Minutes

Boise State University Faculty Senate

April 14, 2009 3:15pm

Hatch A, Student Union Building

President Rainford called meeting to order at 3:15pm


Guest of the Senate Present

Provost Andrews, Dr. Don Warner, Mr. Jim Stockton, Dr. Lathen, Dean Mark Wheeler, Ms. Pam Hooper

Minutes

Minutes for February 24, 2009 were considered for approval. Vice President Lubamersky sent some additional figures that should have been represented in the minutes to President Rainford. They were included in the minutes printed for Senators approval today.

- Sen. McCain made motion to accept the minutes as amended.

- The motion was seconded by Sen. Gough and carried.

Old Business

Policies with Selland College References Dr. Hourcade could not be present to discuss the changes. In his absence, President Rainford brought forth a series of policy changes that are being recommended. The changes made were to remove any references to Selland College and to delete those policies related only to Selland College. The policies brought forth were: Minor Curriculum Change Procedures, Department Program Review, Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation, Faculty Tenure Procedures, Applied Technology Programs Non-tenure Faculty Guidelines, Applied Technology Programs Non-tenure Faculty Peer Review, Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee Duties and Compositions, Division Managers, Faculty Voluntarily Phase Retirement.

- Senator Gough made the motion to accept the changes in the packet

- Senator Goodman seconded the motion and it carried without discussion

Selland College Senate Seat Senator Pfautsch requested clarification on the regulations regarding Selland College faculty leaving and the by-laws which state that a representative from that college be on the Faculty Senate. He is a Senator from the college and would like to know what should happen now that he will be leaving.


**Discussion**

Senator Saunders – There is no provision for this situation. The by-laws state that each college be represented. Since the college will no longer be a part of the University there may not be anything else that needs to be done.

President Rainford – It appears that since there is nothing in the by-laws that addresses this situation the Senate seat for the Selland College will cease to exist after this year.

**Special Lecturers – Jim Stockton** brought forth a report from the special lecturers that he met with regarding lecturer status and circumstances at BSU (a copy of the report will be attached with the minutes). Mr. Stockton reported that he has spoken with 11 of the 84 (approximately) special lecturers at BSU. No formal voting on these issues took place. The following is the list of concerns and opinions of those special lecturers present in the discussion:

1. Given the current state of the economic climate, it was the general sentiment that now is not the time to pursue Lecturer tenure.

2. It is the general consensus that SLs would like to pursue the opportunity for multi-year contracts.

3. It was agreed that SLs should continue to ask for a Lecturer position on the Faculty Senate.

4. It was agreed that “Lecturer” is preferable to “Special Lecturer.”

5. Sls would like further clarification as to the stated differences between senior lecturer, associate lecturer, and lecturer.

6. It is the preference of SLs that the Provost’s proposed definition be revised, so as to be less restrictive.

Mr. Stockton is requesting that a motion be made by someone on the Faculty Senate to allow the faculty at BSU to vote to create a seat for Lecturers to be represented on the Faculty Senate. The preference would be for the position to have full voting privileges.

**Discussion** General discussion took place regarding the need for the by-laws to be altered in order for this change to happen and the wording of the proposed definitions to be clarified.

Senator Baker - Regarding definitions – we need to be consistent with the definitions. Clinical faculty is restricted from the committees they can sit on (primarily those committees regarding promotion and tenure). There will probably not be a lot of support for lecturers sitting on committees of this nature. He asked that the request be reconsidered given this information.

Mr. Stockton - There are other committees that the lecturers could serve on and would not have anything to do with promotion or tenure and they would be more than willing to do that.
Senator Saunders – consider rewording the definition to read “may serve on a wide range of academic or governance committees with the exception of tenure and promotion committees subject to policies of the department, college and the University.”

Senator Baker – It would not take a lot of time to review the terminology in the clinical faculty policy and recommend we use that information.

Senator Neri – The new definition appears to be more restrictive than the old definition. If the intent is to have the new definition less restrictive than the old one it needs to be reworded.

Mr. Stockton – The attempt has been made to reach all the lecturers via email but only three have responded so far. It seems prudent to go back to the individuals that had input on the wording of these definitions and discuss this feedback.

President Rainford – The only thing that the Faculty Senate can act on is the request to have Lecturer representation on this body.

Senator Klein – Regarding the issue of long term expectations comes under number five—the difference between senior lecturer and associate lecturer. Policy needs to be in place for a lecturer to obtain associate or senior status, otherwise it doesn’t mean anything. Additionally, if we are going to suggest a lecturer seat on the Faculty Senate, the end of the Spring Semester may not be the best time to obtain optimal participation. It may be better to add this to the Fall agenda.

Senator Saunders – I have been in favor of this motion for years not only for lecturers but for adjunct faculty. I am wondering if we should make the motion regarding both groups and come up with an agreed number of seats to request (i.e. two seats for lecturers and adjunct faculty) then the faculty can vote on this issue at the same time. Maybe this body can issue a resolution in support of the principle and then issue the vote in the fall.

President Rainford – In terms of definitions, it may be most helpful to have a discussion with the Professional Standards Committee and the Provost Office. In terms of the issue of representation on the Faculty Senate, it takes a motion by a Senator.

Mr. Stockton – The group I have spoken to is very patient and can wait until the Fall for this opportunity. We have taken this opportunity to air our concerns and wishes for multi-year contracts and other issues. We would like to move forward with representation and will bring that request to the next President of the Faculty Senate.

Senator Saunders – I will bring a motion in support of this issue to the next meeting.

Vice President Lubamersky – It may be good to also include instructors, clinical faculty, and research faculty in who would be included.

Senator Gough – There are some questions and concerns about how this election would proceed within the group (i.e. lecturers, adjuncts, clinical faculty, etc). How would they elect who would be the representative? How many would be represented? We would possibly need to create the ratio of who would be represented, etc.

**Selland Faculty Emeritus Status - Provost Andrews** It has been about a year since the Faculty Senate determined they did not want to go through every application for Emeritus status. Since that is the case, the President of the Faculty Senate gathers the applications and sends them to the Provost for review. Provost Andrews reported to the Senate that she has approved Emeriti status to staff and faculty from Selland College.
that met the requirements of years of service. There are some exceptions that could be made for those that
don’t meet years of service requirements but those individuals were not given Emeriti status.

Senator Saunders – The history of the Emeritus applications is that they used to come through the
President of the Faculty Senate but then were passed on to the Professional Standards Committee. It
was decided that was a waste of the committee’s time to approve the applications in order to simply
send them on to the Provost. The intent was to streamline the process, not to bypass the Senate
review. At the end of each semester, the Faculty Senate President would bring a list of the Emeriti
faculty and ask for approval.

Senator Klein – Is there a way for the Selland College faculty that did not meet the years of service
requirement to appeal the decision? I think there needs to be some opportunity for the Selland faculty
to appeal this decision, especially if they are really close to the cut off.

Provost Andrews – I don’t know what the appeal process is but we should let them do that. There is
nothing in the policy that addresses an appeal.

Senator Pfautsch – There is a clause that allows for the applicant to qualify for an exception if the
year of service requirement is not made if, in the opinion of the recommending department and the
Faculty Senate, the candidate will be actively interested in the institution until retirement.

President Rainford – It is not necessarily the job of the Faculty Senate to second guess the Provost.
However, it appears that there is a policy weakness here that needs to be addressed. Who owns
Emeritus status?

Provost Andrews – The faculty owns Emeritus status. The President and Provost cannot grant
Emeritus to someone without the recommendation of the faculty. There are approximately six or
seven applicants that were denied.

Senator Saunders – There is a process for appeal. The Professional Standards Committee is charged
with the responsibility to review any controversial situations of Emeritus status.

- **Senator Klein proposed a motion that any Selland College faculty who wish to have their
Emeritus status denial reviewed be told to contact the Professional Standards Committee.**

- **Vice President Lubamersky seconded the motion**

**Discussion**

Senator Ahten – If the committee is going to review the applications, they should include in them the
information that addresses the exception to the requirement (what will make them actively interested in
the University).

Senator Pfautsch – The application does not have an area to address that issue. I would have liked to put
that information in my application but there was no designated place in the application to explain how I
would like to be actively involved in the University.

Provost Andrews – We could provide the Faculty Senate a list of names of those that were denied so the
Senate can send out letters to each individual explaining the review process. This needs to be done very
quickly because these individuals will be announced at graduation and the graduation programs go to
print very soon.
• Senator Klein amended her motion to say that this matter needs to be of high priority and needs to be done quickly.

President Rainford – I know this is a special situation but I want to make sure we are not setting a precedent here that would allow for individuals to bypass the Provost. Emeritus status needs to mean something.

Provost Andrews – The Faculty Senate cannot grant Emeritus status. The review would come in the form of a recommendation to the Provost to grant Emeritus status to the applicant.

Senator Klein – This process needs to be expedited so the names can be announced at graduation.

• Senator Saunders call the question – motion carried unanimously.

President Rainford will send a letter to the six or seven people that were denied after Provost Andrews sends him the names. The applicants will be asked to write a letter of addendum to include answering the issue of how they will be actively interested in the University and a deadline of when the applications are due. Once the addendums are received, President Rainford will scan them into email and send them to the members of the Professional Standards Committee with the charge to review it within a week and give a vote via email.

**Core Curriculum – Dr. Warner** presented the conclusions and recommendations from the Core Curriculum Committee (CCC) Report. The original report was sent faculty-wide via email. The summary will be attached to the minutes. The number one conclusion from this report is that the committee is having significant difficulty with compliance. The support from the Faculty Senate will aid in gaining compliance. One conclusion that the committee has drawn is that lack of compliance and non-participation suggests lack of faculty and departmental ownership of the core. The CCC recommends and supports the Core Reform Task Force because critical thinking and problem solving are categories that are not adequately addressed. The most common resource issues listed by faculty are that classes are too large, and that more teaching assistants are needed.

**Discussion**

Vice President Lubamersky – suggested that there be some sort of monetary reward for completing the requirements instead of a punitive consequence for non-completion, since most of the instructors are adjunct faculty and do not have a lot of time to complete extra reports.

Dr. Warner – That is a good idea and one that has been suggested before.

President Rainford – How much time does this process take for the instructor?

Dr. Warner – The process takes about an hour. The instructor fills out a report and also distributes a questionnaire to the students.

Senator Klein – The process can take up to two hours for some adjuncts and some sort of a reward would be positive for instructors.

General discussion centered on the issues of possible reasons that the results in the report are so dramatic. Ideas of reasons for the results were that the measurement instrument was insufficient, instructors are not being clear enough in their explanations to the class about what they are teaching,
instructors need to read the syllabus to their students. Additional explanation was given by Dr. Warner about the interpretations of the data and recommendations from the CCC.

New Business

**Human Rights Task Force – Pam Hooper** brought information to the Faculty Senate about a Human Rights Teach-In that will be conducted to educate the students at BSU about the Human Rights Act Amendment on April 21st. She brought a flyer that was distributed to the Senators with the date and location of the event. The goal at the conclusion of the teach-in is to have students, staff and faculty of BSU form a Human Rights Task Force that will focus on rallying the voice at BSU around human rights issues. Pam requested the support of Senators and encouraged them to get involved in this important matter.

**Financial Affairs Report – Dr. Lathen** reported to the Faculty Senate on the financial affairs report that was given to Provost Andrews. The charge of the committee was to evaluate University Academic Units’ proposed budget reductions and make recommendations to the Provost. The committee came up with five guiding principles: [1] maintain high quality for programs and degrees retained; [2] maintain high quality support for faculty and staff [3] be sure reductions are strategic in nature; [4] reduction across departments, college, university units are equitable given the “reasonable test”; [5] bring to light any reduction proposal that seems odd or wrong. This committee only reviewed the 6% reduction proposals as the Provost requested. The committee was unanimous in its desire to respect the decisions made by individual colleges through their respective processes. However, the committee did raise primary concern that efforts should be made to preserve tenured and tenure-track lines. The report will be attached to the minutes.

Provost Andrews – With regards to the 6% reduction proposals, some colleges had vacant faculty positions and were using those vacant positions to meet their 6% reduction. The recommendation is that if there are any restoration monies that they be applied to those tenure track lines.

**Student Fees & Budget Concerns - Provost Andrews** The State Board of Education will approve budgets for Universities on Thursday. Boise State University will receive the 5% tuition increase and Enrollment Workload Adjustment (EWA). This year the money is a reallocation. About $1 million will come from the University of Idaho’s budget and about $950,000 will flow into BSU’s budget. We are expecting a 4% reduction for the University budget. We will be looking at reducing on average the academic units (colleges, library, and research) to be less than the average reduction in the administration units (Provost’s office, finance and administration, student affairs, and the President’s office). There will be campus-wide budget hearings on Thursday of next week. The budget should be finalized by the end of this month.

Senator Rohn – Is the administration considering reducing tenured faculty salaries?

Provost Andrews – There will be no across the board salary reductions for personnel. The state was proposing a 3% across the board reduction in salary for state employees. However, we have the ability to make the reductions where we want them, instead of an across the board reduction in salaries. There are no proposed salary reductions for any employees at this time. There are reductions in FTE. There aren’t any reductions for faculty FTE. There are proposals to eliminate some vacant positions.

**Dean Wheeler** attended the meeting to speak with the Faculty Senate about a winter intercession proposal. Due to time constraints he will send the proposal via email.

**President Rainford** – Elections for Senators must be completed. The new Senators must be present at the next meeting at which time elections for officers will take place.
Committee Reports

- Academic Standards – No Report
- Core Curriculum – No Further Report
- Curriculum – No Report
- Diversity – No Report
- Financial Affairs – No Report
- Faculty Grievance – No Report
- Faculty Professional Standards – No Report
- Graduate Council – No Report
- Sabbatical Leave – No Report
- Nominating – No Report
- Student Affairs – No Report
- Research Committee – The proposal was sent to President Kustra for approval.

- Senator Gough made a motion to adjourn
- Senator Klein seconded

Meeting adjourned at 5:20pm

Respectfully Submitted,

Kimi Eames,

Secretary, BSU Faculty Senate