

IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES

VOLUME XXIX, MEMO 1

August 24, 2009

4:00 PM

Faculty Senate Conference Room, REND 301

In Attendance: Beard, Coffland, Cole, Dye, Edwards, Ellis, Forest, Frantz (Chair), Galindo, Guryan (telecommunication), Hasenpflug, Knudson, Leavitt, Livingston Friedley, McCarthy, Moulton, Oliphant (telecommunication), Packer, Payne, Pearce, Wolter, Wilson, Young
Non-voting: Delehanty, Morrow, Olson, Trimmer, Wallace (Recording Secretary)
Excused: Phelps; Knight, Vailas
Absent: Francis, Larsen
Guests: Steve Adkison, Pam Crowell, Jim DiSanza, Jim Fletcher, John Gribas, Joseph Han, Rudy Kovacs, Enouri Omar, René Rodriguez

I. Welcome, Introductions and Announcements

Frantz opened the meeting. Senators and *Ex-officio* members introduced themselves. Frantz announced Provost Olson will begin holding Academic Assemblies for faculty and staff. The first Fall Academic Assembly will be held on September 14th at 3:30 p.m. in the Pond Student Union Theatre. It was scheduled before the Provost realized the time conflict with Faculty Senate's standing meeting time of 4:00 p.m. on Mondays. Senate may decide to meet later this one time to accommodate the Academic Assembly. Frantz urged Senators to inform their constituents and encourage everyone to attend. President Vailas will also be holding his Fall General Assembly soon; the date has not yet been set.

Frantz and Cole are making a concerted effort to attend departmental faculty meetings this semester and hear faculty concerns. Lecturers and Instructors have expressed concern that their interests are not well represented in governance issues. Frantz requested Senators make an extra effort to reach out to Lecturers and Instructors in their divisions to get their input and feedback.

II. Faculty Senate 101 and Visions for the Year

Frantz asked Senators to read the Faculty Senate 101 document posted on the Senators' webpage and become familiar with the duties and responsibilities of being a Senator. He reiterated the most important aspects: facilitating communication between Senate and faculty, preparing for and attending all Senate meetings, participating in Senate activities and task forces. He briefly reviewed the function and purview of each of the Senate's nine Councils. Faculty Senate delegates tasks and issues to each of its Councils to work on. The Councils submit their recommendations for Senate to consider and revise. Recommendations approved by Faculty Senate, both from Councils and from Senate, are forwarded to the Administration.

Senate will continue its work from last year on the Workload Policy, Promotion and Tenure Policy, and other faculty policies. In addition, the grievance procedures need to be revised, and a new Hostile Work Environment policy should be created.

Frantz is trying out a new agenda format: discussion of an important issue will take place before the Consent Calendar and other business items are addressed.

III. "Issue of Concern" Discussion: Workload Policy

Faculty Senate held a university-wide faculty meeting earlier today. About 125 faculty members attended and were quite forthcoming with their concerns about many issues, including the Workload policy. The Administration views the Workload Policy as approved and finalized; faculty see it as needing more work. The Workload Policy showing the administrative changes to the version approved by Faculty Senate was projected onscreen for everyone to see.

Provost Olson said there was a lot of miscommunication and misinformation circulating around campus. What is said at the top levels does not always filter down in the same form to the lower echelons. He intends to improve communication by holding regular meetings with department chairs as well as deans.

Olson said he saw two main issues with the Workload Policy: 1) **process** and 2) **content**. Addressing **content** first, he reviewed the timeline of the Workload policy, beginning in February 1987 when the State Legislature requested all Idaho universities to develop a workload policy. He said that the new Workload Policy was essentially the same as had been in place since 1993. The only substantive changes in the new version were to allow departments the flexibility to adjust the ratio of service to research. Each department should decide for itself how best to distribute the workload among its faculty, which means the faculty members in the department would work among themselves to figure out workload assignments that meet the needs of the individual faculty members and the department as a whole, subject to approval by the Dean. This policy does not assign specific workloads to any particular individual; it simply makes a broad general statement about workload.

The intent behind the Workload Policy was to switch to a variable course load which will allow active researchers more time to do their research and spend less time in teaching and service activities. The widespread belief that the Workload Policy increases teaching loads for everyone is simply not true. The goal is to allow for a 2-2 or a 2-1 course load for researchers. Of course, that would entail other faculty members picking up more of the teaching responsibilities, so yes, they will have a higher course load.

ISU is in a good position to move up to the next Carnegie designation from Doctoral Research University (DRU) to Research High. Olson said that Carnegie is currently undergoing their periodic reassessment of all institutions, so the timing is very good for ISU. There are many benefits for attaining a higher research designation; at a minimum it would open more opportunities with grant funding agencies, government agencies and other national and international entities. Concurrently with this reassessment, the State Board of Education has asked all the higher education institutions in the State to revisit the institutions considered as official peers. ISU has taken this peer institution review seriously and has identified 13 national peers that are most similar to ISU. Only one of those is a DRU institution, the rest are all Research High. ISU really is positioned to move up without much trouble. One requirement is having a variable course load policy, which this new Workload Policy has.

Regarding **process**, Provost Olson said the policy revisions took a year and a half to accomplish. A lot of input from faculty was accumulated and incorporated into the version passed by the Faculty Senate last Spring. The Administration agreed with most of the revisions but there were a few that the Council of Deans overruled. The word “**negotiate**” was changed back throughout the policy to “**assigned**” because ultimately the department chair does have final authority as a supervisor to assign individual workloads. Provost Olson said that was not really a substantive change, simply a semantic one to reflect the actual organizational structure. As such, that change will stand. Once the President signs a policy, it becomes official and is in effect.

One procedural issue that caused some problems was that the Academic Council was not a standing body of the institution. It was created by President Vilas a few years ago to allow for additional input from the Faculty Senate Chair. When Provost Olson came to ISU this spring and reverted to the traditional Council of Deans, he was not aware of the flowchart created last year and the integral part played by Academic Council in the approval of policies. He discovered the problem in May or June and has been working with the Senate Chair to solve it. From now on, whenever a recommendation is forwarded from Faculty Senate, the Senate Chair will be included in the Deans’ meeting, and that session will be called Academic Council in accordance with the approved process. Provost Olson reassured Senators that he does not intend to cut anyone out of the process; quite the contrary. He has always championed transparency, communication and openness. To that end he will be holding regular Academic Assemblies to communicate directly with faculty and staff. He was confident that the solution he and Frantz have worked out will alleviate future problems.

Frantz said the interpretation and implementation of the policy has caused lots of the controversy. Beard said part of the confusion is based on the roles of the various parties and who makes the final decisions. The State Board of Education policy clearly puts the President as the ultimate authority. Provost Olson reminded Senators that in his most recent article for the *Chronicle of Higher Education* he addressed the role of shared governance in setting university policies.

Delehanty noted that the faculty had brought ISU to the verge of achieving a Research High designation despite chronic and severe shortages of resources and necessary infrastructure. He disagreed with Provost Olson that the former workload policy was inflexible; faculty were able to function under it well enough to bring ISU to this point, and would not be hampered by it in moving to the next step. He pointed out that in Biology faculty members’ teaching workload varied anywhere from 1-0 to 4-4. The department’s overall performance in teaching, scholarship and grantsmanship has been exemplary for many years. He opined that the new Workload policy is much more restrictive. He stated that Faculty

Senate has never asserted the right to veto policies. However, if the President's signature certifies that is how things will be done on campus, Delehanty noted that the President had signed off on a particular procedure that had been two years in the making on how policies would be developed and revised. The new Workload Policy did not follow that approved procedure; therein lies the problem. It was a contentious issue from the start, and that contention still exists, whether the policy is in effect or not. No consensus was reached and faculty have not bought into the policy, which shows the system failed. Faculty are angry about how the policy was developed and the methods used in its implementation. They fear that the Workload Policy's wording opens the door for mediocre teachers to carry the teaching load and service load while researchers are encouraged to excel. That is not a direction faculty want to go at ISU.

Delehanty reminded Senators how hard he had worked to protect the academic side of the university in the absence of a Provost last year. He also reminded that Academic Affairs delayed releasing the policies for several months; Senate did not receive them to start working on them until mid-November. Comments from more than 600 faculty members were solicited, received, and synthesized into a rewrite of the policy by Faculty Senate. The revised policy had two readings in Senate and a cursory review by Faculty Professional Policies Council before it was approved and forwarded to Administration. Delehanty clarified he was not criticizing the Provost's intent to improve the university, only the flaws in the policy itself and the process leading to implementation.

Provost Olson responded that his comments were meant to be positive and the approved policy was basically the same as what Senate approved; most of the changes were semantic. There was a brief exchange between Delehanty and Olson regarding their miscommunication about the process flowchart and the perceived exclusion of the Faculty Senate Chair from regular contact and interaction with deans. Frantz reiterated that he and Olson have worked out the solution mentioned earlier to rectify that. He noted that in today's university-wide faculty meeting, faculty expressed strong concern that may not be enough; they would like to see more discussion and two-way feedback much earlier in the process. Provost Olson contended that had happened during the year and a half it took to develop the draft in the first place.

Delehanty clarified that faculty were not brought into the process until last November. Adding to the problem was the fact that multiple policies were released simultaneously from Academic Affairs and the Office of Finance and Administration that all had to be reviewed and commented upon, each was deemed top priority, all while the budget crisis was taking up most of the focus and energy of departments and administration. Faculty Senate is by nature a deliberative body; this was fast work, considering the circumstances, the semester breaks and the sheer volume of policies and feedback to wade through for each.

All agreed that the Workload Policy has fractured the campus and the issues must be resolved satisfactorily before the university can progress to the next level. Olson reminded everyone the document does not assign workload, the departments themselves do that.

Frantz said the conflict was caused by the methods used in implementing the policy. A Senator from the College of Arts and Sciences concurred; everything she has heard and experienced purportedly coming from the Deans' Council has been heavy-handed and couched in terms of "we must follow this policy," and "you must perform this much." If what the Provost has said is true that departments are to distribute their own workloads, there obviously is a communication break-down because the instructions to the Deans' Council are being misrepresented by the time it reaches faculty. Provost Olson agreed; he has become aware of this translation problem, which is why he intends to disseminate information directly to faculty via the Academic Assemblies. The Senator said she had read in one of Olson's articles that he believed in accountability, and she asked him to hold deans accountable for their methods of dissemination, and to curb the heavy-handedness some have been exercising. Provost Olson agreed.

A Senator from the College of Education asked for clarification regarding who makes the final decisions as to what counts toward teaching and/or research, and how much credit each activity gets. He is confused whether working out his workload with his department chair is enough, or whether he has to convince the dean as well, or whether the Provost's office can decide he hasn't done enough research and assign him a greater teaching load to compensate. He contends he hasn't been misinformed; rather, he has not been informed.

Provost Olson concurred. He said each of the department chairs have been charged to have department-wide discussions with their faculty and come up with a set of procedures that make sense within the department and discipline, to be sent to their deans by October 1st for review and approval. The

Workload Policy is intended to provide guidelines for the departments to follow in creating their own workload policies. This policy is supposed to free up time for the right people.

A Senator from the College of Technology commented that her department's faculty were specifically told they will not be allowed to decide their own policies nor exercise their own judgment about what would work best for their department, nor to use existing literature with supporting evidence on how to assign equivalencies for certain activities. Instead, the faculty were told that the dean will decide what will be done in each department. If deans were supposed to have the departments come up with their own workload assignments, that is not at all what was actually happening. This is why faculty are so angry across campus about the new Workload Policy, as was vividly apparent in today's university-wide faculty meeting. Provost Olson said that was not what he intended. He said he had told the deans to wait until faculty return to campus after the summer break and then make sure the department chairs have those discussions with their faculty.

Adkison said academics are accustomed to using peer review for verifying the quality of their work; this is no different. It is a given that the faculty in a department are the peers who evaluate and set the criteria for how a workload policy will work for their department and discipline. That is exactly what the faculty are being asked to do this fall. Chairs cannot do that for them, nor can deans, though as Olson said, chairs and deans must approve the policies developed by faculty. Olson recognized there was a problem with communication and implementation. In answer to a question from a Senator from the College of Arts & Sciences whether departments are required to rank their faculty, Provost Olson said that a faculty member's workload should match what he or she actually does.

A Senator from another college pointed out that the words "**quality teaching**" had been deleted from the original policy passed by Faculty Senate [on page 1, the last sentence under A. Rationale]:

"The expectation for tenured and tenure-track faculty at ISU requires ~~and~~ significant expenditure of effort in research/scholarly/creative activities."

Provost Olson said the deletion was obviously an error; teaching is an important part of faculty's work and is included in workload throughout the document. He said **he will make sure the mistake is corrected** and that "**quality teaching**" is inserted back into the official policy.

Wilson and Provost Olson briefly discussed having the Provost's office work together with faculty and Faculty Senate to alleviate the problems inherent in the previous workload policy that were carried forward into the new policy, and to help the college and departmental administrators and faculty develop their internal procedures in a way that meets the needs both of the university as a whole, and of the individual departments and colleges.

Cole pointed out three other controversial differences in the official Workload Policy from Senate's approved version:

- The change for lecturers and professional-technical education (PTE) faculty from **12** equivalency units **plus a significant service requirement** to **15** equivalency units **which may be reduced if there is a significant requirement for service and/or scholarly activity**. Cole said this opens the question whether those faculty members would have any service responsibilities.
- The change for tenured and tenure-track faculty from "**no more than**" 9 units of teaching to an "**average**" of 9 units of teaching per semester.
- The re-insertion of the unsubstantiated claim that State Board of Education policy required 15 equivalency units per semester. Cole noted this claim has since been deleted from the official Workload Policy.

Provost Olson verified that Lecturers and PTE faculty will be required to teach 5 courses per semester, though in some cases a course may be offset by a tutoring assignment for a certain number of hours in the Center for Teaching and Learning, the Math lab or the Writing Center, or some other form of university service.

Cole noted that his inquiries revealed the average course load for faculty in Research High institutions was 2-1 or 2-2. Olson concurred, and that is definitely the direction ISU needs to go. Keeping everyone at the same teaching load does not allow adequate flexibility to progress to the next Carnegie level. Vice President Pam Crowell reminded that research productivity should be factored into workload assignments as well as teaching; not all researchers are equally productive. She advised examining respective teaching, research and service loads and the overall picture when making comparisons with other institutions' workloads.

Beard said in his experience a 2-2 teaching load was too much for a researcher to be productive. A variable course load was essential. Provost Olson agreed; he also said ISU needs more graduate students

and should rely less on so many full-time temporary faculty. Graduate students and post-docs would help in research and in teaching classes. He contended that graduate students, with help and guidance from experienced faculty, are potentially the best teachers because they are on top of the cutting edge developments in their fields.

Forest mentioned the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) listed the average teaching course load for faculty as 9 course credits per week for undergraduate courses and 6 course credits per week for graduate level courses. "The faculty in Carnegie Category I Research institutions have a typical workload of 6 to 8 contact hours per week." [*Proceedings of the 2003 American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference & Exposition*]. He contacted several research institutions and found they did not count instructors as faculty, only professors.

Delehanty said administration and faculty agree on at least one thing: flexibility. But the use of the word "average" loses that flexibility because of the arithmetical zero-sum game. It leaves open the possibility of purposely hiring mediocre teachers to cover the teaching load. Negotiation between chair and faculty member leads to mutually beneficial consensus. Olson said in practice that is exactly what will happen in departments: chairs and their faculty members will work out workload assignments together.

Provost Olson clarified to Senators that "average" as it is used in the Workload Policy does not mean that within a single department if one faculty member is assigned a lighter course load then another faculty member is automatically assigned a heavier course load to make up the difference. It simply means that the aggregate average over the entire college and university will conform to the policy and be adequate to cover the courses that have to be taught.

Another Senator cautioned against becoming too focused on research to the detriment of teaching. He mentioned a study (*Does Faculty Research Improve Undergraduate Teaching?*) which concluded research productivity does not actually benefit undergraduate teaching. Undergraduates reported less satisfaction with institutions where faculty are heavily research-oriented than with institutions focused on student development. The second conclusion was that for all practical purposes teaching and research are essentially unrelated. Provost Olson reminded everyone the two (research and teaching) are not mutually exclusive.

Frantz said there will be further discussion about these points later. Links to both the study mentioned and Provost Olson's article about making the transition to a research intensive institution will be posted on the Senate's website for reference and comparison.

IV. Consent Calendar

A. Faculty Senate Minutes

1. Minutes of May 4, 2009

B. Faculty Ombuds Office Report 2008-09 – pulled from Consent Calendar

C. Council and Committee appointments

1. General faculty reps

a. **Budget Council**

- 1) Education – replace Dotty Sammons for remaining **2 years** of term

College nomination for Susan Scherz

b. **Campus Planning Council**

- 1) Health Professions – replace Denise Bowen

College nomination for Ted Peterson, Occupational Therapy

- 2) Pharmacy – replace Chris Daniels for remaining **1 year** of term

College nomination for Tom Wadsworth, Pharm. Practice (ISU-Meridian)

c. **Council for Teaching & Learning**

- 1) Arts and Sciences – replace Maria Wong (eligible)

nomination for Maria Wong

- 2) Health Professions – replace Mary Anne Reynolds

College nomination for Bryan Gee, Occupational Therapy

d. **Cultural Affairs Council** – multiple candidates; pull from Consent Calendar

- 1) Business, Education, Engineering or Health Professions (not from Pharmacy or Technology) – replace Jacque Freudenthal, Health Professions

Kasiska College nomination for Cindy Bunde, Physician Assistant Program

Education College nomination for Beverly Ray

e. **Curriculum Council** – chosen by college-wide elections – pull from Consent Calendar

- 1) Technology – replace Raj Bajracharya for remaining **2 years** of his term
Rick Fuger, Cosmetology was elected by the College

f. Research Council

- 1) Education – replace Shelly Counsell
College nomination for Matt Sanger

g. Undergraduate Research Committee – 3-year terms

- 1) Education – replace Karen Appleby
College nomination for Karen Appleby

h. University Library Committee –

- 1) Pharmacy – replace Mark Olah for remaining **2 years** of his term
College nomination for Glenda Carr, Pharm. Practice (ISU-Meridian)

2. Faculty Senate reps on Councils – need volunteers

- a. Academic Standards Council
- b. Campus Planning Council
- c. Council for Teaching and Learning
- d. Research Council

Frantz asked Senators to consider serving on one of these Councils. Appointments will be made in the next Senate meeting.

ACTION: Beard moved to **approve the remaining items on the Consent Calendar**. Seconded by Hasenpflug. No discussion. The motion **passed** unanimously. The **Faculty Senate minutes of May 4, 2009 were approved** and **Scherz, Peterson, Wadsworth, Wong, Gee, Sanger, Appleby and Carr were appointed** as nominated.

Items Pulled from Consent Calendar

IV.C.e. Curriculum Council – to be filled by college-wide elections

- 1) Technology – replace Raj Bajracharya for remaining **2 years** of his term
Nomination for Rick Fuger, Cosmetology

Packer said there had been no College election as required by the Council's Bylaws and the Faculty/Staff Handbook; the Dean's Office had selected this person to fill the seat without the faculty's consent. An election was soon to be held to fill another vacancy on the Curriculum Council and this seat will be added to the ballot. It was clarified that Faculty Senate ratifies college elections and appointments to all Councils, including Curriculum Council, to ensure eligibility, proper procedures were followed, and for reasons of transparency and membership tracking.

Rick Fuger was **not appointed** to the Curriculum Council; the seat will be filled by a college-wide election.

IV.B. Faculty Ombuds Office Report 2008-09

Frantz noted the report contained specific recommendations, goals and plans which Senators should consider carefully and separately from the Consent Calendar. He wanted to make sure Senators had an opportunity to make suggestions and ask questions of the Faculty Ombudsman, John Gribas, who was in attendance, before approving the report. In response to Beard's question, Gribas said his caseload and activities for each case vary greatly from week to week and month to month, depending on the quantity of inquiries and complexity of each case. Sometimes he is kept very busy, other times he has plenty of time to prepare for his classes. The contact breakdown for a year is approximately:

- 10-20 individuals with whom he works on an extended basis in face-to-face meetings, meetings with other individuals involved with the case. Sometimes a case will extend over multiple years.
- 5-15 individuals with whom he has contact 2 or 3 times
- 5-15 one-time inquiries

Gribas said he keeps files on the more serious cases. He briefly summarized the main recommendations in his report:

- Despite the big-picture issues facing the university, do not ignore smaller issues such as workplace quality and professional relationships. If not dealt with, those smaller issues will fester, grow and ultimately be much harder to resolve than they would be if taken care of sooner.
- Develop and implement meaningful performance evaluations of Administrators – Chairs, Deans, Provost. Faculty are very frustrated that they do not have a good, anonymous method of giving frank and candid evaluations of their supervisors.
- Develop written guidelines for the Ombuds Office. He suggested the Faculty Senate would be the appropriate body to:
 - Define the criteria for selecting and evaluating an Ombudsperson
 - Specify the term length for appointments
 - Ultimate authority for making the appointment
 - Define the duties, responsibilities, limitations and reporting chain of the Ombuds Office and the Ombudsperson
 - Update the Faculty/Staff Handbook accordingly
- Revise Faculty grievance procedures to give faculty more options for filing grievances. The current guidelines are too restrictive and limited. The guidelines for Staff grievances specified in the Faculty/Staff Handbook are much better.

Frantz and Provost Olson both agreed that the current grievance procedures are severely lacking and need updating. Frantz said Olson had suggested examining faculty grievance policies at institutions where faculty are unionized because they are likely to have comprehensive policies. Hasenpflug asked Gribas to draft a working document for Senators' consideration. Provost Olson agreed that the Ombuds Office was a very important office and should be supported and touted. Frantz said Senators can decide later how to approach reviewing and revising whatever draft Gribas submits. Next meeting, if Gribas is agreeable, Senate would reappoint him as Faculty Ombudsman.

ACTION: Beard moved **to approve the 2008-09 Faculty Ombuds Office Report**. Seconded by Moulton. No discussion. The motion **passed unanimously** and the report was accepted. Gribas said this report and the ones for previous years are posted on the Ombuds Office website for anyone who wishes to view them. Delehanty thanked Gribas on behalf of the Senate for his dedication and service as Faculty Ombudsman; Senators applauded their agreement.

IV.C.d. Cultural Affairs Council – multiple candidates

- 1) Business, Education, Engineering or Health Professions (not from Pharmacy or Technology) – replace Jacque Freudenthal, Health Professions

Kasiska College nomination for Cindy Bunde, Physician Assistant Program
Education College nomination for Beverly Ray

No action was taken on this appointment at this time. It will be addressed in the next Faculty Senate meeting.

Due to time constraints, the remaining agenda items were deferred to later meetings.

VII. Adjournment: 5:57 p.m.

The next Faculty Senate meeting is scheduled for **Monday, September 14, 2009** at 4:00 p.m.

Alan C. Frantz, Ph.D., Chair

Catherine Wallace,
Administrative Assistant 1

Approved by Faculty Senate: September 14, 2009

Documents:

Faculty Senate Minutes of May 4, 2009
 Faculty Ombuds Office Report 2008-09