



IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate

Governance Council Minutes

March 3, 2022

Item 1: Minutes

Senator Peterson agreed to take minutes of this meeting.

Item 2: Proposed Handbook changes regarding Promotion and Tenure and Innovation and Entrepreneurship

Discussion:

The current system does not have a clear way to include innovation and entrepreneurship for promotion and advancement. The VPR's office has worked with the Research Planning and Policy Committee to develop potential changes to the Faculty Handbook to incorporate these items. It was noted that the proposed changes need to be in a different format.

FDAR has had a similar working group on incorporating extension scholarship more directly (Brian Arbuckle of FDAR attended this meeting as well).

Several members of the committee raised concerns about how I&E work would be evaluated. There were concerns that the standards for I&E work need to be clear to both the faculty doing this work and to the faculty and administrators who are evaluating the faculty for promotion and advancement. Colleges vary in how expansive and inclusive they are in how they define scholarship, but I&E work is not being consistently evaluated.

There is an additional problem of how these standards are communicated to external reviewers.

One Senator asked if there are other universities that have adopted something similar. ISU is part of a working group and other institutions are implementing parts of this. The goal in this working group is not to raise or lower the bar for promotion and advancement, but to widen the bar to include a greater variety of types of work.

It was generally agreed that there needs to be room left to departments and colleges for how I&E work is evaluated and valued.

There was a concern that there needs to be examples of work outside of STEM fields, particularly in the humanities and social sciences.

The inclusion of the “formation of companies” in the proposal generated a lot of discussion. There were concerns that this created a conflict of interest and that faculty would be rewarded via ISU for work that they are also financially rewarded for from an external entity like a business. It was noted that this is also a problem for recognition of textbook writing.

The language about “ISU intellectual property” creates a problem for faculty who are hired at a more senior level. If they conduct I&E work based on research at a previous institution, does that not get included in their evaluation material?

It was noted that this work is not an add on to existing work. This can be part of research/teaching/service and faculty have to comply with their PRS and meet department standards.

A concern was raised that creating a business is not scholarship. It doesn’t meet the definition in the handbook—it cannot be evaluated in the same way. They are not shared in the same way as scholarship. It isn’t validated by peers in the same way. It is more akin to professional practice.

Maybe, the formation of a business isn’t scholarship but is a measure of the impact of the scholarship.

This needs to include social entrepreneurship, so a lot of these things need to be included in impact.

Summary: General consensus that I&E should be included but the main sticking point is the creation of businesses.

Item 3: Term Faculty Advancement.

The discussion mostly focused on clarifying exactly what this proposal does. It only affects the advancement of term faculty and not the promotion of tenure eligible faculty. The main point is that this simply requires departments to have the same rules about rank eligibility for the evaluation of term faculty as it has for tenure faculty.

Senators emphasized that this creates consistency and only shapes the eligibility but not necessarily the requirement of who serves. The key thing is that this means that people cannot be excluded because they are term faculty.

Senator Parsa moved for a vote. Senator Peterson seconded. The vote was unanimous in support.