President Owen McDougal called the Faculty Senate to order at 3:19 p.m.


- **Announcement:** Pres. McDougal has met with Pres. Kustra and VP Rudin, and has communicated with other university senate presidents, the Pres. of Professional Staff and Pres. of Classified Staff to arrange a legislative lunch. Pres. McDougal, other faculty senate presidents, and both the Pres. of Classified and Professional Staff will be meeting to discuss a set of talking points provided by Provost Andrews to focus the discussion. Focus will be on personal stories of how the university is benefiting the State of Idaho and why we should continue to receive state funding.

- **Announcement:** On February 18, 2010, Pres. McDougal will present to the SBOE on state purchasing and on the SBOE policy, along with other faculty senate presidents. The request for an attorney general opinion has been authorized by Pres. Kustra and is on its way to the SBOE through Legal Counsel Kevin Satterlee. Anticipation this year of a 9-10% tuition increase.

**Agenda Items:**

2) **Approval of Past Minutes**

   (a) 26 January 2010 Minutes:

   - **Senator Klein:** Page 1, under Old Business (a) “…were rewritten by University Legal Counsel and Pres. McDougal with Kevin Satterlee” was changed to “…were rewritten by University Legal Counsel Kevin Satterlee and Pres. McDougal.” Also, page 7, under committee update for Graduate Council, requested to delete “made a bid”. This change was made to the minutes.

   - **Senator Marker** moved to approve the minutes from the 26 January 2010 meeting. The motion was seconded by Senator Gough and unanimously passed by the Senate. There were no objections.

3) **Old Business**

   (a) **Policy 4520 Evaluation of Deans – Joie Burns:**
- Presented what changes had been made to the policy since being sent out to Senators (page 2, B (1)). Note the involvement and more clear representation of library faculty in this committee.
- Sen. Baker: Is concerned that having typed comments might not stop confidentiality from being breached in that the person’s identity might be revealed by the nature of his/her comments. Suggests changing who sits on the committee, perhaps not allowing direct reports, i.e. chairs, of the dean to serve on the dean evaluation committee and instead having senior faculty members do a compilation of results.
- Joie Burns: At some point you have to trust people will be professional. The committee did consider this.
- Sen. Baker: Recommendation that no committee members provide “direct reports,” but that senior faculty in the college do the summary.
- Sen. Klein: Has mixed feelings. Understands Sen. Baker’s point, but chairs deal more directly with deans and they need to help evaluate them.
- Sen. McCain: Is not sure he sees a role for the committee that is not already being done by data processors earlier in the policy. Information is not requested from the committee in 2 B (2). What is the role of the individuals serving on this committee?
- Provost Andrews: Reports produced by the committee are very valuable. Information from the committee’s evaluation is helpful in highlighting important points.
- Sen. Gough: Key element here is the necessity to synthesize the various responses. Question about the problem with chair participation.
- Sen. Baker: Main point is that by having people who are directly reporting to the dean, you may have a conflict of interest. This has occurred before. The danger is that then those who may have made critical statements could be retaliated against by a dean.
- Pres. McDougal: Perhaps these suggestions could be incorporated by Joie’s committee?
- Joie Burns: We did not look that closely at specific positions of the committee members regarding direct reports; we were more concerned about the integrity of the reporting process.
- Sen. Klein: The library representation has changed to 3 or 4 official faculty with no supervisor serving on the committee, and supposes the rest of faculty could go this direction.
- VP Lubamersky: Chairs work more closely with the deans so they have more knowledge of how the dean operates. There is a place for chairs on the committee.
- Sen. Marker: Department heads would still have input in the process they just would not serve on the committee compiling the results.
- Sen. Baker: More concerned about achieving a truly representative view of college faculty and removing any possible conflict of interest.
Sen. Rainford: There is no need for directors to be on the committee and would feel more comfortable writing honest comments if they were not.

Senator Rainford moved: Under B (1) strike (a) “a list of all departments chairs/unit coordinators in the appropriate college/library”, strike “three department chairpersons”, thereby taking care of concerns regarding chairs involvement on the committee.

Sen. Ahten: Must strike “other” concerning “other official faculty”.

Senator Rainford added to his motion to modify “three (3) other official faculty” to read “five (5) official faculty, excluding those who report to the dean”. The motion was seconded by Senator McCain.

Sen. Klein: Proposed two changes under Definitions on page 1: added “and the library” to the end of “Dean: Chief administrative officer of the college”, and changed “of” to “or” in the definition of Official Faculty.

The motion was unanimously passed by the Senate to move the amended policy forward.

4) New Business

(a) Sloan Foundation for Faculty Career Flexibility – Cindy Anson and Provost Andrews:

- About 2 years ago, a grant was given to BSU to accelerate the work that BSU is doing in the area of Faculty Career Flexibility.
- Proposed work was to do three things:
  1) Provide faculty mentoring
  2) Do a better job communicating to chairs, deans, and faculty in general as to policies we have and how they would be interpreted
  3) Provide flexibility for tenured and tenured track faculty to move in and out of full and part time positions depending on particular life circumstances.
- Status of mentoring programs currently in place.

(b) Campus Quad Re-design Steering Committee representative – President McDougal:

- Program is in place to add aesthetic beauty to the Quad.
- No volunteers from the Senate.

(c) Academic Grievance Board Committee representative – President McDougal:

- Short one faculty member.
- No volunteers from the Senate.

(d) Policy 4380 Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty – Senator Rainford:

- Shared a complaint by a fellow faculty member who feels this policy is redundant both to the annual review combined with tenure and promotion processes and asked the purpose of the policy.
- Sen. McCain: This policy provides a mechanism to remove someone who is not positively contributing to the department.

(e) SBOE Policies: Official Faculty Vote – VP Lubamersky:
1) Committee Business – The 2nd read document is still not available to the general public.

Do faculty at BSU really support changes to the SBOE policy?

Investigated polling mechanisms, i.e. qualtrix, ASBSU voting, and found that they might not allow for total anonymity, and decided survey monkey would be the easiest to use.

\textit{Sen. Willerton} and \textit{Sen. Klein} proposed changes to the document provided by VP Lubamersky.

\textit{Sen. McCain}: the policy draft as opposed to the introductory statement are not consistent.

\textit{Sen. Klein}: Suggested expanding the opening statement/paragraph and include links to Faculty Senate minutes. Is concerned with including too much verbiage. The point is to show faculty this is the first read of the policy and ask do you or do you not support the language in the first read.

\textit{Sen. Ahten}: People don’t want to read through two versions of the document but we could attach what the Senate objected to.

\textit{Sen. Rainford}: It would be informative to include a condensed form of the conversation that took place with the FAC on reservations toward the policy and more verbiage is ok.

\textit{Sen. Klein}: We need to move quickly on this survey, suggests amending this document to include a short paragraph with FAC objections along with links.

\textit{Sen. McCain}: Vote is do we want any change versus no change in exigency. Is not opposed to voting but does not want to advocate changes as superior to the original policy.

\textit{Sen. Rohn}: A paragraph could simply say are the faculty in favor of changing language to financial exigency, yes or no?

\textit{Sen. Rainford}: Would we be able to control the number of times one votes?

\textit{VP Lubamersky}: Yes, each faculty member would only be able to vote once.

\textit{Sen. Baker}: Not voting on what the Senate decided. Vote on the current, 1st read document only.

\textit{Senator Klein} moved to vote on this as amended with an additional paragraph. The motion was seconded by VP Lubamersky.

\textit{Senator Rainford} proposed a substitute motion to have Pres. McDougal receive the draft then send it out to the Senate to be voted on within 24 hours before being sent out to faculty. The motion was seconded by Senator McCain and passed by the Senate.

5) Committee Business – Reporting Committee Membership

- Did not reach this agenda item.

Senator Gough moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Senator Rainford and unanimously passed by the Senate. There were no objections. The meeting adjourned at 4:59 p.m.