

Idaho State University
Faculty Professional Policies Council
Minutes

Wednesday, January 14, 2009

2:30 PM

Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301

In Attendance: Allen, Ford, Johnson, Marsh (Chair), Payne, Savage, Shropshire, Sorensen (for Hatzenbuehler), Squires, Steiner, Thomas

Excused: Carr

Non-voting: Wallace (Recording Secretary)

1. Announcements

Marsh welcomed the two members who were unable attend meetings last semester: David Squires from Education and Tracy Payne from Mathematics who was on sabbatical. He formally thanked Jane Strickland and Larry Kratz for their service as temporary replacements, even though neither was present.

In reply to a question from Shropshire about the faculty policy drafts being circulated for comments, Marsh clarified that those are separate from the MAPP of MAPPs (Manual of Administrative Policies and Procedures) the Council is currently working on. The Faculty Senate is collecting comments and feedback regarding the faculty policy drafts and will work with the Academic Affairs office on revising those policies.

Marsh said the Faculty Senate had recently formally charged this Council to revise the MAPP of MAPPs.

2. MAPP of MAPPs draft revisions

Marsh emailed Council members the revised version of the MAPP of MAPPs and Appendices A and C in which he had incorporated the Council's comments from last time. He had accepted the changes Ford drafted from the Council's discussions, added in other suggestions he had received, and corrected minor grammatical errors. He reminded the Council they left off with the Stakeholder Review Group, how it should be defined and how it would fit into the existing shared governance structure. Steiner noted the Deans were left out of the process as described in the original MAPP and should be included in the review process.

Marsh outlined **two alternative approaches** the Council could take regarding the Stakeholder Review Group and asked them to decide which way they preferred to go. The Council discussed the two options at some length:

- whether the Stakeholder Review portion of the process should **use the existing governance Councils and committees** as reviewers, or
- whether a **separate ad hoc committee should be created** to review each new policy draft.

Some members were concerned that no one person selected to represent a constituency would know how all his or her constituents would feel about a particular policy. On the other hand, going through each constituent's governing Council separately could generate conflicting suggestions and comments. Marsh said when the members forward their final recommendations to the Faculty Senate, they could attach a memo describing the factors they had considered.

In the end, the Council members decided to strike the word "**Group**" and make the **Stakeholder Review a stage or step in the process**. They felt it did not make sense to create a new entity when an appropriate review structure already exists. They also wanted to avoid any arbitrariness in the review process; the Reed Gym Task Force was pointed to as a prime example

of the problems inherent in ad hoc Stakeholder Review Groups. The Responsible Executive's role in ensuring all action steps are completed would **include resolving potential conflicts between various Stakeholders** and developing a general consensus. Other wordsmithing revisions to Sections III.B., III. D., IV.B.2. and IV.B.3. were agreed upon. **Marsh said he would incorporate those changes into a new revision for the Council to review** at its next meeting.

Another question to be answered was what happens after the Stakeholder Reviewers submit their comments and suggestions. Members felt the Responsible Executive should incorporate those comments into a revised policy draft. Council members debated whether the revised draft should go back to the Stakeholder Reviewers for further review, or whether it should be forwarded on to the next level. After much discussion the **Council decided the Responsible Executive should forward the revised policy plus all of the original comments to the Vice President of Finance and Administration, and send a copy of the revised policy to the Stakeholder Reviewers** to let them know what was done.

Ford reminded members that the final policy must hold up under any administration and management style. The Council decided the **Stakeholder Reviewers should forward their comments directly to the Executive Review Group** so the ERG could see whether those comments and concerns were addressed in the final policy under consideration. The concern of the Council was to make sure all constituents have a chance to review and comment, but not to bog down the process with endless reviews and comments. Each constituent would have a representative in the Executive Review Group who should bring up any remaining concerns that were not addressed in the revised policy.

After some discussion, the Council agreed it would be appropriate to keep the ASISU President as a member of the Executive Review Group since some of the policies will affect students as well as faculty and staff. Another issue discussed was the role of the Faculty Senate and whether it should be considered equivalent to the other constituencies or have a more prominent role in the process, but no decision was made. Marsh had consulted with Karen Kearns, the university's archivist, and they agreed **the official repository of MAPPs should be in the Office of the General Counsel, then transferred according to records management policy to the University Archives**, not a website as the policy currently calls for.

3. New Business

Marsh mentioned that the Faculty Senate approved and forwarded a Bylaws Template for all its Councils along with instructions for each Council and subcommittee to review its bylaws. He will soon ask for volunteers to work on that task once the MAPP of MAPPs recommendations are completed. He will also check on the status of the Children in the Workplace draft policy and whether the Council will be asked to start working on it as well.

4. Adjournment: 4:09 p.m.

The next FPPC meeting is scheduled for **Wednesday, January 28, 2009** 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