

Idaho State University
Faculty Professional Policies Council
Minutes

Thursday, November 29, 2007
11:00 AM
Portneuf Room, Student Union Building

In Attendance: Adkison, Allen, Dundas, Hasenpflug (Chair), Johnson, Marsh, Olah, Payne, Shropshire
Excused: Hatzenbeuhler
Absent: Meyer
Non-voting: Wallace (Recording Secretary)
Guest: Dr. John Masserini, Faculty Senate Chair

1. Preliminaries and Announcements

Hasenpflug opened the meeting and recognized a quorum. He briefly reviewed the agenda for today's meeting.

Update on Phased Retirement Policy: The Council's recommendations were passed by the Faculty Senate and have been submitted to the Vice President of Finance and Administration, James Fletcher, for his consideration. The Council will be updated again when more information is received regarding the status.

2. Minutes from last meeting, September 27, 2007

ACTION: Dundas **moved to approve** the Minutes from the last Council meeting. Seconded by Marsh. No discussion. The vote was unanimous; the **motion passed**.

Faculty Senate Chair, guest presenter

Hasenpflug introduced Dr. John Masserini, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, and turned the meeting over to him to lead the discussion on Agenda Items #3 and #4. Masserini stated his intention in coming was to present the Senate's concerns about the Academic Rank handbook recommendations and why the document was being remanded back to the Council for further consideration. He also wanted to elaborate on the new Salary Schedule Charge to FPPC from the Senate and be available to answer any questions the Council might have.

3. Old Business

a. Faculty/Staff Handbook Changes: SC-F2007-01 Academic Rank

Council members received a handout containing comments from two Senators summarizing concerns for the Council to reconsider. Masserini clarified that the Senate understood the Council's intent to address the College of Technology's concern about making the Master's degree requirement consistent, but it had opened up a broader policy issue the Senate felt should be addressed in more depth.

- What type of university does ISU want to be?
- What type of faculty should be hired in keeping with that vision?
- Should degrees from non-regionally accredited institutions be considered acceptable?

The College of Technology has its own section in this part of the Faculty/Staff Handbook (**Part 4.C.**) which deals with Promotion and Rank policies specific to the College of Technology and its Professional – Technical personnel. However, its Academic Faculty fall under the purview of the Academic Rank policies under **Part 4.A.**, which is the policy now under consideration.

The Senate felt that simply requiring a Master's Degree with no other restrictions opens the door for faculty members to teach in a field completely different from their own fields of study or expertise. Adkison noted that State Board of Education (SBOE) policy takes precedence over institutional policies, and its phrasing specifies the Master's Degree must be in a relevant field. Hasenpflug clarified that the Council had originally considered including the phrase "in a closely related field" but decided instead to submit the policy in its barest bones form. He suggested changing the phrasing to include "a Doctoral (or Master's) or similarly recognized terminal degree in the field" might solve the problem. Masserini suggested ISU follow the State Board's language in its own internal policies to ensure compliance and alignment. Adkison and Masserini both reiterated that ISU policy can be *more* specific and rigorous than SBOE policy, but cannot be *less* so. Adkison also reminded members that ISU can take recommendations for state-wide policy changes to the State Board for their consideration.

Although in his comments Senator #2 advocated using the Doctor of Philosophy as the default degree, Council members felt that may not be the best way to go since it would create a problem for Pharm. D. degrees, D.A. degrees and other non-Ph.D. doctoral degrees. Adkison clarified that traditionally the D.A. degree emphasizes teaching and pedagogy, not research. Hasenpflug stated this issue would be addressed by Deans and/or Departments in their specific hiring decisions. It should not be part of a written institutional policy. Marsh pointed out that there are at least one or two highly respected and award-winning faculty members currently at ISU that have D.A. degrees. The Council should be careful not to exclude highly qualified people when making their policy recommendations. A statement specifying "terminal degrees" would be an important component to include, because not all fields have doctoral degrees (such as Fine Arts; an M.F.A degree is as far as one can attain).

Turning now to the Time-in-Rank issue, Adkison noted that here again SBOE policy sets the policy for ISU. Not all Colleges follow the policy, which is exactly why the Faculty Senate is formulating its Task Force to look at Tenure and Promotion policies campus-wide. Granting credit for time in rank for previous experience is permissible in hiring negotiations, but only as a condition of hire. Hasenpflug argued that the issue currently before the Council is simply Academic Rank. The Time-in-Rank issue is covered separately by other policies and should be looked at separately. Adkison pointed out this could be something the Faculty could recommend the Administration take to the State Board to change their policy to reflect common institutional practices.

Hasenpflug stated the Council would return to this topic and discuss fine tuning the Academic Rank policy a little later in the meeting. In the interest of letting Masserini finish his business, the Council moved to the next agenda item.

4. New Business

a. Salary Schedule Charge: FS-F2007-02

Masserini said increasing faculty salaries is the top priority for Faculty at ISU. The University Presidents' Council is also pushing for faculty salary increases at the State Board level. The Faculty Senate believes the best way to effect changes is to come up with concrete ideas that can be presented to ISU's Administration. The Senate has charged the FPPC to investigate salary schedule models from other universities and come up with two or three models for ISU to consider. The charge is not to devise an actual salary schedule to be implemented, only to investigate examples of schedules in use by universities of similar size and Carnegie classification. If ISU does move up a Carnegie class, would having a salary schedule help recruit and retain faculty?

Johnson pointed out that ISU's classified employees currently have a salary schedule with specified salary ranges. However, Faculty salaries are more market-driven. Adkison reminded that many research universities have salary schedules that are separate from their merit-increase

policies or cost-of-living increase policies. ISU already has a crude 3-step salary schedule: Assistant, Associate, and Full Professorships. Other universities have other policies that specify additional levels for each rank, depending on research activities, productivity, and other expectations being met. Johnson mentioned the salary issue has been an issue for many years and that the different Colleges will likely have differing perspectives on appropriate salary ranges. Salary schedules do affect recruitment and retention of faculty.

Hasenpflug stated that ISU's **Office of Academic Affairs' Institutional Research website has a report that lists salary ranges and how many faculty from each College fall into each category**. Masserini reiterated that the most productive way for faculty to let the Administration know how important salaries are to them is to present their ideas in the form of possible solutions for the Administration to consider. If one idea doesn't pan out or isn't feasible, then try another. Adkison assured the Council that this approach does work. Phased Retirement, for example, is still in the forefront of the Administration's priority list. Even if the policy cannot be practicably implemented right now, the issue is far from dead as far as the Administration is concerned. The policy as recommended by FPPC is quite consistent with President Vailas' own conception of what he would like to see implemented. The Salary Schedule recommendations could help set criteria and incentives for productivity, not just in research but in instruction, creativity and other arenas.

Masserini wants to see the Faculty Senate and its Councils pushing the salary issue until ISU's faculty salaries are on par with their peers at similar universities. Again, FPPC's charge is not to *create* a salary schedule, but to present models for consideration. In response to Johnson's concern, Adkison reminded Council members that some salary schedules do recognize market forces and take the variations between disciplines into consideration. The costs may be offset by increases in retention rates.

Hasenpflug **tabled** the discussion for now; the Council will return to the issue again in the next meeting. He thanked Masserini for coming; Masserini thanked the Council members for all their work, then left the meeting.

Reconsideration of the remanded Academic Rank recommendation:

Hasenpflug opened the meeting for discussion and revision of the Academic Rank policy language. If the Council approves new language, he will make the appropriate changes to the memorandum and policy wording, and submit the revised recommendation to the Faculty Senate for their consideration in their next meeting.

Several Council members were opposed to specifying "Doctor of Philosophy" since it was too restrictive and did not adequately take into account the several other doctoral degrees many faculty members on campus have. Marsh noted that with the current trend toward interdisciplinary programs, it would be better to specify "**in a closely related field**" rather than "**in the field**" itself. Similar language suggestions were made, discussed, and discarded.

Hasenpflug verified with members that the changes should be made to both the Master's and Doctoral degree requirements, and the Council would not deal with the Time-in-Rank issue in this document. They do not want to interfere with or duplicate the work of the Tenure and Promotion Task Force.

The Council members were confused as to exactly what Senator #2 meant by his suggestions to add a reference to Section III.C. in **Section III.A.2.b**. Moving the sentence "Each College has personnel policies..." as suggested does make sense, and the Council agreed it should be done. Hasenpflug stated he would **revise the policy language as the Council had discussed and agreed**, and would submit the revisions to the Senate for their reconsideration.

For the next meeting, Hasenpflug asked Council members to start thinking about the salary schedule issue. He recommended taking a look at salary schedules used not just for faculty at other higher education institutions but also those used by public schools, the State's classified employees and other

less obvious sources. Also, he suggested they look at the Academic Affairs Institutional Research Website for ISU faculty salary information. The goal is to come up with some models of salary schedules which could be adapted, if indeed there are any models that would suit ISU's needs. The Council should draft a **preliminary report** by **March 1, 2008**. More discussion ensued about how to go about finding information, salary schedules and salaries in general, and other related ideas.

Adjournment: 12:25 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, January 31, 2008** at 11:00 a.m. in the Clearwater Room of the SUB.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Wallace
Administrative Assistant I
Faculty Senate Office

Approved by Faculty Professional Policies Council: January 31, 2008

Approved by Faculty Senate: February 11, 2008