The Committee on Honorary Degrees solicits nominations for honorary degrees each September with a letter to all the faculty. The deadline for nominations is in mid-January. This year there were no nominations by the deadline, although I had been approached by several potential nominators with ideas of people to be honored. Therefore I wrote to the President with suggestions of two people, and he passed my suggestions on to the Provost. After meeting with the Provost, I called James McCormick, Chair of Political Science, to suggest the name of Jim Leach, former congressman from eastern Iowa and presently Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities. The Dean of Engineering and I talked with Richard Wlezien, Chair of Aerospace Engineering, about nominating Dr. Peggy Whitson, native of southern Iowa, biochemist, and long-time astronaut.

The two nominations, very good ones indeed, soon arrived. I passed them to the committee, and they were unanimously approved by e-mail within a couple of days each. I then took the nominations to the Executive Board of the Faculty Senate, where they were also unanimously approved. They are presently with the President, with the date of the conferral of the degrees not yet made public.

Peter J. Reilly
Chair, Committee on Honorary Degrees
Membership: Sanjeev Agarwal [BUS], Katie Brown [GSB Rep.], Tom Daniels [ENG], Brad Dell [LAS; Fall 2012], Heather Greenlee [CVM], Joanne Olson [CHS], Robert Martin [CALS], Frank Peters [Academic Standards and Admissions Chair], Brad Skaar [Outcomes Assessment Committee Chair], Jonathan Sturm [LAS; Spring 2013], Gary Taylor [DES], Janette Thompson [FS Curriculum Committee Chair], Robert Wallace [AAC Chair], David Holger [Assoc. Provost, ex officio]

Activity:

Dead Week Policy: The AAC was charged with reviewing the current section of the faculty handbook (FH 10.6.4) to examine whether better language could be crafted to develop a policy that would resolve some of the issues that had been previously discussed with student representatives in Spring 2012. The AAC agreed that the revised language should be proposed as a policy, rather than a set of operational recommendations. The Council, working with representatives of the Government of the Student Body, developed a sub-committee which discussed intended components of the policy, and then drafted revised language that was proposed to the Executive Board, which will be considered for approval as Senate Docket item, S12-17.

Review of ISUComm: The Council began discussions regarding a general review of the ISUComm program for undergraduate communication, looking specifically at the function of the program, and what curricular requirements are in place across the curricula that ensures continuation of training in advanced communication courses and in the discipline following completion of English 250. A draft set of concepts related to the development of a campus-wide survey was compiled and shared with faculty in the Department of English who are involved with teaching in and administering the ISUComm program. A more specific draft of possible survey questions (to be sent to curriculum chairs in all undergraduate departments and academic programs as an on-line survey) which are intended to gather basic information about communications course requirements in existing curricula, was developed and will be refined during Summer 2013, with plans to administer the survey and gather the data during Fall 2013. The goal of this project is to determine how the various undergraduate programs follow-up on communications course requirements and provide communications-related experiences within their disciplines. The results of this study will enable programs to assess the need to ensure adequate communications training to all undergraduate students, and to examine possibilities of improvements which can be done to the advanced communication course offerings.
Extracurricular Activities Make-up Policy: In response to a situation at the University of Northern Iowa involving a student and problems publicized regarding extracurricular activities and making up missed work, the AAC was asked to review Faculty Handbook Section 10.4.3 ['Extracurricular Activities'], and suggest revised language that will provide for required student absences, and the ability for instructors to allow students to make-up missed work. The AAC reviewed several proposed to modify the present FH language, and proposed revision which have been reviewed (and modified) by the Executive Board which are being considered for approval by the Senate as docket item S12-18.

Review of Academic Program Proposals: The AAC reviewed and approved proposals for actions involving the following new or modified academic programs:
- Master of Finance – New Degree
- Bachelor of Public Relations – New Degree
- Minor in Landscape Management – New Degree
- Bachelor of Agricultural Engineering – Name Change
- Bachelor of Family Finance Housing and Policy – Name Change

Early Credit Task Force Report: The Council reviewed the report from the Early Credit Task Force, and requested that two of its constituent committees (Curriculum Committee and Academic Standards and Admissions) to review portions of the report and recommend whether policy changes or modified best practices should be implemented in response to the information contained in the report. The committees have made recommendations and a final response report from the AAC will be prepared and delivered in the Fall 2013 semester, including a report on any actions taken or if new proposals are developed relevant to those recommendations.

Robert S. Wallace, Chair
Academic Affairs Council
1 May 2013
General Topics

- General consensus of the committee is that if a program determines a need for a special GPA/grade requirement for their program, it is preferred that the requirement be based on a minimum GPA for a group of courses, rather than a minimum grade for each course (e.g. Minimum GPA of 2.00 instead of a C or better in each course). This discussion was precipitated in part by a department’s initial request to require a minimum grade in every course applied to their degree programs. While there could be some instances when a minimum grade in each of a set of courses may be justified, wide scale implementations of such rules would effectively change the ISU grading scheme.

- Investigation of existing special GPA/grade requirements demonstrated the need for a database of all special requirements. A database of all known requirements was assembled by the committee by combing through the Catalog. This database will be maintained by the ASAC and used by the registrar’s office to cross check any new requests for special requirements to be coded into the DARS degree audit system. This will also provide a gate check so that special requirements that are not approved not be included in the Catalog or degree audits.

- Special grade requirements for prerequisites were discovered in the draft 2013-2014 Catalog draft that were not approved. One department withdrew these requirements upon being asked for justification, the other program provided reasoning and it was approved by ASAC before the Catalog edit deadline. This further supports a need for a better system of tracking special GPA/grade requirements.

- The development of the database revealed that the language stating special requirements was inconsistent through the Catalog, and often vague or in error. An effort for next year will be to work towards consistency and accuracy of wording.

- A Procedure Document was developed to assist programs which want to implement a new special grade/GPA requirement. This document (attached) will be included in the web site for new class development that the FSCC is creating. The document informs the program on the procedures as well as the information that is needed to support a request.

- Discussion on admission requirements for non-native English speakers. Pat Parker explained to the committee the changes that ISU has implemented to keep a diverse population at ISU but also only admitting students who can be successful. The committee was impressed with the explanations and the innovative changes they have made to address this issue. No further action necessary.
Specific Policy Actions

- Early Credit Task Force Items. ASAC was tasked to look at 3 items identified by the Early Credit Task Force.
  - Freshman are entitled for 5 drops. This wording will be changed in the Catalog to reflect the current practice which is students who are direct admit from high school will have 5 course drops.
  - Students put on probation if GPA <2.00 and total credits earned/attempted >75. Committee suggested no changes. Students should be put on probation to trigger the support which comes with this status to assist them in improving their grades regardless of where they earned credits.
  - Students cannot take a course P/NP until they have earned 40 credits. No change requested at this time, but discussion was tabled until next year to get input from advising committee. Some discussion on the need for this rule at all, or to base it on number of semesters completed (ie. 1 or 2) instead of credits earned.

- Teacher Education – Practica and Student Teaching special requirement approved for all student teaching programs at ISU. Limits the number attempts students have to complete practica or student teaching. While the policy is strong, there is an appeal mechanism and other support provided to students. This is also critical to teacher licensure requirements.

- Veterinary Medicine academic standards policy changes approved. Decisions are now made on GPA in core classes as well as overall GPA to avoid students taking electives to pad their overall GPA.

- Com S 342 Prereq of C- or better in Com S 228, 330, or Cpr E310 approved.

Respectfully Submitted,

Frank Peters

Chair ASAC – 2012-2013
Procedures for Approval of Special GPA, grade or other special requirements

The Faculty Senate Academic Standards and Admissions Committee has responsibility to approve all special GPA and grade requirements that an undergraduate program wishes to impose. Some examples of such requirements include:

- A minimum grade for a prerequisite course
- A minimum GPA in a set of courses to advance in the degree program or graduate
- Minimum grades in a set of courses to advance in the degree program or graduate
- Restrictions on how many times a student can take a course
- Requirements to take examinations outside of course requirements to proceed in a degree program.

While there are legitimate needs for such rules, the ASAC needs to grant approval so that rules that unduly restrict students’ progress or effectively change the ISU grading scheme are not allowed. Requirements that mandate a minimum grade in each of a set of classes are generally not acceptable without significant justification; a preferred mechanism is a minimum GPA for that set of courses.

A program that wants to implement a special rule needs to develop and provide adequate justification. Examples of justification include:

- Statistics on past performance of students that would be restricted versus those students who would not be restricted by the proposed rule
- A need for the restrictions based on specific knowledge that is critical for future performance as dictated by required internships or accreditation

Consideration on whether this rule would unfairly impact certain groups of students needs to be included in the proposal.

Approval process:

- Proposal and justification developed by the program that wants to establish special rules
- Approval by the Academic Standards Committee (or equivalent) of the respective College
- Approval by the Faculty Senate Academic Standards and Admissions Committee
- Rules that are significantly different from past precedence may need to be approved by the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Council (as determined by chair of ASAC in consultation with the chair of the AFC).
- The approval will be communicated to the Registrar’s Office such that the Catalog changes can be included and the rule change be coded into the Degree Audit System (if needed).
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April 29, 2013

FDAR Council 2012-13

Chair, Ann Smiley-Oyen, HS
Ken Stalder, AGR; Dan Zhu, BUS; Pamela Iasevoli, DES; Ralph Napolitano, ENG; no rep, LAS; Linda Thompson, VET; Heimir Geirsson, Recognition & Development Committee; Kimberly Zarecor, Committee on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion; Dawn Bratsch-Prince, Provost Office; Suzanne Hendrich, Faculty Senate President

The FDAR Council met six times this year. The major tasks we undertook were correcting and updating Sections 6.4 Emeritus/a Professor and 5.1.1.2 Annual Reviews in the Faculty Handbook. Changes were approved by the Faculty Senate. We also brought forward a name change for the Committee on Women and Minorities to the Committee on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion. Faculty Senate approved this change.

A topic of discussion was ways to help prepare new non-tenure eligible faculty by inviting them to an orientation workshop for new non-tenure eligible faculty in August (separate from the tenure eligible faculty orientation). We also discussed the potential of supporting a mentoring program for lecturers who wish to apply for promotion to senior lecturer. Bratsch-Prince will look into possibilities and this discussion will continue next year.

Finally, we reviewed the steps Faculty Senate put in place to address the balance between tenure eligible and non-tenure eligible faculty. Reports from Department Chairs are due to the Deans by July 1 and to the Provost by August 1. Provost Wickert will provide a report to Faculty Senate at our September 2013 meeting.

Respectfully submitted by,

Ann L. Smiley-Oyen
FDAR Council Chair
asmiley@iastate.edu
The Recognition and Development Committee met a total of three times during the academic year. The committee reviewed two applications for the Big Twelve Faculty Fellowship Program, recommending that both applicants be awarded a fellowship. Three nominations for the Regent’s Excellence Award were received and the committee recommended that all three nominees should receive an award. The committee received a total of 121 foreign travel grant applications, up from 94 during the previous year, and was able to fund 82 of those applications.

A major responsibility of the committee is to review, rank, and select foreign travel grant applications for funding. This year the Faculty Senate contributed $27,840 to the fund, the Provost’s Office $15,000 and President’s Office $20,000, for a total of $62,840. This is the first time in five years that the President’s Office has contributed to the fund and the contribution significantly affected our program, especially in light of the increase of applicants from the previous year.

The foreign travel grants represent a major part of ISU’s international outreach program. These resources ease the burden of faculty traveling the globe as invited experts delivering keynote addresses, top researchers contributing their results with the world and our brightest scholars sharing their gifts. What is gained by the individual faculty member is extremely valuable for their professional development. These foreign travel experiences are the catalyst for opening future opportunities for collaborations in joint research efforts and potential agreements between institutions. Iowa State University receives from this investment the type of recognition worthy of our research institution.

It is important to maintain this funding and preferably increase the level of support for the foreign travel grant program.

Submitted by

Heimir Geirsson
Chair, Recognition and Development Committee
geirsson@iastate.edu
Faculty Senate Research Planning and Policy Committee (RPPC)
Annual Report – August 2012 – April 2013

Members: Kan Wang (Chair), Julia Badenhope (DES), Scott Beckman (ENG),
Jorgen Johansen (LAS), Peter Martin (HSC), Chris Minion (VET), Forrest Nutter
(CALS), Sridhar Ramaswami (BUS), Sharron Quisenberry (VPRED), David
Oliver (VPRED)

Three RPPC meetings were scheduled for the fall semester of 2012. The committee met on
September 20 and November 19, 2012. The third meeting on December 13 was cancelled due to
illness of Dr. Quisenberry. Three meetings were scheduled for the spring of 2013. To date, the
committee has met on March 4 and April 11, 2013 with the Interim VPRED Oliver. Last
meeting for the spring 2013 will be May 8.

Two major discussions during this period include:

1. Irregularity of OSPA gold sheet submission requirement specific to NIH R1 grant
   applications. RPPC had addressed this issue 1.5 years ago in consultation with and
   approval of Dr. Quisenberry to simplify this particular budget (pre-budget) routing
   process. The committee would like to continue the pre-budget routing process for NIH
   R1 application to elevate unnecessary burden to faculty. Dr Quisenberry was
   investigating this issue. Currently Dr. Oliver is revisiting this issue with OSPA and will
   bring his findings to the committee.

2. Review of college level allocation of indirect cost (IDC) associated with sponsored
   research. Discussion among members of the committee indicates that research policies
   and IDC distribution vary widely across colleges. The committee also has noted
   differences in need, based on changes in sponsor policies and developing new programs.
   The VPRED office has noted that some colleges with long, well established research
   cultures might have strategies for supporting research and other sponsored projects that
   would be particularly useful as models for best practices. Some committee members
   proposed to form focus groups comprised with PIs, administrators and budget
   management staff to identify best practices on a college-by-college basis.

Respectfully submitted,

Kan Wang, Committee Chair
28 April 2013