

Idaho State University  
**Faculty Professional Policies Council**  
Minutes

Wednesday, December 10, 2008  
2:30 PM  
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301

In Attendance: Allen, Carr (telecomm), Ford, Hatzenbuehler, Kratz, Marsh (Chair), Savage,  
Shropshire, Strickland (for Squires), Steiner, Thomas  
Excused: Johnson, Payne (sabbatical)  
Non-voting: Wallace (Recording Secretary)

**1. Meeting Minutes**

a. Minutes of October 8, 2008

It was pointed out that Carr was physically present at the meeting, not via telephone as indicated. An extraneous sentence was deemed unnecessary commentary and was struck.

b. Minutes of October 29, 2008

No corrections or amendments were mentioned.

**ACTION:** Steiner moved **to approve both sets of minutes** with the above amendments to the October 8<sup>th</sup> Minutes. Seconded by Savage. The motion **passed** with two abstentions.

Carr joined the meeting at this point from ISU-Boise via videoconferencing.

**2. Announcements**

Marsh said that the Faculty Senate had asked the Council to continue working on their **revisions to the MAPP of MAPPs** and he hoped the Council would be able to finish it by their next meeting on January 14, 2009. **Children in the Workplace policy revisions** would need to be completed and submitted to Faculty Senate by January 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Marsh also thanked Larry Kratz and Jane Strickland for their service this semester in filling in for Tracy Payne and David Squires respectively.

a. Phased Retirement Policy update – Kevin Marsh

Marsh said there had been some mixed messages regarding how to proceed on the proposed Phased Retirement Policy. Faculty Senate made it clear that the final policy draft should have more flexibility built into the language and offer more options that would be mutually beneficial both to the university and to potential retirees. He and Hatzenbuehler will continue to work with Human Resources to find a common ground between faculty desires and administrative constraints.

b. Reed Gym User Fee Task Force update – Larry Kratz

Kratz said there was nothing new to report since the ad hoc committee's report handed out during the last Council meeting. There is still no consensus between the constituent groups. The ground was recently broken and construction of the Reed Gym addition has begun despite the lack of operating funds.

Marsh had met with Lee Krehbiel and reported there has to be some sort of fee structure developed for the use of Reed Gym facilities in order to raise money for the necessary operating costs. Marsh said Krehbiel specifically acknowledged the \$54,000 contributed

annually toward Reed Gym the past several years was on behalf of the faculty. But more money is required to pay for the improvements. Marsh said that if faculty have to pay an additional user fee for Reed Gym facilities, it should be clarified what improved services they will get in return. Marsh had warned Krehbiel that he will need the following if he wants to convince faculty that any proposed user fee is justified:

- hours of operation and access to the facilities
- better website maintenance and accurate posting of current information
- actual budget figures that accurately document the money needed for what aspects
- actual faculty usage information

Council members recognized that the current financial crisis and budget cuts have changed the situation. But since salaries are not likely to increase, having to pay to use the gym decreases ISU employees' net income even more. Savage noted that many of his colleagues in the corporate sector report that their employers pay for their gym memberships because it helps cut down health insurance costs and increases productivity. Marsh had asked David Miller in Human Resources to check into possible options regarding health insurance packages, and Miller explained that this was not an option under the current group insurance plans for ISU. He will stay in touch with Krehbiel regarding the forthcoming user fee proposal.

### 3. Continuing Business

#### a. MAPP of MAPPs

Marsh handed out his revisions that incorporated members' comments from the last Council meeting, other comments he had received, plus the Faculty Senate's language amendments passed during the Senate meeting last Monday.

The Council suggested several language changes to the revised document:

- Insert "**administrative**" in place of "**university**" policies throughout to clarify the strictly administrative function of the policy and prevent it infringing on academic policies
- Clarify the distinction between "'**business**' and '**administrative**' aspects of the university"
- Delete "**institutions of**" in Marsh's addition to the end of the first sentence of **II. Policy Statement**.
- Change "**to review and approve**" to "**for reviewing and approving**" in **III. B** and **F**.
- Change "**to review and comment**" to "**for reviewing and commenting**" in **III. C**
- Change "**to review and conduct**" to "**for reviewing and conducting**" in **III. E**
- Move **Item III. B** regarding the Vice President's approval to become **Item III. F** just before the University's President responsibility.

In response to Hatzenbuehler's question why only the Vice President of Finance and Administration was listed as a reviewer and approver of the policy, Marsh clarified that during the last Faculty Senate meeting Mr. Fletcher had said he saw his role strictly as a coordinator to ensure proposed policies go through the proper steps and are reviewed by all the affected constituents. His intent was not to approve the document itself during the process, but to sign off that each step had been properly completed. Ford said that all policies are reviewed by each of the Vice Presidents when they get to Executive Council.

Marsh reminded that there was some controversy who would constitute the **Policy Advisory Group** mentioned in **Item III.E**, to whom it would answer, and if it would be even necessary to have such a group. There were questions about the difference between it and the **Stakeholder Review Group** from **Item III. C**, and what their specific roles actually meant. Faculty Senate, Staff Council and ASISU should be named as important reviewing

bodies and the existing shared governance structure needs to be formally incorporated into the entire process. It is inefficient and unnecessary to create new committees every time a proposed MAPP policy is drafted and sent out for review. The Council recognized the occasional need for people with specific expertise in certain areas (such as Information Technology Services, Library, Facilities, Public Safety, etc.) to participate in discussions regarding proposed policies.

Ford read aloud his revisions to the policy draft. **Marsh asked members to email further comments, suggestions and discussion points to him for distribution to the Council to review.** He will incorporate them into the working draft for the Council to review in the next meeting.

b. Children in the Workplace MAPP policy draft

Shropshire and Kratz attended a forum on this draft policy last week that brought up several critical issues regarding this policy. Marsh, Shropshire, Thomas and Kratz agreed to meet next week to discuss the issues.

**4. Adjournment:** 4:07 p.m.

The next FPPC meeting is scheduled for **Wednesday, January 14, 2008** at 2:30 p.m. in the Faculty Senate Conference Room.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Wallace  
Administrative Assistant 1  
Faculty Senate Office

Approved by Faculty Professional Policies Council:      January 28, 2009  
Accepted by Faculty Senate:                                      February 2, 2009