

IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES

VOLUME XXVIII, MEMO 12

February 9, 2009

4:00 PM

Faculty Senate Conference Room, REND 301

In Attendance: Adler (telecommunication), Beard, Bearden, Cole, Delehanty (Chair), Dye, Edwards, Forest, Frank (telecommunication), Frantz, Guryan (telecommunication), Hasenpflug, Kantabutra, Kearns, Knudson, Larsen, Magnuson, Moulton, Murphy, Oliphant (telecommunication), Packer, Payne, Schroder (for Livingston Friedley), Trimmer (for Smith), Vik, Wilson, Wolter

Non-voting: De Jesus, Ford, Fullerton, Wallace (Recording Secretary)

Excused: Livingston Friedley, Phelps, Smith, Womack; Adamcik, Adkison, Vailas

Absent: Lambert, Whitaker; Knight, Spencer

Guests: John Fitzen, Dr. Linda Smith from College of Technology Faculty Council

I. Announcements

A. Collective Bargaining Update

Faculty at all the major institutions in Idaho have indicated support for the proposed Collective Bargaining bill that some legislators are trying to get onto the Legislative Calendar for consideration. The Idaho Federation of Teachers is urging faculty members to indicate their support to State Senator Bob Geddes.

B. Google Email

ISU is considering switching to Google email, which would allow 6 gigabytes of memory instead of the current 100 megabytes per user. Randy Gaines would like two faculty members to attend a couple of meetings to help decide what user names should be assigned to ISU faculty, staff and students. Frank suggested a change from the current standard user name of first four letters of last name and first four letters of first name. Her user name happens to be similar to a student's, so much of the email directed to her is sent to the student instead. This situation should be rectified when the new system is implemented.

Bearden and Schroder volunteered to contact Gaines and arrange to attend the meetings.

C. MAPP Update

Delehanty will be meeting with Vice President Jim Fletcher and Kevin Marsh, the chair of Faculty Professional Policies Council (FPPC), to discuss Administration's objections to the MAPP of MAPPs recommendations forwarded by Faculty Senate last meeting on February 2, 2009. FPPC will revise the MAPP of MAPPs to address Administration's concerns and will return the document to Faculty Senate. The new revisions will also be sent Department chairs who have requested a chance to review and comment on the policy.

II. College of Technology Faculty Council – guests Dr. Linda Smith and John Fitzen

Linda Smith introduced herself as the President of the Faculty Council and John Fitzen, the Vice President. She distributed copies of a memo to the Faculty Senate from Faculty Council dated January 26, 2009 along with copies of a letter from Karl De Jesus, Faculty Senate Chair dated October 5, 2006 to the then Interim Dean of College of Technology, Marilyn Davis that dissolved the College of Technology's Faculty Council as one of Faculty Senate's Councils. Smith said the Faculty Council would like to clarify the communication channels between Faculty Senate and Faculty Council. Apparently the full impact of the letter sent in 2006 was not realized until this fall 2008.

De Jesus related his recollections about the Senate's decision and resulting letter. The rationale was based on two factors:

- no other College council reports to Faculty Senate, so it seemed inappropriate that the College of Technology's council be subordinate to and micromanaged by Faculty Senate
- the Faculty Council should report to its own faculty and College

Frantz pointed out the College of Technology has four Senators on the Faculty Senate and asked where the current structure was failing to meet the Faculty Council's needs. Fitzen said that in 1993 the College of Technology faculty were no longer eligible for tenure. The Faculty Council came to the Faculty Senate then and asked to become a Council of the Faculty Senate. At that time, the Senate required all its Senators be tenured. Therefore, College of Technology non-tenured faculty were excluded from representation by Faculty Senate and had no protection or insulation. So at that 1993 meeting, the Faculty Senate voted unanimously to include the Faculty Council as a Faculty Senate Council. Smith said currently only 7% of the College of Technology's programs offer tenure-track positions, and of the 17% of faculty who do have tenure grandfathered in (having earned tenure prior to the 1993 ruling), many will be retiring in the next few years and their positions will return to non-tenure eligibility.

Fitzen said that although College of Technology faculty do not currently feel inhibited in speaking candidly and freely, they are very aware that might not always be the case and would like to make sure they have options that will help protect non-tenured faculty. Being a Council of the Faculty Senate does provide some insulation for the College of Technology Faculty Council and faculty. Also, the Faculty/Staff Handbook makes it clear that the Faculty Council has governance responsibilities, but it is unclear where the Council actually fits in the governance structure.

In response to Senators' expressed puzzlement as to why the College of Technology's council should be treated differently than any other college council, Fitzen said that some faculty members who were given terminal contracts tried to appeal through the university grievance system but were not allowed to. Smith said the Council does not want to be simply an advisory board to the Dean with no other outside communication. The Faculty Council is the only faculty governance body in the College of Technology. She noted the College's current curriculum committee does not have faculty representation on it. She said the faculty feel they need the ability to have a governance body to address faculty issues in the College.

Dye elaborated on the way Kasiska College of Health Professions' Faculty Advisory Council functions and said that might serve as a model for the Faculty Council to consider emulating. Wilson asked how being a Senate Council served the needs of the Faculty Council that are not met by having Senators from the College of Technology. Smith said it provided clear lines of communication and governance. Vik said that if the Faculty Council is a Council of the Senate it loses its autonomy and he and other Senators find it hard to see why that would be a benefit to the Council.

Fitzen said it might be a good idea to convene a committee of Senators and College of Technology faculty members to discuss various options on how the Faculty Council can become more involved with faculty governance rather than simply serving in the administrative governance structure of the College of Technology.

Delehanty said this issue will be revisited in the next Senate meeting.

ACTION: Vik moved **to suspend the agenda and bring New Business Item A to the table for discussion.** Seconded by Wilson. The motion **passed.**

V. New Business

A. Salary Resolution

Adler explained that when he was in Boise for the Alumni Board meeting in late January, he met with various State legislators and heard that several legislators were proposing across the board salary cuts for all State employees. Articles published in newspapers yesterday indicated growing support for State salary cuts, including faculty pay cuts. Adler reminded Senators that if such cuts were made faculty salaries would never recover to their current levels. He said that politically speaking cutting State employee salaries is an easy way out for legislators to save

money because then they don't have to make hard choices regarding priorities. He suggested working with the other universities to gain their support in opposing such across the board cuts.

Delehanty read aloud Adler's proposed resolution against salary cuts for Senators to consider and discuss:

The faculty of Idaho State University categorically oppose any legislative effort to cut faculty salaries. Such a measure would exact great harm on higher education and inflict intolerable injury on faculty members who already labor for a wage that is far below that of their peers.

Trimmer reported that Utah State University faculty and staff were told they would have to take unpaid leave during Spring Break. Beard said that working quickly with faculty and administrators at the other universities might have a good effect of nipping this salary cut proposal in the bud. Delehanty warned that the administration of the other universities would not support this resolution, nor would the Faculty Senate chair at Boise State, though their faculty might. He suggested to Senators it would not be strategically wise to pair with ISU administration on this resolution since they are able to speak for themselves; it is stronger if it comes from the faculty on their own. Furthermore, **across the board cuts would be particularly damaging to ISU because ISU does not have the reserves to pick up the slack** that the other universities have. ISU has already worked very hard to figure out its own plan for cutting budgets. Each institution should be allowed to make its own decisions on where to cut. If the other institutions were to accept pay cuts, then their salaries would become closer to equity with ISU.

Ford reported that President Vailas was quite upset at this proposal and believed it was exactly the wrong approach to solving the State's budget crisis. Vik said that if all State employees are forced to take a pay cut, it is false to say that all Idahoans are in it together because in effect it is a selective tax imposed on State employees that no other Idahoans have to pay. Vik and others reiterated it is not only faculty and universities who would be affected. There was some discussion about how to disseminate the resolution to newspapers, if passed. Other suggestions included encouraging faculty, staff and other State employees to write letters and cards to their legislators opposing across the board salary cuts. The target audience would be the Governor, all State legislators and the State Board of Education.

Delehanty reread the proposed resolution. Trimmer suggested classified and professional staff could be involved as well; that way it would not just be faculty but other State employees weighing in on the issue. Edwards mentioned Senators might want to inform their constituents to let them know about this idea and get their input. Delehanty said that from everything he had learned in the meetings he has attended, there was some urgency to get some response into the hands of legislators as quickly as possible. The problem for ISU was that across the board cuts would not allow for any customizing by the individual institutions. Senators suggested various language changes to the resolution.

Adler, Wilson, Vik and Dye left the room **to hash out a revised resolution incorporating the Senators' suggestions** for Senate to consider later in the meeting.

Delehanty returned to the agenda and **called for discussion on the Consent Calendar.**

III. Consent Calendar

A. Minutes from Councils

1. **Academic Standards Council**

- a. Minutes of November 19, 2008

B. Faculty Appointments to Councils

1. **Academic Standards Council**

- a. Engineering -- to replace Richard Wabrek (term expires May 2010)
nomination for **Habib Sadid, Civil & Environmental Engineering**

Frantz asked for clarification on the length of the appointment to the Academic Standards Council. Wabrek has had an ongoing scheduled class conflict so the replacement was to finish out his term.

ACTION: Moved by Moulton and seconded by Beard **to approve the Consent Calendar.** No further discussion. The motion **passed.** **Habib Sadid was appointed** to the Academic Standards Council. A formal letter would be sent.

V. New Business

B. MAPP Resolution

Delehanty said the Arts and Science Chairs had passed a resolution requesting a **review and comment period through March 2, 2009** of the revised MAPP of MAPPs, in accordance with the resolution passed by Faculty Senate on December 15, 2008. Cole reiterated the process for clarification purposes: Delehanty and Kevin Marsh are to meet tomorrow with Vice President Fletcher, who will present Administration's suggested changes. Faculty Professional Policies Council will meet again this Wednesday to work on incorporating those changes into the MAPP of MAPPs document. Once FPPC forwards their revisions and the document is approved by Faculty Senate, it will be distributed to the department chairs for their review and comment.

C. Banner Freshman Admissions Criteria – recommendation from Academic Standards Council

Ford discussed the necessity of developing new admissions criteria that can be implemented into the new Banner system. The subcommittee looked at peer institutions' admissions criteria to explore various options. Grades alone are an unreliable indicator of academic success, so standardized test scores such as ACT and SAT will be required for traditional recent high school graduates and home-schooled students. International students and older non-traditional students returning to school after several years would have different criteria.

The Council suggested a three-tiered admissions policy, similar to the one currently in use, defining **Assured, Conditional** and **Petition** admissions criteria. Using the proposed criteria in evaluating the actual admission requests received for Fall 2007 and Fall 2008, **the modeled results were similar to the actual enrollment figures** for those two semesters. The proposed criteria would be easy to modify later if they are found to be too lax or restrictive, and can readily accommodate non-high school graduates.

ACTION: Moved by Beard and seconded by Knudson **to formally bring New Business Item C. Banner Freshman Admissions Criteria to the table as a motion** for discussion and voting. The motion **passed** and **Item C. was now a motion.**

ACTION: The Senators **voted to accept the Banner Freshman Admissions Criteria** as recommended by Academic Standards Council.

The Senators crafting the modified language for the salary cut resolution returned to the meeting.

A. Salary Resolution, continued

The following amended resolution was projected onscreen for Senators to view:

The Faculty of Idaho State University categorically oppose any legislative effort to cut state employee salaries. In fact, the imposition of such a measure on faculty salaries would exact great harm on higher education and inflict intolerable injury on faculty members who already labor for a wage that is far below that of their peers. This measure would impose a selective tax on state employees not shared by all Idahoans.

Frantz asked if the committee discussed whether faculty input should be sought. Adler said the committee did discuss it; in his view the Faculty Senate represents the faculty and can assume the faculty will agree. The resolution had received the unanimous agreement of the committee. Another Senator opined that most faculty would support the resolution.

ACTION: Hasenpflug moved **to approve the amended resolution and have it forwarded to the legislature, the Governor, SBOE and any other appropriate community venues.**

Seconded by Vik. No discussion. The motion **passed** with one abstention and none opposed. Adler suggested the resolution be sent to the other universities as well. Frantz formally thanked the committee for their efforts in revising the resolution.

Having concluded **V. New Business**, the Senate returned to the rest of the agenda.

IV. Continuing Business

A. Draft Faculty Policies

1. Faculty Sabbatical Leave – Senators Hasenpflug, Wolter and Larsen

Hasenpflug went through the report his committee had compiled entitled “Senators’ and Constituent Notes on the *Faculty Sabbatical Leave Policy*.” The six basic issues were:

- Eligibility: research and clinical faculty should be included; clarify wording
- What work may be undertaken during sabbatical leave: add creative work
- Length of sabbatical – policy was written for 9-month contract: add language to explicitly accommodate faculty with other contract lengths.
- Funding sources for sabbatical – this was the biggest issue for many faculty: an overwhelming concern was that a “sabbatical” not funded by the university is a leave of absence, *not* a sabbatical. Rankings and awards were made this year, then the process was changed midstream and the awarded sabbaticals were rescinded. Because the sabbaticals involve FY2009-10 it is a budgetary issue and the Budget Council should be involved in the discussions and decisions.
- Committee review: wording suggestions were made
- Need more information regarding how sabbaticals are affected by financial crises
- Questions and situations absent from the policy: how sabbaticals affect promotion and tenure, inequities in awarding sabbaticals, and other such issues.

In answer to De Jesus’ question, Delehanty asked Senators to decide how they want to proceed with the accumulated data and policies. At some point someone has to re-write the policies. Ford suggested Senators acquire hard evidence to back up their points, such as the practices of other universities. There was discussion on what form the Senate’s final recommendations should take: whether compiled comments or rewritten policies. The consensus was to do both: **rewrite the policies the way faculty want them to appear as well as submit a compilation of comments**. FPPC should look them over, but there are too many for the Council to deal with effectively. The Senate’s subcommittees were fulfilling that function.

De Jesus said it would be a good idea to find information from other universities. He also said that since all the sabbaticals for FY2010 were revoked, then the people who are funded by external funds will be on **leaves of absence**, and will still be eligible to apply for sabbaticals. Ford said the letters granting the leave explicitly spell out whether the time counts toward promotion and tenure or not. He also indicated that rewriting the policies and including cogent arguments for some of the main points would be a good way to go.

Delehanty said it was a good idea to point out the omissions that need to be addressed. **Senators should solicit feedback from their constituents as the revised policy drafts are received by Senate** to let them know their comments are being seriously considered and make sure their concerns are addressed in the policy revisions.

2. Faculty Workload – Senators Frantz, Bearden and Magnuson

Bearden said their group had compiled all the comments received into a report, and also revised the original document incorporating the comments. The biggest concerns were:

- Lack of clarity in places
- Full-time adjuncts teaching full loads with no opportunity for service
- Balancing workload and ensuring flexibility in negotiating individual workloads

Frantz said the workload policy was so central to the other policies it should go to FPPC for them to work on further. The Council would need good direction from Senate on what their exact task would be.

Magnuson said that the general concern was consistency in the document. De Jesus said there were two issues Senate should discuss before sending it to FPPC:

- Substantial change in the 12-hour requirement with 3-hour service for lecturers
- New faculty not assigned service in their first year – need to allow flexibility

Delehanty said these two policies, **Workload** and **Sabbatical**, will be discussed next time.

VI. Adjournment: 6:00 p.m.

The next Faculty Senate meeting is scheduled for **Monday, March 2, 2009** at 4:00 p.m.

Dr. David Delehanty, Chair

Catherine Wallace,
Administrative Assistant 1

Approved by Faculty Senate: March 16, 2009

Documents:

Memo from College of Technology Faculty Council to Faculty Senate January 26, 2009

Academic Standards Council Minutes of November 19, 2008

Banner Freshman Admissions Criteria – recommendation from Academic Standards Council

Salary Resolution