinction between protected and unprotected speech; speaking events on campus; and public employee rights.

Senator Day asked Provost Wickert to comment his perspective of the U.S. Diversity requirement adopted by FS Executive Board (EB).

Provost Wickert said that the process is that when FS approves something, it becomes an official docket item with a cover sheet. There are three signature lines for FS president, provost, and ISU president. This process holds for all kinds of motions, including curriculum changes and changes to FH. There is no opportunity for a veto; it is simply a matter of signing the cover sheet or not.
Provost Wickert said that he thought it was important for senators to know that the process to change the U.S. Diversity requirement began five years ago, when Jonathan Sturm was FS president in 2016. Provost Wickert suggested that FS modernize the U.S. Diversity requirement, in light of feedback from students and the observation that the requirement had never been updated, and some features of it were outdated. FS Academic Affairs Council (AAC), under Tim Bigelow’s leadership, began that work. The Provost’s Office started a U.S. Diversity course grant program to provide grants to faculty who wanted either to take an existing diversity course and modernize it to address contemporary social issues, or to create a new course. This revision work continued for five years, until a proposal came to FS for a vote last spring, at the very last meeting of the year.

Provost Wickert said that the committee did not meet with him or University Counsel. At the time, House File 802 was working its way through the state legislature. In hindsight, Provost Wickert said he wished that those conversations with him, FS President, and University Counsel had taken place last spring. When FS’s motion reached his desk, he decided that he could not sign it at that time. Provost Wickert stressed that he did not veto it and did not say that he never would sign it. The concerns that he had at the time are concerns that he continues to have. One is the importance of student choice coupled with HF 802. Another is a concern about capacity to offer thousands of seats. If all four learning outcomes are required, that will reduce the number of classes available to satisfy the requirement. Provost Wickert did not want to institute the requirement if there was not a high probability of offering enough seats. Another concern was about faculty choice. Some faculty in this room spoke about classes on ableism, ageism, and sexuality that would not be able to meet all four outcomes. Some of the most popular classes today that satisfy the U.S. Diversity requirement would not meet all four. This would leave some faculty behind. Instead, Provost Wickert thought that it was important to retain faculty choice. For these three reasons, Provost Wickert made the decision not to sign off on the docket item.

Provost Wickert contacted outgoing FS President Faber and rising FS President Wheeler. Provost Wickert asked to meet with EB to share his rationale and decision in the spirit of shared governance.

Provost Wickert said that we all have different roles at the university, which carry different responsibilities and accountabilities. As provost, his responsibility is different from faculty responsibilities; and ISU President’s Wintersteener’s responsibilities are different from his. Provost Wickert said that everybody cares about ISU and our students and each other. The relationship between FS and the administration is a good and strong relationship and enables us to do good work on complex issues, through dialogue, respect, and compromise. Provost Wickert believes that the landing place is a win, moving from five legacy outcomes, where students needed to meet at least two of the five, to needing to meet at least three of the four updated outcomes. FS, Provost Wickert, and ISU President Wintersteen approved all four outcomes. That’s a win. If a faculty member wants to teach a class that meets all four outcomes, she can. Another faculty member who can meet only three learning outcomes is also able to deliver their class and have strong enrollments. Provost Wickert observed that in big organizations, it’s often not possible to get everything all at once; but this new requirement is progress. Provost Wickert said that he supports the difficult work by EB over the summer.
Provost Wickert encouraged senators to vote as they feel best. He said that he respects both views, and welcomes the discussion. He added that if FS sends a docket item requiring U.S. Diversity courses to meet all four outcomes, he will not sign it. And his reasons will be the same reasons for why he could not sign the change adopted by FS in May. And we’ll return to the legacy outcomes and work on those. But FS has other work to do.

Secretary Butler asked whether declining to sign is different from rejecting. She also asked whether it would be a problem if all faculty offered courses that satisfy all four learning outcomes. Were that to happen, students would not have choice that Provost Wickert thinks is important for keeping the general education requirement from becoming mandatory training. Will the Provost’s Office dig into the particulars of course offerings to ensure that student choice is preserved?

To the first question, Provost Wickert said that he declined to sign the docket item. To the second question, Provost Wickert said that he is not able to track every class. If FS passes a requirement for graduation, FS has an obligation to ensure that there are enough seats and that students will not be waitlisted. If all instructors decide to satisfy all four outcomes, they are allowed to do that, in accordance with faculty choice. And that might be a great situation, provided that the thousands of seats are available for students to satisfy the requirement.

Senator Behnken said that EB and President Wheeler have said that adopting the rescind motion will destroy all of the productive work and return us to 1995’s diversity requirement. But what the supporters of the rescind motion have said that the problem is that the process kept senators out of decision-making. The modification to the diversity requirement should have been brought back to FS for approval before being sent to the administration. If the rescind motion passes, then senators will have to address Provost Wickert’s concerns and find some space for negotiation. It may be the case that adopting at least three of four outcomes is the best compromise. But that would be acceptable, because it would be a compromise decided by the entire FS. Senator Behnken asked whether adopting the rescind motion would in fact destroy everything, or would there be opportunity to renew negotiations?

Provost Wickert said that he could not report what President Wheeler or EB said. But if the rescind motion passes, Provost Wickert said that he will not sign a docket item requiring all four learning outcomes. Both the provost and university president’s signatures are required for a change to the requirement. So in the absence of his signature, the legacy requirement will be in force. Perhaps through negotiation a new proposal could be found, but there is not a guarantee that that would be signed by Provost Wickert or ISU President Wintersteen. The current situation is that all parties have signed the diversity requirement. Provost Wickert said that he thought that that was a win.

3.4. P&S Council
P&S Council President Johnsen deferred his comments until the December FS meeting.
3.5. **Student Government**
SG Director of Academic Affairs Roberts said that SG leaders met with leaders from student governments from UNI and UI to discuss student priorities and identify common issues. SG confirmed a Deputy Director of IT. SG is organizing a campus safety walk.

3.6. **Graduate and Professional Student Senate**
GPSS President Iennarella-Servantez said that GPSS discussed BOR survey. GPSS is working on mental health initiatives for students and faculty incentive programs to promote student health and well-being.

4. **Special Order: Collaborative Leadership, Campus Culture, and the Role of the VPDEI’s Office – Charles Small, Interim VP for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion**
Interim VP Small introduced himself. He has worked in athletics, helping students with academic and career development. He is a liaison and Title IX coordinator.

Interim VP Small said that we are all responsible for the precious university resources, a big part of which is humans, including students and faculty. In his interim role, he sees his task as moving forward on those initiatives that former VP Stewart put in place. This includes preserving the momentum that the VPDEI’s Office has in terms of consultation, collaboration, and engagement. This work is grounded in the core principles of the landgrant mission and the idea that everyone is welcome, regardless of money or gender. This commitment is reflected in the Faculty Handbook and Strategic Plan.

Interim VP Small is working on developing the onboarding process. He reported some findings from *Gallup’s Perspective on Creating an Exceptional Onboarding Journey for New Employees*. New employees who have an “exceptional” onboarding experience are 2.6 more likely to be extremely satisfied with their place of work. But only 12% of new employees agree that their place of work does a great job of onboarding. After onboarding, only 29% of new hires report that they feel supported and prepared to excel in their positions. This failure comes at a cost of six to nine months’ salary of the new hire to find and onboard a replacement. The takeaway is that it is important to onboard effectively.

Four areas of focus for onboarding are: compliance, clarification, culture, and connection. His office is completing profile sheets of VPDEI candidates to find out under what circumstances they work best, their strengths, and where they want to be in five years. What should a manager know? Who are potential mentors for the new hire? This will help the new hire fill out their staff, based on their strengths and special background. The office is also reaching out to groups that have worked closely with VPDEI’s Office, asking three questions: What phase of development related to diversity, equity, and inclusion is your department or college in? What is your role within your department or college? What do you think the new VPDEI will need to know about your department or college in their first 90 days? There will be several groups to consult with, collaborate with, and engage: community partners, students, faculty, and alumni. In the spring, the VPDEI’s Office will work on some initiatives, including: ACE Learner Success Lab Project; strategy and institutional process; ISCORE debriefing; and navigating state law and other policies.
The VPDEI search committee is chaired by Senior VP Younger. And the committee is working with Spelman Johnson Executive Search Firm. The committee is going through the semifinalist stages.

5. Special Order: Ad Hoc Committee on the US Diversity Class - Meghan Gillette
Senator Gillette chairs the ad hoc committee on the U.S. Diversity requirement. Their primary task is to examine the impact of the change to the U.S. Diversity requirement. To do so, they collected information from instructors who teach courses that currently satisfy the U.S. Diversity requirement. In the instructors’ view, how much of what they do meets the four learning objectives? (The ad hoc committee does not know what threshold the standing committee will use for conferring the U.S. Diversity course designation, so the ad hoc committee could not provide that guideline to respondents.) The respondents were directed to make these assessments in intervals of 10%.

The response rate was 79%. Senator Gillette laid out the results of how many seats would be available for courses that satisfy 3 or 4 of the learning objectives, when the threshold for meeting a course objective is set at 30%, when it is set at 50%, and when it is set at 100%. If three out of four objectives are required, and meeting an objective is set at 30% of coursework, then (based on current enrollments) 5500 seats would be available and used to satisfy the U.S. Diversity requirement. However, in AY19-20, about 6700 seats were needed, and in AY20-21, about 7400 seats were needed. So even with the 30% threshold, the need would not be met.

The data provided by Senator Gillette show that enrollments are not evenly spread out among all the courses with the U.S. Diversity designation. There are ten courses that account for two-thirds of all U.S. Diversity requirement enrollments.

Senator Gillette also called senators’ attention to comments from respondents. 79% said that they wanted to keep their U.S. Diversity course designation. Four said that they would need additional resources (up to 6 months of time and money) to retool their courses to meet the new objectives. Although there are not enough seats with the current offerings, most courses already meet at least three of four learning objectives, and many of those that do not are close to doing so. In the qualitative feedback, some respondents reported that they found the learning objectives difficult to interpret. There were concerns about topics that were left out. Some expressed concerns about legal repercussions for teaching content about diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Senator Gillette reported that SG President Campbell issued a survey to student leaders, and 25 students participated. Of those respondents, 56% said that courses should have to meet at least three out of four of the learning objectives in order to receive the U.S. Diversity course designation; 28% said that all four learning objectives should be required.

6. Unfinished Business
Senator Kedrowski asked whether the design of the program is intended to meet AACSB accreditation standards, and is the curriculum prescribed by AACSB? Professor Gray replied that it is not prescribed by AACSB, but able to be under the AACSB accreditation umbrella.
The motion was adopted, without dissent.

6.2. **Master of Community Development [21-4] – Bennett-George**
Senator Bennett-George said that this new program has foundations in an existing program. Since submission of the proposal, there has been discussion of the transitioning process. The new ISU program will reflect strengths of the Community and Regional Planning (CRP) department, and bring in extension and outreach, which are not in the current GPIDEA program. Currently, there are eight students in the GPIDEA program. Those students will have three options: remain in GPIDEA through ISU, transfer to another GPIDEA partner, or transfer into this new ISU program. Many students are waiting to enroll until this new program is approved. New courses in the program will reflect interests of CRP faculty.

Senator Day asked whether GPIDEA’s Board supports the transition, or whether the transition would weaken our relationship with GPIDEA. Professor Awusu said that everyone agrees with the proposal.

The motion was adopted, without dissent.

6.3. **Master of Entrepreneurship [21-5] – Bennett-George**
The motion was adopted, without dissent.

6.4. **FS Minutes September 14, 2021 21/M/1 – [21-7] – Butler**
The motion was adopted, without dissent.

6.5. **Motion to rescind the US Diversity Class [21-2] – Butler**
Secretary Butler said that voting to rescind affirms our commitment to robust academic freedom and the democratic norms of FS. ISU University Counsel has adopted a peculiar interpretation of the risk posed by HF 802, while the other Regents universities have affirmed that the law does not affect academic coursework at all. ISU’s University Counsel has said to the senate that a mandatory course is tantamount to training, a claim that all educators must reject. Secretary Butler thought that the remaining concern about the number of seats can be addressed by careful implementation, working with departments and instructors to ensure that enough sections of diversity courses are made available to students. FS sets the curriculum. FS twice said that we expect our graduates to meet all four learning outcomes, to carry with them into their postgraduate lives and careers. Secretary Butler observed that it is exceedingly unusual for EB to adopt a policy change over the summer and fast-track signature by the provost and president. She said that this extraordinary measure should be invoked only under truly emergency conditions. The current U.S. Diversity requirement proposal arose from a task force report in fall 2020. There was no emergency situation requiring immediate action in July 2021. It was improper for EB to act. She encouraged senators to vote to rescind EB’s action, reasserting FS’s commitment to the entire senate being the locus of decision-making authority and power.

Senator Wood said that requiring that courses meet at least three of the four outcomes creates the chance that one of the outcomes will be under-utilized, either by chance or out of fear. Will FS regularly audit the courses to determine whether any learning outcome is under-utilized, and if it is discovered that that happens, is there a plan of action to address it?
Senator Gillette said that the ad hoc committee shared that concern, but did not find support for it in the instructor survey data. She said that she would anticipate that the standing U.S. Diversity committee would perform such an audit in their periodic review of courses. But that committee has not been formed yet.

Senator Reddy-Best wanted to address the capacity concern. She said that she teaches the third course on the list of high-enrollment U.S. Diversity courses. She said that she thinks that her course would easily meet all four learning objectives. Currently, her course is capped at 300 students per semester, and is offered in the fall, spring, summer, and now in the winter. She asked her chair and received permission to increase the capacity for the course, and her chair said that her department could provide resources to help her meet that increased capacity.

Senator Smiley said that she did not support the rescind motion for two reasons. EB acted under the power that it has, and the process was proper. Their decision moves this process forward, rather than risking a return to the learning outcomes from the 1990s. She had supported an amendment to at least three of the four learning outcomes all along, and one reason for doing so is that requiring all four outcomes limits academic freedom of faculty. There are faculty who have been teaching U.S. Diversity classes for a long time who already meet or could easily meet three out of four of the outcomes, and it would limit their freedom to require them to meet all four outcomes.

Senator Peterson stressed that he does not have an ideological objection to requiring at least three of four outcomes, and he agrees with Provost Wickert that the compromise is a win. This changed requirement is “leaps and bounds” better than the diversity requirement from the 1990s. Senator Peterson said that he objects to the compromise purely on procedural grounds. FS bylaws are crystal clear: EB is subject to the decisions of FS. FS twice voted down amendments to at least three of four learning outcomes. FS bylaws do not say that EB can do what FS rejected if something changes, or if there is new information, or if the provost will not agree. Instead, the bylaws state that EB does not have the power to override the decisions of FS. Senator Peterson said that while he supports requiring all four outcomes, it is clear that the provost will not sign it. So if the rescind motion were to happen, Senator Peterson said that he would support suspending the rules to allow an immediate vote on a motion to make the amendment to the requirement, requiring diversity courses to meet at least three of the four outcomes. But it’s important that that compromise is reached through proper process.

Senator Day said that he felt that a lot of claims had been made about EB’s intent and why actions were taken – that EB had always intended to modify the proposal to require at least three of four outcomes. Senator Day said that if that was happening, he was unaware of it. Instead, EB thought that this compromise was a good win and a big move forward. That’s what EB was doing. He said that he was FS president five years ago, when this issue was on the table and conversations dragged on. He said that he would pass anything rather than talk for another five years. This is a win and a move forward.

Senator Peterson said that he believed Senator Day’s report that EB acted in good faith. But he stressed that it was still a mistake. FS is an institution bound by our rules. The intent is irrelevant
when the action violates the rules. If there is disagreement about the interpretation of bylaws, the full senate decides how to interpret the bylaws.

Senator Bennett–George said that while she is against the motion to rescind, she does not especially like what EB did over the summer. She was thrilled when FS passed AAC’s motion in May (later celebrated with a “very expensive” bottle of wine), and committee members recognized that they were being bold by requiring all four learning outcomes. That left open the possibility that somewhere down the line a compromise might have to be reached. “Somewhere down the line” happened over the summer, after a series of extended discussions in EB. Had she been present at the meeting when the amendment was voted on, Senator Bennett–George said she would have voted in favor of it, because it is a move forward. She thought that FS needs to direct its attention to other important matters, such as teaching evaluations, flexible work options, and state and legislative control of faculty jobs and classrooms.

Senator Freeman said that he appreciated that even though some people supporting the rescind motion question EB’s intent, not everyone does, and the latter support rescinding for procedural reasons. He said that he has served on FS for a long time and on EB several times. He does not think that EB violated anything in FS bylaws. FS had never discussed what to do if the provost or university president did not approve FS’s motion. Therefore he thought it was misleading to characterize EB’s action as “overturning” something FS decided: FS never had a conversation or vote on that process. When conditions change, it is appropriate to rethink the decision and find a compromise. Senator Freeman added that it is rare for EB to act over the summer, but not as rare as suggested. EB last did this in negotiations with the Provost’s Office to make modifications to the policy concerning term faculty titles. FS had passed something at the main meeting. The provost was unable to sign it. EB made some small modifications, and the policy was approved, and FS moved on. That process followed FS bylaws. EB reported their action to FS at the first meeting. It was clearly within the rights and responsibilities of EB both in FS bylaws and FS constitution to act over the summer. He called upon senators to vote against the motion to rescind and to move on.

Senator Kedrowski said that her first FS meeting was at the end of this process in May. At that meeting, FS decisively voted against the motion for at least three out of four learning outcomes. She understands the provost’s perspective and the articulate arguments made by colleagues. She does not disagree with the outcome, but she is “very disturbed” by the process. EB adopted exactly the motion that the senate voted down. She thought EB’s action undercut the authority of this body. She thought that it is especially important that we follow our procedures with respect to curricular matters, in pursuit of shared governance. She supports the motion to rescind. Even with new information, the change made by EB was not a small, technical change; it was a major change.

Senator Rosa said that this process exhibited shared governance at its best and worst, where conflicting ideas are expressed through dialogue. Although defending shared governance is sometimes ugly, it is important to defend. Senator Rosa thought that Provost Wickert upheld shared governance when earlier in his announcements he said that senators should decide how to vote on the rescind motion. As a landgrant, public institution, all faculty and administrators are employees of the Iowa government. When FS voted on the U.S. Diversity requirement, there was
a lot of uncertainty about the bill in the state legislature. But he thought that the modification was a win. He encouraged senators to vote to move on, so that we can carry on other work in the spirit of shared governance.

Senator Behnken said that he disliked EB’s procedure and the content of the amendment. He disagreed with the recommendation to vote to rescind and then suspend the rules to adopt the amendment to have at least three out of four learning outcomes. He pointed out that Provost Wickert raised questions and concerns, and we do not know the answers to them, although we have an “inkling” of answers. He thought it was a bad idea to change the policy in the absence of answers to those questions. He encouraged senators to vote to rescind and then commit to finding out the answers to the questions and concerns before amending FS’s motion.

The motion was lost, with 20 in favor and 33 against.

7. **New Business**

Senator Bennett-George said that this policy change allows the offering of professional certificates that do not require concurrent completion of bachelor’s degrees. The current policy says that certificates are awarded upon completion of the bachelor’s degree or to students who already have a bachelor’s degree. This new policy would allow the offering department to determine whether an associate’s degree is required.

No discussion.

7.2. **Name Change: Agricultural and Rural Policy Studies [21-9] – Bennett-George**
Senator Bennett-George said that this proposal changes the name from Agriculture and Society to Agricultural and Rural Policy Studies. Students and alumni expressed a need for the name change. The curriculum-related changes noted in the proposal are not being voted on; this proposal concerns only the name change.

Senator Kedrowski asked why FS is not also considering the curriculum change. She said that the proposal goes well beyond a name change. There is a proposal to create seven new courses, at least four of which duplicate courses offered elsewhere on campus by well-credentialed and qualified faculty. She thought it was really problematic that only Sociology was consulted, when there are other departments with existing expertise. She asked whether there would be an opportunity to vote on those other courses and discussion of the whole curriculum.

Senator Bennett-George said that AAC does not evaluate curricula of existing programs, only creation of new programs. AAC does evaluate name change proposals. So she does not expect to have that curricular discussion in AAC.

Senator Kedrowski said that the creation of four new classes that duplicate existing courses taught elsewhere in the university is troublesome. There are ongoing conversations about budgetary issues and concerns about declining enrollment. This is in fact an exciting opportunity for interdisciplinary collaboration. Duplication of effort is exactly the wrong direction. If this
conversation will not take place in AAC or current structures, we need to figure out how to engage in them, for the mutual best interest of departments and our students.

Professor Peters said that the proposal does include description of curriculum as part of the larger document, but the proposal concerns only the name change. The program’s current curriculum is outdated. The proposers got feedback from the departments of Ag Education, Economics, and Political Science. The proposers reached out to the chair of Political Science and found that some of the duplicated courses have not been taught in six or seven semesters. The proposers are open to cross-list or jointly teach common courses, but those are curricular decisions not affecting the name change. The proposal does not reflect most recent developments of the curriculum, which will soon be sent to CALS Curriculum Committee.

Senator Kedrowski said that as of Saturday, she had been informed by her dean that there had not been conversations with the affected departments. Professor Peters said that he could forward the relevant e-mail. Senator Kedrowski said that she was repeating what she was told. She implored Senator Peters to think about how collaboration can happen. She said that she was concerned that FS’s council and FS are unable to make decisions on curriculum beyond name changes.

Senator Peterson echoed Senator Kedrowski’s points. As he understood it, an e-mail reply was sent to the proposers, but their concerns were summarily dismissed in the proposal. He recommended sending the proposal back to AAC. This proposal goes beyond a name change, because it requires six new classes and hiring new faculty. He said that the proposal reads like a backdoor way to create a new major with seven new classes and new faculty, but that gets approved under the umbrella of a name change, enabling it to receive less scrutiny from other departments or colleges.

Professor Peters clarified that it is just four new classes. He stressed that the proposal has not been updated to reflect development since April. The reason is that any change would require new faculty votes and move the proposal backwards in the approval process. He added that the proposal would require hiring only one new faculty member, who has already been hired.

President Wheeler said that she thought that the proposal could be referred to AAC to make sure that tensions are ironed out, and so that there is agreement on the questions.

A point of order was made that such referral would require a motion.

Senator Peterson moved to refer the motion to AAC. Senator Kedrowski seconded.

The motion was adopted.

(A call was made to check quorum. The body was quorate.)

7.3. Non-substantive FH Changes [21-10] – Freeman

Senator Freeman said that this proposal does not change any policy. It removes a lot of policy detail from FH 8 and provides references to the full policies in the Policy Library. One section
dealing with curricular activities should be moved to FH 10. Governance Council felt that these changes were non-substantive.

Secretary Butler said that she was disappointed to see that infelicities in the motion (including typographical errors and formatting errors) were not corrected after they were pointed out in EB. She asked that those corrections be made before the second reading.

7.4. FS Minutes October 12, 2021
Secretary Butler moved to adopt the October 12, 2021 FS Minutes. Senator Padgett Walsh seconded.

Senator Gillette said that she had two concerns about the minutes. On page seven, it is reported: “President Wheeler had stressed in her announcements at the last meeting (after quorum was lost) that ‘declining to sign’ is not the same as ‘not approving,’ but now President Wheeler is saying that the provost is prepared not to approve.” Senator Gillette asked whether President Wheeler said this at the October 12, 2021 FS meeting, or whether President Wheeler reminded everyone at the October 12, 2021 FS meeting of her announcement. Secondly, also on page 7, the minutes report: “In the EB meeting, Secretary Butler asked that question directly of representatives from the Provost’s Office, they had declined to say that they were prepared to ‘blow this up’ or return ISU to the 1990s diversity requirement.” The minutes also report: “Secretary Butler wanted to hear how that negotiation went, because she was hearing different stories from the provost’s office and from FS leadership about the consequences.” Senator Gillette said that she didn’t understand why information from an EB meeting was included in FS minutes, or why the secretary’s opinion was being reported.

After Senator Gillette’s comments, quorum was lost.

8. Good of the Order

9. Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 5:27 p.m., when quorum was lost.

Respectfully submitted, December 2, 2021
Annemarie Butler
Faculty Senate Secretary

NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, December 14, 2021 – 3:30 p.m.
Sun Room, Memorial Union