Minutes
Boise State University Faculty Senate
February, 24 2009 3:15pm
Farnsworth, Student Union Building

President Rainford called meeting to order at 3:15pm


Guest of the Senate Present
Provost Andrews, Associate Vice President McGuire, Dr. Said Ahmed-Zaid, Dr. Don Warner, Dr. Bob McKarl

Minutes
Minutes for December 9, 2008 were considered for approval. Vice President Lubamersky had one correction: on pg 5 paragraph after Vice President Lubamersky; the statement should read “they should receive tenure”.

- Sen. McCain made motion to accept the minutes as amended.
- The motion was seconded by Sen. Gough and carried.

Minutes for January 27, 2009 were considered for approval.

- Sen. Rafla made motion to accept the minutes.
- The motion was seconded by Sen. Marker and carried.

Minutes for February 10, 2009 were considered for approval. Senator Klein had two corrections: in some places Vice President Pearson is referred to as “Stacey” and she should referred to as “Vice President Pearson” consistently throughout the minutes. Additionally, on page four under President Kustra’s response to the question of the faculty moving to a 4/4 teaching loads, his response should read: “I am opposed to increasing teaching loads, because if we did so, we could no longer carry out the mission of the university and ‘might as well become ’CWI East’”.

- Sen. Klein made motion to accept the minutes as amended.
- The motion was seconded by Sen. Goodman and carried.

Old Business
Ad Hoc Finance Committee President Rainford requested to revisit the issue of the ad hoc committee to clarify its status.

Senator Saunders moved that the Faculty Financial Affairs Committee include one representative from each college, nominated
by the Senator from the college, that there would be no student representation, and to use the existing committee as already set up to serve in place of the previously proposed ad-hoc committee. This would serve the purpose of the ad-hoc committee that Pres. Rainford proposed.

Senator Klein seconded the motion

Discussion There was clarifications made about what would happen to the committee in the future when the budget was not as big of a concern as it is now. There will not be a student representative on this committee because it is a faculty financial affairs committee and students don’t have an interest in this. ASBSU President Trevor Grigg agreed with the recommendation that students not be represented on the committee.

Senator Peloquin made a friendly amendment to add the wording “change in the bi-laws” because in order to make the changes in the motion the bi-laws would have to be altered as well.

Senator Saunders accepted the friendly amendment

The vote required two-thirds majority in order to change the by-laws. It passed with unanimous support.

President Rainford – The committee needs to be populated as soon as possible. Any recommendations for people to sit on the committee should go to Senator Marker.

IPEDS Data Vice President Lubamersky explained the graphs from the IPEDS data report for the years 2005, 2006, and 2007. She brought copies of graphs that illustrate the differences between BSU and comparable institutions with regards to faculty, administrative, professional, and non-professional positions. The emphasis was on the need for BSU to examine where the resources are being utilized during this budget crisis and the need for restructuring.

Discussion The discussion and questions were focused on various definitions for positions in the data set, funding sources for positions, and the different classification of positions with regards to BSU and other institutions.

Dr. McCarl – The trend at BSU mirrors the one in state government. In the Rainbow Report the trend says that in 1999 there were 142 state employees that made more than the Governor of Idaho. Today there are 284 state employees that make more than the Governor (Butch Otter makes $107,800) and of those, 42 are BSU administrators. This trend is continuing.

Provost Andrews – There is an issue of characterization, definitions, and classification systems. With increased grant activity, the BSU Administration has tried very hard at
BSU to put as many positions under grant funding as possible and that information was provided to the Faculty Senate.
Vice President Lubamersky brought forth a motion regarding this issue:

In order to bring Boise State University back into a faculty/administration balance similar to our peer institutions I move that Boise State University reassign at least 100 Executive, Administrative, and Managerial personnel back to their home departments to support the core mission of the university: Instruction; Research; and Public Service beginning with the contract year 2009-2010. These former Executive, Administrative, and Managerial personnel shall be compensated according to the prevailing salaries of their department and rank.

There was no second to the motion, therefore the motion is dead.

Senator Saunders made the motion to send this issue to the newly formed Faculty Financial Affairs Committee to make recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

Senator Klein seconded the motion.

Discussion Comments and advice were given to FFA committee to consider that comparing statistics with other institutions is difficult because each one is so different. For example within student affairs at BSU currently at the bookstore, the child care center and similar positions are showing up on the IPEDS data as executive/managerial but other institutions our size typically contract out for those services and therefore they would not show on the IPEDS report.

Provost Andrews wants faculty to understand (regarding the motion of 100 executive/managerial personnel) the burden will also be on the colleges and departments because the list of 242 executive/managerial positions includes people in the colleges. She asked that when considering this motion that the categories of executive and other professional staff be collapsed because of the fuzzy definitions.

Senator Gregory – I think we need to be careful with the graphs because we are talking about BSU and the comparison group medians. It might be more beneficial to pick several institutions and look at them specifically instead of medians to get a clearer picture.

Senator Klein – The trend recently in higher education with regard to expenses is that faculty salaries have flat-lined and administration salaries are climbing. This financial crisis is an opportunity for colleges and universities to re-examine the amount of money that is being spent at the top and put that money back into instruction and research.

The motion carried unanimously.
Anonymous Feedback of Students – Senator Marker requested that this issue be sent to another committee to discuss and come up with recommendations for the Faculty Senate.

Vice President Lubamersky assigned the issue to the Academic Standards and will contact the liaison for that committee.

Policies Pertaining to Selland College – President Rainford and Provost Andrews asked that a committee be assigned to look over the policies pertaining to Selland College and eliminate wording regarding Selland College and change wording regarding faculty that will remain at BSU.

Vice President Lubamersky assigned the issue to Professional Standards Committee.

Academic Grievance Policy – Associate Vice President McGuire asked that the issue of academic grievance policy at BSU be referred to one of the committees for examination. The process seems antiquated, cumbersome and misplaced in terms of having less faculty involvement in the process. There are number of other institutions that could be examined as models for this process. Currently there are seven members of ASBSU (an ASBSU member chairs the process) that sit on the committee and there is little faculty advisement.

Vice President Lubamersky assigned the issue to Academic Standards and will contact the liaison for this committee and will respond to Associate Vice President McGuire with the name and contact information.

Definition of Faculty – President Rainford and Provost Andrews reminded the Faculty Senate that the issue of faculty titles has yet to be resolved. Professional Standards committee was charged with this issue at the December 9th meeting.

Provost Andrews – It would be nice to resolve the titles at least so that when the Selland College revisions are made the titles will be available to put in the policies.

Undergraduate Degree Requirements – President Rainford and Provost Andrews reminded the Faculty Senate that this issue has also not yet been resolved. Provost Andrews reported that the issue of degree requirements rests with the faculty and does not have to be approved by the State Board of Education.

Vice President Lubamersky assigned the issue to the Academic Standards Committee to discuss and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

Discussion The discussion that followed centered on issues of accreditation and differentiation of degrees may play a part in the decision.

New Business
Assessment of Diversity Requirements – Dr. Said Ahmed-Zaid brought a proposal to the Faculty Senate to approve the new assessment of diversity requirement. The
assessment will follow the schedule and process model of the already existing Core Review. Dr. Ahmed-Zaid brought an example of the questionnaire for the students and faculty.

**Dr. Ahmed-Zaid made the motion for the Faculty Senate to accept the proposed assessment of diversity questionnaire.**

**Senator Klein seconded the motion.**

**Discussion** The discussion that followed centered on clarification of the process of the assessment regarding timelines and courses that would be involved. The goal is to get the process started this semester with the core courses that are in line to be assessed. The diversity assessment will be given along with the core assessment. In the future this form would be used for all diversity courses regardless of whether or not they are core courses.

**The motion carried unanimously.**

**Non-participation in Core Review** – Dr. Don Warner brought a revision to the proposal (regarding non-participation or under-participation in the core review process) that he brought forth in a prior meeting. The new proposal reads as follows:

The review of Core courses is based primarily on evidence that faculty are engaged in a regular and thorough review of Core offerings at the course and department level. Further, it is faculty teaching core courses who are making direct measurements of student learning. Thus, it is important that departments document faculty and chair participation in the assessment process and, in so doing, provide the CCC with useful information about learning in the Core.

In order to facilitate the gathering of data, the CCC will assign a liaison to each department during the assessment cycle. The liaison will provide information and support for the process at the department level. However, if the CCC determines, by majority vote, that it cannot draw conclusions concerning the strengths and weaknesses of the Core because it does not have sufficient information, the department will be reviewed again in two years. If the second review is also unsatisfactory, the CCC will send a formal letter of non-compliance to the Chair of the Department and the Dean of the College and will consult with Faculty Senate to determine a proper course of action. On the other hand, satisfactory participation in the process during this special review cycle will leave the department’s courses in good standing. The department will next be reviewed three years later (in its regular slot in the review cycle).

Inadequate participation in the Core assessment process can occur if the department fails to submit reports documenting the assessment of its Core Courses, submits only some of the required reports, or submits reports too
late for CCC to consult during that assessment cycle. Note that if the department’s submissions are incomplete or only some of the department’s reports are inadequate, CCC can choose to re-assess only the courses for which the reports were missing or inadequate.

Senator Gough seconded the motion

**Discussion** The discussion that ensued brought up questions surrounding whether the Faculty Senate is able to be an enforcement body. The discussion centered on timelines, process of evaluations, and how to get optimal cooperation from departments.

Senator Saunders made a friendly amendment to change the sentence “If the second review is also unsatisfactory, the CCC will send a formal letter of non-compliance to the Chair of the Department and the Dean of the College and will consult with Faculty Senate to determine a proper course of action.” to “recommend to Faculty Senate a proper course of action.”

Dr. Warner accepted the friendly amendment

Senator Klein seconded and called the question. The motion carried.

The next agenda will contain the issue of Emeritus Status for faculty members going to Selland College that have been at BSU for many years.

**Committee Reports**
- Academic Standards – No Report
- Core Curriculum – No Further Report
- Curriculum – There is a meeting scheduled for tomorrow
- Diversity – No Further Report
- Financial Affairs – No Report
- Faculty Grievance – No Report
- Faculty Professional Standards – No Report
- Graduate Council – Approving graduate programs and courses.
- Sabbatical Leave – Reviewed 24 applications and approved 23 applications
- Nominating – No Report
- Student Affairs – No Report
- Research Committee – The proposal regarding the Research Council was sent to President Kustra for approval.
  - Senator Gough made a motion to adjourn
  - Senator Gregory seconded

Meeting adjourned at 5:00pm

Respectfully Submitted,
Kimi Eames,
Secretary, BSU Faculty Senate