
**Agenda Items:**

2) **Approval of Past Minutes**

   (a) 26 January 2010 Minutes:
   - Senator Klein moved to approve the minutes from the 09 February 2010 meeting. The motion was seconded by Senator Marker and passed by the Senate. There was one abstention by Senator Stohr.

3) **Old Business**

   (a) **Policy 4490 Search for and Selection of Academic Deans – VP Lubamersky:**
   - Policy 4490 was revised by both the Provost and the Academic Standards Committee. The changes are highlighted under item number two on the policy cover sheet.
   - Sen. Klein: Proposed editorial changes. In the policy under 1 (C), “one graduate student” should be “one (1) graduate student.” The change was made. Proposed to insert the following sentence at the end of 1(D): “No more than two (2) representatives from the external community will be selected and appointed by the Graduate Council to the Graduate Dean Search Committee.”
   - Provost Andrews: Suggestion during discussion about the importance of having an external member on the Dean Search Committee. The practice has been very useful in the past.
   - Pres. McDougal: So the appointment of the community members would be made by the Graduate Council?
   - Sen. Klein: So that would make this section read: “No more than two (2) representatives from the external community will be selected and appointed by the Graduate Council to the Graduate Dean Search Committee.”
   - Senator Gough moved to approve Senator Klein’s revision to 1 (D). The motion was seconded by Senator McCain and unanimously passed by the Senate. There were no objections. The change was made.
   - Sen. Klein: Also, under 2 (D), “The committee of the whole” should just read “The committee.”
- Senator Gough moved to approve the revision to 2 (D). The motion was seconded by Senator Garza.
- Prov. Andrews: Under 2 (D), suggested to remove the reference to rank ordering. Rank ordering candidates is not a helpful tool at the institution. Search committees can articulate that rank ordering in words and not use numbers.
- VP Lubamersky: Members of the committee felt ranking was necessary. Ranking provides the committee with an opportunity to express its preferences.
- Sen. McCain: Need ranking for evaluation. Without ranking, there is really no reason for the committee to exist.
- Sen. Baker: Did not formally rank on last Dean selection, but gave overview of strengths/weaknesses of candidates
- Prov. Andrews: It is better to be able to articulate strengths and weaknesses.
- Sen. Ahten: Strengths and weaknesses allows ranking of candidates. Sen. Stohr: Is reluctant to remove “rank order”, is concerned the policy does not provide clear direction about what our role would be, but would be willing to reduce the role in rank ordering. We need policies that clearly point out what the role of the faculty committee responsibilities should be.
- Sen McCain: Is persuaded to drop ranking candidates.
- Sen. Lubamersky: The intent of the committee was to provide faculty on the selection committee with the flexibility to make their own decision about how best to present the candidates and their preferences. If you remove this option, you therefore limit the committee to only expressing strengths and weaknesses.
- Senator McCain moved to approve the deletion of rank ordering of candidates as stated under 2 (D). Revised to state that the committee will express its preferences of the candidates by listing their strengths and weaknesses. The motion was seconded by Senator Klein and passed by the Senate. Senator Stohr was opposed.
- Senator Gough moved to approve Policy 4490 as amended. The motion was seconded by Senator Brown and unanimously passed by the Senate. There were no objections.

(b) Policy 3130 Academic Grievance – Mary Stohr:
- Pres. McDougal: There are some minor language changes and those have been made. Clarifications to grade appeal---reorganizations to provide clarity in the document.
- Sen. Stohr: This policy appeared before us last fall but was sent back to committee because all student representation was taken out. Discussion focused on how to include student representation balanced with faculty representation. A two stage process for considering the appeal was also included. Students are represented on all appeal boards.
- Pres. McDougal: What changes have been made from the original policy?
- Sen. Stohr: Most changes involve increased student representation and streamlining of the decision making and appeal processes. Fewer members are now required on the appeal board and a more streamlined committee structure is in place that can respond more effectively.
- Sen. Gough: Are there enough student appeals for two phases?
- Sen. Stohr: It is true there are not many student appeals that reach the formal process. Until this year, there were not any appeals for the last two years.
- Prov. Andrews: Former processes were not well-known to students before this year, but now that the process is clear, the number of cases/appeals might change.
- Chase Johnson: Is better able to explain the process to concerned students.
- Sen. Willerton: Two phases are great for screening out department level problems that should not come before the board.
- Sen. Klein: Proposed editorial changes. Under III, “It is the student’s responsibility to prove the final course grade.” should become “It is the student’s responsibility to demonstrate the final course grade…” The change was made. Also, under IV, delete the word “first” from the end of the sentence beginning “The Initial Phase is less formal….” The change was made. Under IV. 2, change “…head of the department…” to “…chair of the department…” The change was made. Under section IV, “course” or “class” should be used consistently, as well as another minor change. Lastly, under section V. Timeframes, a new item needs to be added. The provost needs a timeframe. To the last line of the policy was added: “The provost will inform all parties as soon as possible.” The change was made.
- Senator Marker moved to approve Policy 3130 as amended. The motion was seconded by Senator Gregory and passed by the Senate. Senator Gough was opposed.

(c) Core Reform Task Force Update – Amy Moll:
- Had hoped to have a draft proposal to the FS at this point, but the draft still needs significant revision. A link to the current proposal is on the Provost’s website (http://academics.boisestate.edu/provost/core-reform-task-force/). Encourages feedback on the proposal.
- Sen. Baker: Need time to look at the proposal, needs to be done soon or be taken up in the fall.

(d) Policy 3050 Independent Study/Directed Research Policy – Anne Gregory:
- The policy came before the Curriculum Committee on February 1st and was approved at that meeting. In general, changes to the policy make it clear to students and faculty how independent study and directed research can be used.
- In the past, independent studies have been substituted for actual courses; this is not allowed.
- Sen. McCain: Can students take a directed study to replace a required course in their curriculum?
- Sen. Gregory: Yes, if they do an academic adjustment.
- VP Lubamersky: Under Section 1, under Maximum Credit Allowed, why was graduate students directed research eliminated?
- Sen. Gregory: We separated graduate from undergraduate for clarity. Section 1 is undergraduate, and Section II is graduate.
• *Sen. Klein:* The last sentence got dropped during the separating of graduate from undergraduate under Section II G. Student Responsibility. **Restored the sentence that was dropped to section II G. Student Responsibility.**
• The motion was made to approve the policy as amended by Senator Marker and seconded by Senator Gough. The Senate unanimously agreed to approve Policy 3050 as amended. There were no objections.

*(e) Policy 3060 Practicum and Internship Policy:*

• *Sen. McCain:* Philosophical problem: An internship, as directed study, is a course, managed by a professor. New proposed policy removes management and decision making from academic side to the Career Center which is a non-academic support service. It is his course and does not want anyone telling him how to manage his course.

• *Prov. Andrews:* It is still up to the faculty to decide what grade to assign to a student. This change is needed to ensure that internships continue to be offered that provide the highest level of excellence, and that students are not confused by what is required of them. There is no intent to intrude upon the academic content, simply to provide some structural guarantees.

• *Sen. Baker:* What is the difference between the new and the old policy?

• *Sen. McCain:* Bottom line is that makes the faculty take an additional step to go through the Career Center to get structural approval. “Student cannot register unless…….” That is the bureaucratic number of stages that are being imposed. If we deny registration based on this process, it simply puts more hurdles between the student and faculty----more to get done. This would essentially yet the syllabus on the part of the administration.

• *Prov. Andrews:* Briefly reads through changes to the entire policy.

• *Sen. McCain:* Still think it adds unnecessary bureaucracy and oversight of academic content.

• Senator Gough moved to table the discussion of Policy 3060 until the next Senate meeting. The motion was seconded by Sen. Klein and unanimously passed by the Senate. There were no objections.

*(f) 128 to 120 Credit Hour Requirement – Anne Gregory:*

• Did not address this agenda item.

4) **New Business**

*(a) Faculty Financial Affairs Committee Report – Senator McCain and Senator Saunders:*

• *Sen. Saunders:* Took the existing Policy 4540 on Financial Exigency and used it as a model in creating an institutional policy. Inserted wording from AAUP guidelines, extended definitions, and inserted wording from the Faculty Senate. Key is to define this in relationship to financial challenge. **Reads proposed changes to policy. Stacy Pearson’s office is defining financial challenge.**
• Sen. Ahten: It is important to define when a financial challenge is over—it cannot be open-ended. Also we are including some basic beliefs and philosophies regarding conditions of financial challenge.

• Sen. Baker: It is hard to discuss this topic because he has not had a chance to read the document. Asked to get the document, read it first, and then discuss it.

• Sen. Saunders: Was just updating the Senate on where the FAC is and what they are working on; it is a work in progress. Nothing is being finalized.

• Sen. McCain: No motion was being brought to the table, just an update.

• Sen. Klein: Perhaps we should have someone from AAUP review the final document to see if we are missing something.

(b) Part 1: Furlough Discussion:

• Pres. McDougal: The policy was approved at the SBOE meeting which would facilitate the ability to implement furloughs. The University of Idaho has already decided to do so as of this year.

• Sen. Stohr: Is it true that BSU is not planning on implementing furloughs this year?

• Prov. Andrews: We have no plans for furloughs this year, but in planning for FY 11, we want to be open to the possibility that furloughs may happen. We need an institutional policy in place and need suggestions from faculty on what faculty furloughs might look like if we were to have a financial challenge. Administrative staff would be the first to be furloughed. We would like to get input from the FS and the Professional Staff Senate on various methods/models that might make sense for faculty for furloughs if they had to be instituted. I can guarantee you that the administrative staff at the university will take the hardest hit when it comes to furloughs.

• Sen. Stohr: Should we be developing criteria for furloughs—salary levels, rank or position, etc.

• Prov. Andrews: The faculty should develop proposals for furlough that are designed from a faculty point of view.

• Pres. McDougal: FAC is defining a financial challenge; if furloughs are an option, there is no mechanism for implementing them--criteria or process. Furlough policy should go to a committee in the FS?

• Sen. McCain: Reluctant to put procedures in a policy at this time. So for example the bottom line would be current definition of poverty level; others based on hour worked; but these are very difficult criteria and in some cases arbitrary decisions and criteria. First have to know how much money is it and where is the money going at BSU?

• Pres. McDougal: Concern that this might happen during the summer. More important to know how this is going to be carried out? We need guidelines before the summer.

• Sen. Gough: A lot depends on the degree of the challenge—we need to know the financial figures.

• Sen. Ahten: There can be financial issues short of a financial challenge.
• *Prov. Andrews*: We have financial concerns, but have not reached what would be a real financial challenge.

• *Sen. Lubamersky*: Important to consider that in the original exigency policy there was a special committee that would have the power to decide where cuts would be made.

• *Sen McCain*: So this committee would not provide specific criteria about who, how much and when furloughs occur.

• *Sen. Stohr*: Division of labor is FAC decides on money; Professional Standards develops values, protocols and guiding principles when furloughs for administrators, faculty, and professional staff.

• *Provost Andrews*: Agreed with Sen. Stohr’s recommendation.

• *Senator Stohr* moved for Professional Standards to develop suggestions for values/protocols and guiding principles for implementing furloughs at not just faculty level and to report back to the Faculty Senate. The motion was seconded by Senator Marker and unanimously passed by the Senate. There were no objections.

5) Committee Business – Reporting Committee Membership

• Did not reach this agenda item

*Senator Brown* moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Senator Gough and unanimously passed by the Senate. There were no objections. The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

The next Senate meeting is scheduled for March 23, 2010 in the BSU SUB Grand A at 3:15 p.m.