

IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE  
MINUTES

**VOLUME XXVIII, MEMO 13**

March 2, 2009

4:00 PM

Faculty Senate Conference Room, REND 301

In Attendance: Adler (telecommunication), Beard, Cole, Dye, Forest, Frank (telecommunication), Frantz, Guryan (telecommunication), Hasenpflug, Kantabutra, Kearns, Knudson, Lambert, Magnuson, Moulton, Murphy, Oliphant (telecommunication), Payne, Phelps; (for Livingston Friedley), Trimmer (for Smith), Vik, Wilson, Wolter, Womack  
Non-voting: De Jesus, Ford, Fullerton, Wallace (Recording Secretary), Werth (Work Study Assistant)  
Excused: Delehanty (Chair), Edwards, Larsen, Livingston Friedley, Packer, Smith; Adamcik, Adkison, Vailas  
Absent: Bearden, Schroder, Whitaker; Knight, Spencer  
Guest: Kevin Marsh, Faculty Professional Policies Council Chair

**I. Announcements**

Delehanty was out of town so Frantz, as Vice-Chair, ran today's meeting. He welcomed Kevin Marsh, representing Faculty Professional Policies Council.

A. Faculty/Staff Handbook Change Recommendations Update

The Academic Council accepted the Handbook change recommendations submitted by Faculty Senate last fall. The recommendations were making their way through the approval chain and soon should be incorporated into the Faculty/Staff Handbook.

Recommendations #1, #2, and #5 passed with no changes

Recommendation #4 was later rescinded by Faculty Senate, which meant that the Senate's bylaws will remain in the Faculty/Staff Handbook

Recommendation #3 (Faculty Definitions) changed "**colleges**" to "**Academic Departments**" to make sure Library faculty are included

Recommendation #6 (Basis of Representation) deleted "**schools**" from "**colleges, schools, Outreach Centers and the University Library**" in each occurrence.

B. Faculty Senate Advisory Council as the MAPP Stakeholder Review Group

Frantz said Delehanty had made this suggestion to the Faculty Professional Policies Council. This item will be discussed later in the meeting as part of the MAPP of MAPPs discussion. Frantz clarified that the Faculty Senate Advisory Council consists of the Council Chairs, upper Administrators, Staff Council representative, and the Senate's Executive Committee. This Council would function as the Stakeholder Review Group, thereby keeping the review process within the existing faculty governance structure.

C. Council Chairs as *Ex-Officio* non-voting members of Faculty Senate?

Senators were asked to consider the idea of including the Council Chairs as part of the Faculty Senate in a non-voting capacity. The rationale behind the idea was to help strengthen the ties and to facilitate communication between the Senate and its Councils. The Council chairs would not be counted for a quorum. Such a move would require changing the Senate's bylaws. This idea will be discussed in the next Senate meeting.

#### D. College of Technology Faculty Council update

Wilson, the Executive Committee member facilitating this request, said the College of Technology Senators asked Senate to hold off on this item for now. They are working with the Faculty Council to clarify the specific issues and what the Council wants so Senate can respond more quickly and effectively. Expect this item to be on the agenda for next time.

### **Frantz made some additional announcements that were not on the agenda:**

#### Communication with constituents

Frantz reminded Senators to communicate regularly with their faculty constituents to keep them informed and gather feedback on items under discussion. There have been complaints that the Senate is working without any input from faculty. That is not true, but Senators have the responsibility to let their constituents know about things under consideration.

#### Faculty Senate Chair's newspaper article

To inform faculty of his actions, Delehanty posted to the Senate Chair's Announcements webpage the article he submitted to the Idaho State Journal in response to an article written by Martin Hackworth and published a week ago. Delehanty's article was published in yesterday's newspaper.

Some Senators indicated they had not read Hackworth's column and wanted to know what it was about. Hackworth's article regarding the Faculty Senate's salary resolution was read aloud to Senators.

#### \$500 Mini-Grant Available from Cultural Affairs Council

Applications for the Mini-Grant are **due by March 16, 2009**. Additional funds might be available to supplement the Mini-Grant, up to a total of \$800 if necessary. Contact Dr. Diana Livingston Friedley for details.

#### "I'm Going to College" Day

During this morning's President Cabinet meeting it was announced that on April 2, 2009 ISU would be hosting approximately 250 elementary and middle school students on campus.

## **II. Consent Calendar**

### A. Faculty Senate draft Minutes

1. *Minutes of December 1, 2008 – pulled from Consent Calendar*
2. ~~Minutes of December 8, 2008?~~ *deferred, not finished yet*

### B. Minutes from Councils

1. **Council for Teaching and Learning**
  - a. Minutes of January 13, 2009
2. **Curriculum Council**
  - a. Minutes of February 5, 2009
    - 1) Bachelor of University Studies Committee
      - a) Minutes of September 25, 2008
      - b) Minutes of October 23, 2008
    - 2) Teacher Education Committee Minutes of January 23, 2009
    - 3) ~~Education Faculty Minutes of December 12, 2008 (for information only)~~  
*pulled from Consent Calendar*
    - 4) University Library Committee
      - a) *Minutes of February 15, 2008 – pulled from Consent Calendar – bylaws NOT ratified by Curriculum Council*
      - b) Minutes of April 18, 2008
  - b. Minutes of February 12, 2009
    - 1) University Library Committee
      - a) Minutes of Sept. 26, 2008
3. **Cultural Affairs Council**
  - a. Minutes of December 3, 2008
  - b. Grant Information to post to CAC website

- c. Large Grant Application Form (with CAC logo)

**ACTION:** Moved by Moulton and seconded by Lambert to approve the remainder of the Consent Calendar. Passed unanimously.

### Consent Calendar Items Pulled

- A. 1. Faculty Senate Minutes of December 1, 2008

Ford pointed out an error in the first paragraph on page 4. The Chairship of the Vice Presidents' committee rotates every semester, not every year.

**ACTION:** Wilson moved to approve the Faculty Senate Minutes of December 1, 2008 as corrected. Seconded by Lambert. No discussion. The motion passed unanimously, and the minutes were corrected.

- B. 2. 3) Education Faculty Meeting Minutes of December 12, 2008

Beard questioned why College faculty meeting minutes were included on the Consent Calendar for Senate's review. The answer was that the minutes were forwarded from Curriculum Council as supporting documents for another set of minutes. After some discussion, Senators decided non-Senate related documents should not be included on the Senate's agenda. Any such supporting documents will be kept in the Senate's files for archive purposes but Senators will not review them.

**The Education Faculty Meeting minutes were formally struck from the Consent Calendar.**

- B. 2. 4) a) University Library Committee Minutes of February 15, 2009

Frantz formally noted that the University Library Committee's bylaws which were included in the minutes were neither approved nor ratified by Curriculum Council and the bylaws were currently undergoing further revisions in accordance with the Bylaws Template developed by Faculty Senate.

**ACTION:** Moved by Kantabutra and seconded by Beard to accept the University Library Committee's Minutes of February 15, 2009 (except the Bylaws included therein). No discussion; the motion passed unanimously.

### III. Continuing Business

- A. MAPP of MAPPs – revised recommendations from FPPC

Frantz said this revision involved a lot of effort and compromise and he thanked Faculty Professional Policies Council (FPPC) for all their work on it. The Department Chairs in the College of Arts and Sciences all received copies of it last week, but most have been busy with the Federal Stimulus Package proposals and have not had a chance to respond as yet. However, the Administration has some policies they need to get under way very soon, and it is in the interest of the faculty to get a procedure in place that they have helped influence. There may be another opportunity in a few months to revisit the MAPP procedure. Hopefully, the latest revisions will alleviate some of the Chairs' concerns. Kevin Marsh, the FPPC chair, was there to answer any questions about the draft.

The document as revised by FPPC was projected onscreen for Senators to see. Frantz said he and Forest had worked together this past weekend on some suggested changes that might address some more of the concerns faculty have. **A major concern was that the proposed process did not allow for meaningful input from faculty who might have legitimate concerns that should be considered and addressed before policies are implemented.** It is hard for those not involved "on the ground" to foresee problems or complications that could arise.

The proposal to have **Faculty Senate's Advisory Council function as the Stakeholder Review Group (SRG)** would be in an advisory role only. Therefore, the suggestion was made to **insert the Provost and Academic Affairs early into the policy proposal stage, in Box #2 of the flowchart in Appendix B.** The Provost is also part of the President's Cabinet and the Executive Review Group (ERG, which are the university's Vice Presidents) later on in the

process. That would ensure the involvement of the Academic Affairs Office to prevent potential inconsistencies with academic policies and procedures. Another suggestion was made to change “**approval**” to “**signature**” of the Vice President for Finance and Administration (VPFA) in **Box #12** as legal certification that the process has been properly followed and completed.

There was brief discussion about the distinction between “**briefing**” and “**reviewing**” and why two separate boxes were needed. Marsh said there was a distinct difference between “**reviewing**” versus “**approving**” and the FPPC tried to keep the language consistent with the roles the respective entities had in the process.

Vik reminded that the goal was to make sure meaningful faculty representation is included early in the process, and as long as that is accomplished the minor routing details are not important. Forest outlined a couple of scenarios where the **Provost’s input (in Box #2) would be important in deciding whether policy proposals belong in the administrative MAPP or in the Faculty/Staff Handbook**. He also said that any changes to MAPPs made along the way would again need to be reviewed by the Provost to make sure no conflicts with academic issues arose in the revisions. There also needs to be a mechanism in place that would have the authority to ensure issues brought up in the “review and comments” are adequately addressed rather than simply ignored. Beard reminded that **there are legal and compliance issues involved**, and ultimately the President has the authority and responsibility to implement good, solid policies.

**ACTION:** Adler moved to call the question and close discussion on the MAPP of MAPPs. Beard seconded. The vote was taken and the motion **passed** (19 for; 2 against). **Discussion was formally closed and the MAPP of MAPPs must now be voted upon.**

**ACTION:** The motion to approve the revised MAPP of MAPPs including today’s revisions was now automatically on the table for a vote. The motion **carried** (19 for; 2 against).

**Senators Forest and Cole requested the minutes formally show they each voted against approving the MAPP of MAPPs.** The final approved version of MAPP of MAPPs and its four Appendices would be forwarded to Vice President Fletcher and Roger Egan, Controller.

B. Draft Faculty Policies – working drafts to be reviewed on dates listed below

Lambert asked and received clarification that the revised policy drafts under consideration were written by small task forces of Senators. There was discussion why the Faculty Senate was doing the work instead of delegating it to its appropriate Council(s). Senators were reminded that Faculty Senate has purview and oversight over all its Councils. The Senate has the prerogative to decide whether it wants to work on a task itself or assign the task to a Council. In this particular case, there are so many policies that would normally go to Faculty Professional Policies Council that the Council would be overwhelmed with work. To expedite matters, the Faculty Senate has chosen to work on the policies itself in order to meet the needs of the university in getting the work done in a timely manner. The Councils were created to assist the Faculty Senate in executing its responsibilities; the Senate decides whether or when it needs or wants assistance.

Hasenpflug and Wilson pointed out that the Faculty Senate had in effect formed subcommittees to integrate the comments into a working draft for the full Senate’s consideration. The intent all along was to have the full Senate review the working drafts and decide whether the drafts needed further work by a Council to address faculty’s concerns, or whether the policies were ready for a final tweaking before being forwarded to the Administration. Timeliness is the issue here, and there is some urgency because of the upcoming accreditation visit in the fall. Beard and Vik pointed out that this year is an anomaly, and Senate is trying not to inundate its Council. Normally Administration does not generate such policies; usually the Faculty Senate would assign FPPC to work on generating or revising a policy draft.

1. **Faculty Workload – Mar. 2, 2009**

Frantz, Bearden and Magnuson crafted the working draft under consideration.

**ACTION:** Wilson moved to approve the working draft of the Faculty Workload policy generated by the Faculty Senate subcommittee. Seconded by Hasenpflug.

**Discussion:** More discussion ensued about what specific documents the subcommittees were expected to submit to Senate. In addition to simply compiling a **comprehensive list of comments** (whether Senators agreed with the comments or not) received from faculty members, Wilson reminded Senators that **the subcommittees were charged with incorporating faculty feedback into the policy drafts themselves to create a working draft** for Senate to consider further. Adler reminded that Faculty Senate is a policy-making body, and it is Senate's duty to make sure faculty's interests and desires are reflected in the final policies. Senators were also reminded that **these policies are destined to replace current policies in the Faculty/Staff Handbook and therefore would follow the official Handbook Change Procedure and Flowchart** recently revised and approved by Faculty Senate, approved by Administration and currently posted on the General Counsel's website. All policy drafts generated by Academic Affairs come to Faculty Senate to review and revise as necessary in accordance with what the majority of faculty want, and/or remand to FPPC if deemed appropriate. All revisions are returned to Faculty Senate for its consideration and approval before being forwarded to the various Vice Presidents and General Counsel for their review. Final approval is by the Provost, who then forwards it to the President for his approval and signature.

De Jesus said that if Senate decides to remand a policy to FPPC, then the remanded draft should contain whatever revisions are necessary to reflect the true feelings of Faculty Senate and faculty at large. Two points in particular stood out that he felt need to be addressed:

- the policy draft mentions a 15-unit workload requirement attributed to State Board of Education policy, but no one seems to have been able to locate any source in the SBOE policies of that 15-unit workload. This will need to be tracked down and clarified to make sure the final policy conforms with SBOE requirements.
- It may be too restrictive to exempt first-year faculty from service requirements.

Frantz mentioned that **faculty comments that were submitted to the Academic Affairs office have not been forwarded to Faculty Senate yet**. In particular, many departmental comments assembled and submitted by the Chairs were not sent to Faculty Senate. The Senate office staff is working on obtaining that feedback.

Frantz requested **Senators review the working drafts with careful consideration as to how well those drafts reflect the views and opinions of faculty**. Cole asked to what extent Senators act as representatives for their constituents and how much they are policy-makers. Adler said that is an age-old question that has been extensively debated. In his view Faculty Senate is a legislative body and Senators are elected by their constituents to represent them, take their opinions into consideration, and are expected to craft policies that reflect the views of the majority of their constituents. The issues in these particular policies are very important to faculty so extreme care should be taken to make sure Senate and/or its Councils write policies that reflect what faculty want. Wilson pointed out that **in this case faculty input has been extensively solicited and received**; now it is a matter of incorporating that input into coherent, reasonable policies that reflect the consensus. Cole clarified that FPPC would wordsmith the working draft forwarded from Senate to make sure it is sufficiently authoritative in its expression of the faculty voice, and that any revisions to the document would be returned to Senate for Senators to consider and to take back to their constituents for their review. Frantz said FPPC would expedite their process and try to submit their revisions in time for Senators to review during the March 16<sup>th</sup> meeting. **Once the document is received from FPPC, it will be posted to the Senators' webpage** for them to review and discuss with their constituents.

Wilson suggested that **Senators review the available working drafts as soon as possible to make sure their constituents' concerns are adequately addressed** before further action is taken on the drafts. If there are suggested changes or additions to any of the policy drafts, **those suggestions should be forwarded to Senators for consideration before the policy is discussed**. Adler reminded that faculty input should continue to be solicited since this is an ongoing process.

There was discussion regarding the **service** component and whether the two hours as called for in the original draft was adequately flexible or too restrictive. Senators recognized that the situation of individual faculty members and departments varied widely. **Forest pointed out three things his constituents wanted clarified:**

- a reference to the specific section in the SBOE policy that discusses workload and what it says
- whether the mathematical algorithm included in the original draft was too restrictive and did not allow department chairs adequate flexibility in assigning mutually agreeable workload expectations with individual faculty members
- how difficult or time-consuming the processes outlined in the policy would be to administer

More discussion ensued regarding the Senate's Promotion and Tenure Policy subcommittee's handout with suggestions on how to possibly standardize a typical faculty work week, calculate the number of hours specific tasks require, and derive a realistic workload schedule that is fairly close to actual experience. Senators agreed that most faculty work more than 45 hours a week, but as Adler pointed out, it is a compromise number that will resonate with the public expectations of those who are unfamiliar with a professor's job (SBOE members, State legislators, and other such non-university policy reviewers) while demonstrating that faculty do work overtime every week. It is also easily divided by several factors and **is close enough to reality that it can serve as a functional model** for calculating workload units. Adler explained the handout's figures and demonstrated possible calculation scenarios, emphasizing that flexibility and individual variation are key components to figuring any workload assignments.

Adler also said the policy drafts are inter-related and the Faculty Workload policy affects the Promotion and Tenure policy as well as several other policy drafts under consideration. His subcommittee would like to see more emphasis on **Scholarship as the end goal**, as distinct from **Research which is a component part of scholarship**. Grant writing is a part of research, but obtaining lots of grants is not scholarship. Scholarship – the creation and dissemination of new knowledge – is the laudable objective.

De Jesus pointed out that the language used in the working draft actually allowed for more flexibility in graduate teaching load than the suggestion in **Section D.2** in the handout. He did agree that **D.3 and D.4 should be incorporated into the working draft to recognize the additional time needed for teaching online courses and traveling to other campuses**.

Adler said that there is value in having the policy include an umbrella statement that faculty members typically work 45 hours a week. First, most people will relate to that kind of schedule. Second, the employer cannot require the employee to work more overtime without giving additional compensation. This would add some protection to faculty not to be expected to increase their workload without pay. Frantz remarked that the intent of the document is **that departments define for themselves how the details are worked out**. Several faculty comments took exception to assigning less credit for teaching Masters students than for teaching doctorate students; their experience is that Masters students require more time and guidance as they learn, whereas doctorate students tend to fend for themselves more. But having a structure in place that works for the entire campus is important.

De Jesus said in **Section C. Purpose and Scope, paragraph 3** the working draft already **gives departments flexibility to define their own variations** from the policy's guidelines by approval of the majority of the full time faculty in the department and the Dean.

**ACTION:** Lambert **called the question to close discussion**. No second yet.

De Jesus suggested Senate make its suggested changes to the document before voting to forward the working draft and its related documents to FPPC. Adler said Marsh and FPPC can incorporate Senate's suggestions into their revisions. The documents to be forwarded to FPPC will include the working draft of the policy, the collected comments, the Senate's Promotion and Tenure Policy subcommittee, plus any comments obtained from Academic

Affairs. Forest wondered whether the assumption that a full-time teaching load is equivalent to 9 units allows enough time for all the aspects of teaching 3 classes: preparing course assignments, teaching, grading, talking with students during office hours. Senators realized the 45 hour work week and other time unit allotments are arbitrary and not overly realistic of a faculty member's actual time spent, but at least they give a starting point that will resonate with and make some sense to the public and political leaders.

Lambert **withdrew his motion to call the question.**

Wilson reiterated the motion currently on the table: **to approve the working draft of the Faculty Workload policy generated by the Faculty Senate subcommittee.** She deliberately did not include in her motion where to send the working draft in order to allow Senate to decide how it wanted to proceed from here.

**ACTION:** Beard moved **to amend the motion to incorporate the comments Senate made today and forward the modified working draft and the comments to the Faculty Professional Policies Council to review/revise and return to Faculty Senate by March 13, 2009.** Knudson seconded. The motion **passed unanimously.**

2. Faculty Sabbatical Leave – Mar. 2, 2009
3. University Faculty Appointments – Mar. 16, 2009
4. Academic Departments and Department Chairs – Mar. 16, 2009
5. Promotion, Tenure and Periodic Reviews – Apr. 6, 2009
  - a. Faculty Activity Report – Apr. 6, 2009

C. Draft Administrative Policies

1. Children in the Workplace draft – Apr. 6, 2009
2. Travel – April 20, 2009
3. Non-Travel Meals, Entertainment and Gifts – April 20, 2009

*Due to time constraints the other draft policies were not discussed.* **The Faculty Sabbatical Leave policy is ready for Senators to review and discuss with their constituents** and will be on the agenda for the next Senate meeting.

#### **IV. Emeriti Nominations**

Emeriti nominations were due last Friday, February 27, 2009. The Office of Academic Affairs had not had a chance to forward the nominations to Faculty Senate yet. Senators should be prepared to review the nominations and be ready to discuss them during the next meeting.

#### **V. New Business**

*Time constraints precluded any New Business from being discussed.*

#### **VI. Adjournment:** 5:45 p.m.

The next Faculty Senate meeting is scheduled for **Monday, March 16, 2009** at 4:00 p.m.

---

Dr. Alan Frantz, Vice-Chair

---

Catherine Wallace,  
Administrative Assistant 1

Approved by Faculty Senate: March 16, 2009

Documents:

Faculty Senate Minutes of December 1, 2008  
Council for Teaching and Learning Minutes of January 13, 2009  
Curriculum Council Minutes of February 5, 2009  
Curriculum Council Minutes of February 12, 2009  
Bachelor of University Studies Committee Minutes of September 25, 2008  
Bachelor of University Studies Committee Minutes of October 23, 2008  
Teacher Education Minutes of January 23, 2009  
University Library Committee Minutes of February 15, 2008 (except the Bylaws revisions)  
University Library Committee Minutes of April 18, 2008  
University Library Committee Minutes of September 26, 2008  
Cultural Affairs Council Minutes of December 3, 2008  
Cultural Affairs Council Grant Information  
Cultural Affairs Council Large Grant Application Form with CAC logo  
Manual of Administrative Policies and Procedures document 01.A.2 (aka MAPP of MAPPs)  
Working Draft of revised Faculty Workload Policy as modified by Faculty Senate 3/2/2009