

IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES

VOLUME XXVIII, MEMO 3

September 29, 2008

4:00 PM

Faculty Senate Conference Room, REND 301

In Attendance: Adler, Beard, Bearden, Cole, Delehanty (Chair), Dye, Edwards, Forest, Frantz, Guryan (telecommunication), Hasenpflug, Kantabutra, Kearns, Knudson, Kratz, Lambert, Livingston Friedley, Murphy, Oliphant (telecommunication), Packer, Phelps, Whitaker, Wilson, Wolter, Womack
Non-voting: De Jesus, Fullerton, Trimmer, Wallace (Recording Secretary)
Excused: Larsen, Magnuson; Vailas
Absent: Moulton, Smith, Vik; Ford

I. Announcements

A. Tuition Benefits Task Force – update from Karl De Jesus re: his meeting with Mr. Fletcher

De Jesus reported that Vice President Fletcher was receptive to the concept of pooling unused tuition benefits. They will meet again to further discuss possibilities and options.

B. Fall General Assembly: Tuesday, Sept. 30 (tomorrow) from 4:00-5:30 p.m. SUB Theatre

Delehanty urged Senators to attend and to encourage their constituents to come as well. He has heard mixed reviews regarding the President's request for unfiltered questions: half the faculty are very pleased at the chance to hear unrehearsed answers to tough questions, the other half of faculty are concerned that non-tenured or less confident faculty will be silenced. Delehanty encouraged Senators to ask questions posed by their constituents and to help redirect the discussion if topics become too narrow and focused on issues specific to a few small groups rather than the university as a whole.

C. NCAA Accreditation

ISU is going through its NCAA Accreditation process again this year. Delehanty asked Senators to spread the word that the NCAA Steering Committee and its subcommittees **need six faculty representatives** to serve on them. Any names should be forwarded to the committees. The subcommittees are **Governance and Compliance; Academic Integrity;** and **Gender Equity, Diversity, and Student Welfare.**

II. Consent Calendar

A. Faculty Senate Minutes

1. *Minutes of April 28, 2008 – not finished yet, deferred until later*
2. Minutes of September 15, 2008

B. Minutes from Councils

1. **Cultural Affairs Council**
 - a. Minutes of September 3, 2008
 - b. Minutes of September 24, 2008
2. **Faculty Professional Policies Council – pulled from Consent Calendar**
 - a. *Minutes of September 3, 2008*
3. **Research Coordinating Council**
 - a. Minutes of April 17, 2008

- C. Annual Reports from Councils
1. Budget Council's 2007-2008 Annual Report
 2. ***Campus Planning Council's 2007-08 Annual Report***– pulled from Consent Calendar
 3. Cultural Affairs Council's 2007-2008 Annual Report
 4. Research Coordinating Council's 2007-2008 Annual Report
- D. Council and Committee appointments
1. **Academic Standards Council**
 - a. Education – replace Roger Rankin
nomination for **Dr. Peter Denner, Ass't Dean, College of Education**
 2. **Curriculum Council**
 - a. Education
Dr. Mike Lester, Sport Science & P.E. was elected by the College of Education
 3. **Faculty Professional Policies Council**
 - a. Education – replace David Squires for Fall 2008 semester only
nomination for **Jane Strickland, Ed. Technology for one semester only**
 - b. Arts & Sciences – replace Thom Hasenpflug – for 1-year only
nomination for **Michael Thomas, Biological Sciences**
 4. **Research Coordinating Council** (once a month Thursday from 3-5, starting Sept 4)
 - a. Education – replace Al Strickland for 1-year remainder of his term
nomination for **Dr. Shelley Counsell, Early Childhood**
 - b. Arts & Sciences – replace Sharon Sieber for 1-year remainder of her term
no nominations as of 9/28/08

ACTION: Moved by Lambert and seconded by Phelps **to approve the remaining items on the Consent Calendar.** No discussion. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Items Pulled from Consent Calendar:

- B.2.a. Faculty Professional Policies Council Minutes of September 3, 2008
ACTION: Frantz said that to be accurate, the phrase “**intramural sports**” should be struck from the fourth bullet point on **page 2, Item 6.a.** He then moved **to approve the minutes with that correction.** Seconded by Edwards. No discussion. The motion **passed** unanimously. The minutes will be corrected accordingly.

C.2 Campus Planning Council's Annual Report 2007-2008

Delehanty informed Senators that contrary to what the report stated on page 4 of the Attachment C Annual Campus Facilities and Space Progress Report, the Sustainability Policy was not reviewed nor accepted by Faculty Senate last Spring, and the report **should be modified to show the correct acceptance date as Fall 2008.** He also suggested the Senate allow for minor editing and formatting changes when they do accept the report in order to correct typos, add pagination and other such details. The Administration is waiting for this report.

ACTION: Dye moved to **approve the Campus Planning Council's Annual Report.** Seconded by Edwards.

Discussion: Delehanty briefly reviewed the different sections of the report. De Jesus cautioned that **if the Senate approves the report, they automatically approve of all the policies and recommendations contained within it.** Hasenpflug questioned **how research space was defined** because the Fine Arts Building is not included, yet that is where he, other musicians and the Art department faculty do their creative work.

There was discussion about the distinction between **research space** and **teaching space.** Dye said her department also discussed this distinction when filling out the survey form, because there are **many dual-purpose research/teaching spaces** and the survey was not

very clear in defining how those distinctions should be made. The report identified 138 research spaces; much depends on how the questions were phrased in the survey. She also pointed out that the report's findings were based on a very small number of returned surveys. Delehanty reminded that space used solely for research (i.e., the creation of new knowledge) and not for instruction does not receive as much State funding as instructional space. The current Administration considers dual-purpose teaching/research space to be desirable because it provides for both funding and new knowledge.

Forest objected to **Appendix C-4 Sustainable Energy & Environmental Policy** draft that calls for shutting down heating and cooling over weekends and the winter break. That would have a detrimental effect on his research. Hasenpflug pointed out that many musical instruments also require climate control; as does the Library and computer equipment facilities. Although the draft policy allows for filing for exemptions to be approved by the Vice President for Facilities, if someone forgets to request an exemption the potential damage could be very costly. The motivation to reduce expenses is fine, but the logistics should be considered more carefully.

ACTION: Beard moved to **table the Campus Planning Council's Annual Report** to allow Senators further time to review it. Seconded by Livingston Friedley. Motion **passed** unanimously.

ACTION: Kantabutra moved to **have a Campus Planning Council representative come to Faculty Senate** to explain the report and answer questions. No second. The **motion died** for lack of a second.

Senators will talk with their constituents and solicit further comments and feedback.

III. Continuing Business

A. Salary Issues

1. Salary Recommendations from FPPC
2. Salary Increase Plan and Merit-Based Raise Proposals from Administration

ACTION: Hasenpflug moved to **temporarily table the Salary Issues** in order to take care of the New Business first. Seconded by Wilson. Motion **passed** unanimously.

IV. New Business

- A. **ACTION:** Frantz moved to approve the written motion to **add a representative from the Staff Council as an ex-officio non-voting member on the Faculty Senate Advisory Council**. Seconded by Kantabutra.

Discussion: Delehanty said that as Faculty Senate Chair he cannot speak on behalf of Staff; he is only authorized to speak for Faculty, even though Staff share many of the same concerns about campus issues. He met with JoAnn Hertz, the current Staff Council Chair. He informed Senators that there are two kinds of Staff employees: **Classified employees** and **non-classified Professional employees**. Each group has its own Council. In the last year or so, **the Staff Council was created to unify the two employee groups**. Staff members serve on several of the Senate's Councils. The motion on the table would give a non-voting seat on the Faculty Senate's Advisory Council to a Staff Council representative.

Senators who spoke said they saw no downsides to this addition, though Beard cautioned not to let the Advisory Council lose its focus. De Jesus reminded that the **purpose of the Advisory Council was to help get Faculty Senate's recommendations implemented** by informing and getting feedback from the people who would be in charge of the

implementation. Staff members are involved in any implementation, and should be in on the discussions. The Advisory Council serves mainly as an information-sharing forum.

Kearns mentioned the absence of an Advisory Council webpage on the Senate's website. She was reassured that lack will be rectified as soon as the website managers have time to create one.

The Senators voted and the **motion passed** unanimously. **A Staff Council representative will be added to the membership roster of the Faculty Senate Advisory Council.**

ACTION: Wilson moved **to untable the Salary Issues and bring them to the floor for discussion.** Seconded by Hasenpflug. Motion **passed** unanimously.

III. A. Salary Issues

1. Salary Recommendations from FPPC
2. Salary Increase Plan and Merit-Based Raise Proposals from Administration

Senators continued their discussion from last time. The Administration's plan uses merit as a metric to identify particular faculty members whose salaries can then be further examined for inequities compared to their peers, and given pay increases sufficient to offset those inequities. As more internally controlled revenue is generated, more money becomes available that can be distributed to a larger group of meritorious individuals. As each group's salary levels are brought in line with their peers, they will maintain that equity and the extra merit/equity raises would go to the next group. If this practice continues for a few years, each underpaid group would be addressed in its turn and the inequities corrected. The question revolves around whether Senators and their constituents think this plan is a good solution to the salary problem.

Lambert pointed out that the **merit plan inherently interjects competition** which undermines and destroys the very collegiality and collaboration the Administration is trying to emphasize. Delehanty said he had mentioned that very point in Academic Council, and it was evident that idea had never occurred to some of the Deans. The State Board of Education mandates pay raises be based only on merit. Deans and Chairs have full discretion for recommending faculty they consider meritorious and underpaid, as long as they can provide adequate justification. Hasenpflug remarked that there is **no mechanism for ensuring uniformity across the entire campus.** De Jesus agreed; some department Chairs deliberately distributed merit increases equally among their faculty, which automatically excluded those faculty members from receiving any extra merit/equity increases that they might otherwise have qualified for.

If the proposed medical school idea goes through, it would put pressure on the State Board of Education and the Joint Finance Appropriations Committee to invest more money in ISU. That increased investment would in turn allow ISU to hire more faculty, bring in more external funding, and create more internally generated revenues that can be distributed towards salaries however ISU chooses without the restrictions imposed by the State.

De Jesus reminded Senators they need to come up with some sort of resolution. He suggested they consider recommending approval of this 10% Bonus Plan with specific stipulations that address their concerns:

- Rename the chart to read something like "Administrative Salary Tool: 10% Bonus Plan"
- Use alternate category labels that are less objectionable and divisive
- Ensure uniformity so that no department is excluded in its entirety
- Funds are spread equitably across colleges with a small reserve for exceptional cases

Delehanty spelled out how the most recent pay raises were allocated. The State allotted 3% of the total faculty salary to be distributed: 1% to everyone, and the other 2% to be distributed based on merit. The most meritorious individuals could receive up to a maximum of 4% from State funds. Any additional percentage increase given to faculty members came from the internally generated funds that the Administration called the Special Equity Pool. Those higher pay raises had to be recommended by the Department Chair and agreed to by the Dean. Not only did the faculty member have to be considered meritorious, but also have current salary significantly below that of his or her peers. The maximum pay raise anyone could get would be 10%: 1% automatically, plus an additional maximum 4% merit from the State, with an additional maximum of 5% from the internally generated Equity pool.

Delehanty informed Senators that during President's Cabinet meeting that morning, President Vailas announced that **ISU has been told to hold back 1% of the total budget** (which is to be returned to the State) **and to hold an additional 1.5% in reserve** in case of additional holdbacks, which will likely be called for.

Frantz said that whatever method would be used to distribute salary increases this year should be more clearly stated; he found the plan's written language to be confusing. Lambert agreed that the language used is very important, since different words resonate with different meanings and cause different reactions. He also would like **some reference to COLA, or cost of living increases**. Adler said the Deans should be required to directly inform faculty members what criteria will be used to measure merit, and not rely on Chairs to disseminate the information. There were too many dissimilar versions of the instructions that were relayed to faculty in different departments. Some way needs to be found to hold Chairs accountable. Adler also commended the Administration for their comprehension of and efforts to correct the salary inequities. He also advocated **any salary savings from retirement or attrition be kept within the Department** and allow the faculty themselves to decide how those funds should be distributed. De Jesus pointed out that the salary plan had not been vetted by faculty before implementation, so it is not surprising the plan was unclear. He also reminded Senators that they or any faculty member can address the State Board of Education and give their opinions. De Jesus and Delehanty both emphasized that **Departments need to keep their vacated faculty lines so they retain control over those lines and salary savings**. That way, the faculty can be responsible for deciding how their own departments can change and streamline their operations effectively. **The current policy needs to be changed so that Administration cannot continue to absorb or redistribute those vacant lines** without faculty input or knowledge of where those lines end up.

V. Adjournment: 5:48 p.m

The next Faculty Senate meeting is scheduled for **Monday, October 13, 2008 at 4:00 p.m.**

Dr. David Delehanty, Chair

Catherine Wallace,
Administrative Assistant I

Approved by Faculty Senate: October 13, 2008

Documents:

Faculty Senate Minutes of September 15, 2008
Cultural Affairs Council Minutes of September 3, 2008
Cultural Affairs Council Minutes of September 24, 2008
Faculty Professional Policies Council Minutes of September 3, 2008
Research Coordinating Council Minutes of April 17, 2008
Budget Council 2007-2008 Annual Report
Cultural Affairs Council 2007-2008 Annual Report
Research Coordinating Council 2007-2008 Annual Report