

Comments from Senator with Responses from Subcommittee
regarding ISU Faculty Constitution PFS Draft 0.3
for Sept 19, 2011 PFS meeting

For efficiency sake I wanted to post questions and comments for the Subcommittee to answer or for the PFS to discuss. The Subcommittee is clearly very qualified, and committed and insights into the thoughts behind their recommendations is extremely helpful.

The senator qualification for time in academic service is something Senate has been criticized for in the past...are we defining this or purposefully leaving it vague to allow for units/colleges to determine?

Draft 0.3 does not specify senator qualifications, though I think it is implied that senators would be "academic faculty"; our old bylaws did add the further requirement of "at least 3 years' academic service at Idaho State University or equivalent service elsewhere" (Article III, Section 1.5) The subcommittee recommends that this be a matter dealt with in the faculty senate bylaws and not the constitution.

The faculty staff handbook defined faculty as all individuals who hold the rank of instructor or higher, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor in one of the colleges of the University. Some, staff professionals have equivalent faculty rank and are considered members of the faculty. Equivalent faculty rank is attained only when specifically conferred by the University and approved by the Board. Is this consistent with our definitions or are we changing f/s handbook too, or is the f/s handbook binding to the institution?

The subcommittee has now discussed this, and we remain uncertain. We need more information about the status of those with "equivalent faculty rank." If "equivalent faculty rank" has the effect of conferring any of the ranks that are mentioned in Article 2, Section 1 (e.g., Professor, Research Professor, Clinical Professor, etc.), then presumably these would be included under "academic faculty."

Article III Section 1a and b. These both address faculty recommendations on teaching and research Since service is an important faculty component, should it be addressed as an an additional stand alone item?

Perhaps so. The question is whether making recommendations concerning the conduct of service is a central component of faculty governance. The service itself is, of course, central to governance.

Are President and Vice Pres replacing old terminology of Chair and Vice Chair for Senate? Is Steering Committee the old Exec Committee?

Will at large Senator members be voted in to be part of the Senate Exec Committee?

Yes, in draft 0.3 the terminology is changed--following BSU's constitution. We could consider adopting the terms more traditional at ISU instead (Chair, Vice-chair, Executive Committee). The subcommittee does not have a strong opinion one way or the other on this matter.

IV Sect 2 meeting notice circulated- is our standard email or posting to website

The draft leaves "circulated" undefined, and this is an example of a case in which vagueness may be appropriate. We don't want to have to change the constitution each time standard methods of circulation change. It may be best to leave this unspecified.

IV Sect 2 c Quorum-physically present needs to include teleconference or DL presence by definition

I would think that a reasonable interpretation of "physically present" would include anyone physically present at a distance site. We could revise this passage to require physical presence "at designated meeting sites" so as to remove any doubt here.

IV Sect 2 d. Shouldn't any member of the faculty be able to submit agenda items to their elected representative in addition to the Faculty Senate President?

Perhaps so, but this language would not prevent that--in that case, the representative would be the "member of the faculty" who submits the item. Because the FS President presides at these meetings, agenda items must, one way or another, be submitted to him or her.

IV Sect 2 e 2. Need to describe further the process for contesting a University presidential action? as it is elaborated in 1

You may well be right that further details are called for here, as in 1.

V Sec 1 b or d consider adding: Each senator will represent the unit or group which elected them. Senators will not represent more than one constituent base. I want to avoid Meridian faculty to be prevented from voting for both Meridian outreach rep and their own unit rep....

This draft would leave it up to each individual "college, division, or unit of the university" to determine how to apportion its representatives within the unit. For example, if the Division of Health Sciences wanted to designate one or more of its assigned seats to represent its faculty in Meridian, it could do so.

I also attached a description of Clinical Faculty that is being discussed in DHS since that is a confusing issue for all, but appears to be addressed in 0.3. I'd like to recommend all clinical and research faculty with a 0.5 FTE or more be able to vote in faculty wide deliberations as opposed to the full time faculty voting requirement for those persons in the old bylaws.

According to this draft, all clinical and research faculty, as members of "THE FACULTY", would be entitled to vote at meetings of "THE FACULTY."