STANDARD SIX

GOVERNANCE AND ADMINISTRATION
Governance and Administration:

Boise State’s Story

Boise State has forward-looking leadership, a clear vision of our future, and a well-developed plan for achieving that vision. The employees and students at the University have a strong propensity to work together to achieve common goals.

These characteristics reinforce one another. Our leadership and our foundation of people together solidify and strengthen our ability to achieve our vision; this vision, coupled with our strategic progress and cooperative personnel, continues to attract and retain more top-notch leadership. Inspirational leadership, a strong vision, and shared values motivate our people to work even harder and with a more cooperative spirit.

Shared governance at the University is done in an environment of collegiality and respect. The Faculty Senate, Associated Students of Boise State, and our Professional Staff Association, and Association of Classified Employees have prominent roles in providing input and recommendations. The climate of mutual respect, inclusiveness, and openness makes it possible for the University to continue to progress on important initiatives.

The University enjoys an excellent relationship with the Idaho State Board of Education and works closely with the Board on matters that impact the institution as well as higher education in general in Idaho.
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Governance System

6.A.1 The system of governance ensures that the authority, responsibilities, and relationships among and between the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students are clearly described in a constitution, charter, bylaws, or equivalent policy document.

6.A.2 The governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students understand and fulfill their respective roles as set forth by the governance system’s official documents.

6.A.3 The system of governance makes provision for the consideration of faculty, student, and staff views and judgments in those matters in which these constituencies have a direct and reasonable interest.

6.A.4 In a multi-unit governance system (state or district), the division of authority and responsibility between the central system office and the institution is clearly delineated. System policies, regulations, and procedures concerning the institution are clearly defined and equitably administered.

Boise State is part of the Idaho public system of higher education, governed by the Idaho State Board of Education (SBOE), in accordance with Idaho Code 33-4001. Although the SBOE officially sits as the Board of Trustees for Boise State, their charge in the state is much broader and includes the general supervision of all public education as prescribed by the state constitution as well as supervision of a number of agencies, such as the State Department of Vocational Rehabilitation and Idaho Public Television. In the realm of higher education, Idaho Code 33-4001 provides that the SBOE will have control and supervision of all property, will employ the University President, and upon advice from the President, appoint other employees, prescribe courses and programs of study, and accept gifts and grants.

In accordance with their statutory charge, the Board has developed policies that govern institutional behavior relative to human resources, finances, and academic affairs. In turn, Boise State has adopted policies in these areas that provide further definition and clarification, and that are in compliance with Board policy, Idaho Code, and applicable federal laws and regulations.

The concept of shared governance is embraced at Boise State. Faculty, staff, and students participate in governance in various ways, as described below.

---

1 Idaho Code 33-4001
Idaho State Board of Education (SBOE)

6.B.1 The board includes adequate representation of the public interest and/or the diverse elements of the institution’s constituencies and does not include a predominant representation by employees of the institution. The president may be an ex officio member of the board, but not its chair. Policies are in place that provide for continuity and change of board membership.

6.B.2 The board acts only as a committee of the whole. No member or subcommittee of the board acts in place of the board except by formal delegation of authority.

6.B.3 The duties, responsibilities, ethical conduct requirements, organizational structure, and operating procedures of the board are clearly defined in a published policy document.

6.B.4 Consistent with established board policy, the board selects, appoints, and regularly evaluates the chief executive officer.

6.B.5 The board regularly reviews and approves the institution’s mission. It approves all major academic, vocational, and technical programs of study, degrees, certificates, and diplomas. It approves major substantive changes in institutional mission, policies, and programs.

6.B.6 The board regularly evaluates its performance and revises, as necessary, its policies to demonstrate to its constituencies that it carries out its responsibilities in an effective and efficient manner.

6.B.7 The board ensures that the institution is organized and staffed to reflect its mission, size, and complexity. It approves an academic and administrative structure or organization to which it delegates the responsibility for effective and efficient management.

6.B.8 The board approves the annual budget and the long-range financial plan, and reviews periodic fiscal audit reports.

6.B.9 The board is knowledgeable of the institution’s accreditation status and is involved, as appropriate, in the accrediting process.

—SBOE MEMBERSHIP

The State Board of Education (SBOE) is established under the Idaho Constitution and is further defined in Idaho Code. Seven members of the SBOE are appointed by the Governor and are confirmed by the Senate for an indefinite number of five-year terms. The eighth member is the elected State Superintendent of Public Instruction, who serves ex-officio. Although the applicable statute does not require geographical representation, governors have historically appointed board members to represent the geographic regions of the state. They are also appointed to represent a wide range of interests in the state.

—SBOE ORGANIZATION, DUTIES, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND OPERATIONS

The SBOE adheres to a set of bylaws that prescribe such things as the minimum number of annual meetings, how meetings will be conducted, and what constitutes a quorum of the SBOE (a simple
majority). The bylaws also detail responsibilities and definitions of board officers as well as generally describe committees of the SBOE and the duties of the Office of the State Board of Education.\(^5\) SBOE bylaws and policy state that members of the SBOE may exercise official authority “only when the Board is in session or when they are acting on behalf of the Board pursuant to its direction.”\(^6\)

The Board's general duties and responsibilities relative to each institution are defined and governed by SBOE policies and bylaws, which state that “although the SBOE is responsible for ensuring that its policies and procedures are followed, it does not participate in the details of internal management of its institutions, agencies, and school. That responsibility is hereby delegated to the respective chief executive officers.”\(^7\)

Policies and bylaws are adopted by the SBOE at public meetings in accordance with the Idaho public meeting law.\(^8\) Boise State’s President, Provost, and Vice President for Finance and Administration attend all board meetings. The SBOE structures its meeting agendas by following a committee structure.\(^9\) They meet in “committee of the whole” during their regular meetings, with portions of the agenda led by the designed committee chairs. In the interim between regular meetings, the committee members meet with institutional representatives to discuss and plan items that will be brought forward to the full SBOE for discussion and action. Committees do not have the power to take action on their own, but instead plan and discuss in preparation for action at regular SBOE meetings. Institutional representatives are invited to join the SBOE members at the table during their regular meetings when items from their respective committees are being considered to ensure ease of discussion and availability for questions.

The four committees and the focus of the agenda (as it relates to higher education) are as follows:

**Planning, Policy & Government Affairs** – During this section of the agenda, the presidents of the public higher education institutions (the Presidents’ Council) are at the table with the Board. The agenda includes reports from the presidents, legislative policy proposals, administrative rule changes, and generally any policy proposal that falls under Section I of the Board’s policies and procedures.\(^10\)

**Instruction, Research and Student Affairs** – During this section of the agenda, the chief academic officers of the public institutions are at the table with the Board. The agenda includes new academic programs and program changes, curricular issues, admission criteria, research, student affairs, and generally any policy proposal that falls under Section III of the Board's policies and procedures.\(^11\)
Business Affairs and Human Resources – During this section of the agenda, the financial vice presidents of the public institutions are at the table with the Board. This agenda includes all issues relative to financial affairs as well as personnel actions, and generally any policy proposal that falls under Section II\(^{12}\) or Section V\(^{13}\) of the Board’s policies and procedures.

Audit Committee – This committee is responsible for overseeing the work of independent auditors hired to evaluate each institution, and works closely with the financial vice presidents and internal auditors at each institution. The committee is comprised of three SBOE members and three citizens at large who have experience in the accounting/auditing field and who are completely independent of the Board or any public institution.

—SBOE ETHICAL CONDUCT

SBOE policy specifically addresses potential conflicts of interest, specifying that SBOE members and employees of public institutions must disclose any personal or business relationships that may influence their thoughts and actions on an item or transaction before the Board for consideration.\(^{14}\) In addition, the SBOE has spent considerable effort during recent years in enhancing its Audit committee function to ensure that it is provided with independent assessments of financial affairs. In January 2009, the SBOE approved the Audit committee charter that defines its purpose, responsibilities and authority and defines their oversight function.\(^{15}\) The SBOE has recently finalized a new policy and memorandum of agreement with all institutionally affiliated foundations to ensure the integrity of the relationships among the foundations, the institutions, and the Board.\(^{16}\)

—APPROVAL OF INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND POLICIES

The SBOE adopts a formal statement of role and mission for each institution of higher education; the last major revision of those statements applying to Boise State and most other institutions was considered and approved in 1998.\(^{17}\) The Board has the power to revise either the mission and scope statement or an institutional role and mission statement on its own initiative and at its discretion. The Board reviews the role and mission statement of each institution during its biennial consideration of the 8-year plan of that institution.\(^{18}\)
— REVIEW OF EXISTING PROGRAMS AND UNITS

SBOE policy\(^{19}\) requires regular reviews of existing academic and professional-technical programs, administrative units, research centers/institutes, and public service components at Boise State. Although state-level review of existing programs is accomplished via audit and special topics review, the primary responsibility for program review is delegated to Boise State.

The Boise State protocol for program review of academic and professional-technical programs was developed and instituted in 1996, and was limited to those programs that are not subject to specialized accreditation.\(^{20}\) Between 1995 and 2006, each program went through two 5-year cycles of program review.\(^{21}\) In 2006, a two-year hiatus was implemented to enable review and revision of the process.\(^{22}\) The following are the primary changes made:

- All programs are subject to review, whether or not they are subject to specialized accreditation.
- The concept of program review was expanded to all aspects of departmental operations, including graduate programs, service coursework, research, and service, and the process was renamed “Periodic Review of Academic Departments.”
- The process was revised to include much more extensive use of data provided by the Office of Institutional Assessment, Analysis, and Reporting.
- The process was revised to provide better focus on aspects of programs that are emphasized in NWCCU standards, such as assessment of learning objectives.

The first set of seven academic departments reviewed with this new process developed their self studies\(^{23}\) between September 2008 and August 2009, and will be undergoing external review during the fall of 2009. All academic departments are scheduled to undergo review every five years; exceptions to the five year cycle are made to align with specialized accreditation.\(^{24}\)

The policy on centers and institutes is being modified.\(^{25}\) The revisions will provide for the creation of a committee to solicit information from centers and institutes and to review the operations of those entities in the realms of quality, efficiency, and effectiveness. The committee then provided its recommendations for action to the appropriate administrators, typically college deans.\(^{26}\)

— APPROVAL OF NEW PROGRAM AND UNITS

New instructional programs, instructional units, majors, minors, options, and emphases require approval by the SBOE prior to imple-
Those with a financial impact of $250,000 or more per year and all graduate programs must be approved by the SBOE. Those with a fiscal impact less than $250,000 per year are delegated to the SBOE Executive Director.

Prior to consideration by the SBOE or its Executive Director, all programs must be reviewed by the Board’s Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP), which consists primarily of the chief academic officers (i.e., provosts) of the state’s public institutions of higher education. Prior to that review, CAAP members are given 30 days to share any proposed program with their faculty and administrators.

To bring long-range planning to the process of proposing new programs, the SBOE created the 8-year plan, which is used to give substantial advance notice to all institutions of new programs that are likely to be proposed during the next 8 years and also intended to reduce duplication in the system and ensure that the regional institution is managing the educational needs of the citizens in its service area. The plan is updated every two years. The 8-year plan is not binding, nor does it guarantee program approval.

— SELF-REVIEW BY THE SBOE AND INVOLVEMENT IN INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION

In 2006, the SBOE invited Dr. Sandra Elman, President of the NWCCU, to a meeting to discuss the ways in which the SBOE might implement changes that would facilitate self-review and improvement by the SBOE. As a result, in April 2006, the SBOE initiated a set of actions designed to give feedback regarding SBOE operations and provide a foundation for remedial actions. A self-evaluation was sent to each board member and the results discussed at subsequent board meetings. At least in part because of the results of the survey, the following actions were taken:

- Reviewed Board policies related to Conflict of Interest and Interpretation
- Enhanced the new Board member orientation
- Improved the submission process for Department of Education agenda materials
- Changed and improved the meeting format for the Executive Committee
- Enhanced the staff review of agenda materials
- Initiated the development of a better plan for external and internal communications
• Initiated public focus group meetings around the state
• Conducted a review of the vision, mission, and strategic plan
• Restructured the SBOE Staff
• Developed a briefing procedure for the Board President prior to each meeting

In March 2008, the SBOE conducted a special self-evaluation and strategic planning meeting. Results of a self-evaluation survey of SBOE members were discussed. As a result of that meeting:

• The SBOE approved a new policy (I.M.5) that codifies its self-evaluation efforts. Specifically, the new policy states that the SBOE will annually:
  o Conduct a self-evaluation of SBOE performance
  o Evaluate the methodology used for annual performance reporting by institutions
  o Discuss results of self-assessments, along with other comments, to further refine SBOE goals, objectives, and strategies

• The SBOE approved a new policy (III.M.3) that clarifies the role of the SBOE in regional accreditation processes. Specifically, the SBOE shall receive a copy of the self study, be given the opportunity to meet with visiting review teams, and receive a copy of progress reports submitted to NWCCU.

• The SBOE developed calendars for all planning and budgeting activities. These planning calendars include specific references to NWCCU accreditation activities and incorporate a schedule for annual self-evaluation activities by the Board. For fiscal year 2008, Board self-evaluation would be accomplished in March 2008, and areas that are identified for improvement would influence strategic planning activities culminating in June. For the fiscal years 2009 and beyond, Board self-evaluations will be conducted each September, reviewed by the full Board in October and incorporated into the Board policy manual, and staff internal operations and strategic planning documents, as appropriate.

In June, 2009, the Board conducted another retreat for the purpose of strategic planning and self-evaluation. As part of the program of that retreat, Dr. Ron Baker, Executive Vice President of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, provided the Board with summary information on the new accreditation standards and process to begin in 2010.
All new personnel positions proposed by the institution are reviewed and approved by the SBOE. Authority to change existing positions is delegated to the institution. In addition, the state Division of Human Resources has delegated to the University the authority to review new and existing positions to determine the appropriate classifications.

The Board reviews and approves all institutional budget requests as well as the annual operating budget for appropriated funds. The approval process includes a budget overview, summaries by function and expenditure class, personnel cost summary and details of personnel position changes. See Standard 7 for additional detail.

The SBOE’s Audit Committee provides another level of fiscal “oversight to the organizations under its governance…for: financial statement integrity, financial practices, internal control systems, financial management, and standards of conduct.” The Audit Committee’s responsibilities include appointing and overseeing the work of the independent auditors. The independent auditor generates official annual financial statements and provides an opinion for the Committee’s review regarding the financial statements. The Committee reviews with the independent auditor the financial statements, adequacy of internal controls, and findings. See Standard 7 for additional material.

Leadership and Management

6.C.1 The chief executive officer’s full-time responsibility is to the institution.
6.C.2 The duties, responsibilities, and ethical conduct requirements of the institution’s administrators are clearly defined and published. Administrators act in a manner consistent with them.
6.C.3 Administrators are qualified to provide effective educational leadership and management. The chief executive officer is responsible for implementing appropriate procedures to evaluate administrators regularly.
6.C.5 Administrators ensure that the institutional decision-making process is timely.
6.C.6 Administrators facilitate cooperative working relationships, promote coordination within and among organizational units, and encourage open communication and goal attainment.
6.C.8 Policies, procedures, and criteria for administrative and staff appointment, evaluation, retention, promotion, and/or termination are published, accessible, and periodically reviewed.
6.C.9 Administrators’ and staff salaries and benefits are adequate to attract and retain competent personnel consistent with the mission and goals of the institution.
In accordance with Board policy, the State Board of Education hires the President of the institution. The President’s full-time responsibility is to the institution. The Board evaluates the President on an annual basis. The evaluation process begins with the preparation, by the President, of a self-evaluation that describes personal and institutional accomplishments as well as disappointments or problems, and a progress report on goals from the previous year as well as the identification of new goals for the coming year.

Dr. Bob Kustra currently serves as President of Boise State. Hired in 2003, Dr. Kustra has an extensive background in higher education and leadership. Dr. Kustra subsequently hired a leadership team of vice presidents with proven track records in their fields of expertise. Each vice president is evaluated annually in accordance with state policy. Furthermore, the President holds regular one-on-one meetings with each vice president. The Administrative Council meets regularly, providing an opportunity for discussion and counsel on various topics.

Ethical conduct and conflict of interest procedures are clearly defined by the Board of Education in their policies and procedures. Furthermore, in 2008 Boise State adopted a Statement of Shared Values and a Standards of Conduct that were endorsed by the leadership, faculty, staff, and students, and that outline and emphasize expectations for all employees and students. Further detail is given in Standard 9.

General policy and supervision of the institution is discussed regularly by the President and the Administrative Council, which is comprised of leaders from each major campus division. Input of the faculty senate, employee associations, and student groups is integral to the governance of the institution, and is evidenced by an active committee system across campus that facilitates discussions ranging from tuition/fee increases to research and scholarly activity to parking and transportation policies.

The University Policy Manual is available to all on the University website. In the last couple of years, it has been reorganized to be more user friendly and the website was enhanced to include more information on the policy-making process, a public listing of policies under consideration and also a listing of those recently revised or added.
There is also a listserv for those who want to receive regular email updates on policy changes and a section of the campus electronic newsletter, UPDATE, is devoted to policy news. Policy #1000 describes how policies are considered and adopted at the University level.

Additional material regarding faculty, staff, and student roles in governance is presented below.

Communication is a key focus of the administration at Boise State. The Communications and Marketing staff issue an internal, electronic “Update” newsletter intended for faculty and staff two times each week. It provides a summary of recent news releases as well as helpful hints about new policies or practices that affect the entire campus. The University website has become an essential tool for internal communication, and includes weekly podcasts from the president on various topics of interest, headlines, links to all divisions of the University, and most recently, given concerns over the economy, a site dedicated to the budget situation and how Boise State is being affected.

—ADMINISTRATORS AND STAFF: RECRUITING AND RETENTION

Recruiting and retaining needed staff is one of the goals of our strategic plan. The University relies on regular data from the College & University Professional Association for Human Resources to set salaries for employees and administrators. While Idaho is probably more conservative than many areas of the country when it comes to employee salaries, we are able to offer competitive packages and have realized success in hiring for key positions. The Division of Human Resources is currently undergoing a review and classification of all professional staff positions on campus to ensure they are categorized and paid appropriately.

Faculty Role in Governance

6.D The role of faculty in institutional governance, planning, budgeting, and policy development is made clear and public; faculty are supported in fulfilling that role.

—FACULTY SENATE CONSTITUTION: POWERS AND AUTHORITY OF THE FACULTY

As stated in Article III of the Constitution of the Faculty Senate, the powers and the authority of the University faculty are that:

“THE FACULTY shall provide recommendations on matters of educational policy within the limits prescribed by federal and state law and the regulations of the Idaho State Board of Education.”
Educational policy pertains to such matters as curricula, methods of instruction, facilities and materials for instruction, standards for admission and retention of students, and criteria for the granting of degrees. It also includes those aspects of student life that relate directly to the educational process including the establishment of regulations concerning financial aid, academic performance, extracurricular activities, and freedom of action and expression.

THE FACULTY shall recommend policies and procedures governing faculty appointment, tenure, and promotion.

THE FACULTY shall normally function through its representative body, The Faculty Senate.

Within the limits of policies approved by the Idaho State Board of Education, the policies and practices with the college/school, division, or department shall be determined by THE FACULTY of the specific college/school, division, or department, and shall normally be implemented by the interested deans or chairpersons.”

The Provost regularly attends Faculty Senate meetings to enhance communication between the faculty and the administration, and the President meets with the Faculty Senate President on an as needed basis, but at least twice annually.

—FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

The bulk of the operations carried out by the Faculty Senate are accomplished by a wide array of committees. Their level of activity is commensurate with faculty and University needs. The Senate routinely assesses its committee structure and determines if inactive committees are still needed or can be eliminated.

- Academic Standards Committee is responsible for a policy governing undergraduate academic standards.
- Core Curriculum Committee supervises the University’s general education requirements (i.e., the “core curriculum”), ensuring a core curriculum that is compatible with current core philosophy.
- University Curriculum Committee supervises all undergraduate offerings, ensuring that curricular changes are compatible with existing programs, feasible under given circumstances, and consistent with the educational objectives of the institution.
- Diversity Committee is responsible for all matters of policy regarding diversity and enhancement of diversity on campus.
- Faculty Financial Affairs Committee provides recommendations regarding (i) budget priorities for allocation of funds, (ii) poli-
cies and practices pertaining to reduction in force and program phase-outs, (iii) faculty salaries and fringe benefits. The committee also coordinates the flow of information between faculty members of the Executive Budget Committee and the Faculty as a whole.

- Faculty Grievance Committee conducts hearings to resolve individual faculty grievances within the guidelines of Boise State Grievance Policy and recommends changes in grievance policy and procedures.

- Faculty Professional Standards Committee is responsible for all matters of policy regarding faculty professional standards (e.g., Rank, Promotion, Evaluation, Tenure, Sabbaticals) and for faculty development.

- Graduate Council supervises all graduate offerings to ensure that they are compatible with existing programs, feasible under given circumstances, and consistent with the educational objectives of the institution. The Council also is concerned with policy and procedures of the Graduate College.

- Honorary Doctoral Degree Selection Committee establishes policies and procedures for awarding of honorary doctoral degrees and acts as the screening and selection committee for nominees.

- Research Council advises the Vice President for Research regarding the strategic direction of University research programs and regarding the policies and procedures of the Division of Research.

- Sabbatical Committee is responsible for policy regarding sabbaticals and for recommendations as to which faculty members should be awarded sabbaticals.

- Student Affairs Committee is responsible for matters of policy regarding the registration, orientation, and advising of students; for policies and procedures pertaining to the awarding of student scholarships, grants and loans; and for policies, procedures, and coordination of prior learning.

—FACULTY SENATE INVOLVEMENT IN GOVERNANCE, PLANNING, BUDGETING, AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT

Each of the committees described above has an important role in one or more aspects of the governance, planning, budgeting, and policy development. The Faculty Senate is the body to which those committees report and which acts upon the findings of those committees.
Below are several examples to illustrate the interaction of the Faculty Senate and the Administration:

- The creation of the Faculty Ombuds position in 2008 was initiated as a result of recommendations of the Campus Climate Survey. The Faculty Senate, in cooperation with the Provost, Human Resource Services, and Legal Affairs, developed a proposal for the creation and funding of the Faculty Ombuds position. That proposal is being funded by the Provost on a 2-year trial basis.51

- The Faculty Senate, working with the Deans’ Council, created new faculty appointment designations for clinical faculty.52 These changes were in response to the need to support programs that require a cadre of faculty members to supervise clinical experiences of students.

- In Fall 2008, the Provost requested that the Faculty Senate authorize the formation of the Core Reform Task Force. The impetus for this effort came from findings generated by the faculty-led ad hoc Learning for Life committee that explored ways to enhance the liberal arts at Boise State and to seek opportunities to propel liberal arts disciplines toward the University’s goals of becoming a metropolitan research university of distinction. One of the significant conclusions drawn by the committee was that “some of what ails the liberal arts at Boise State University can be cured through attention to the curriculum, including the Core.”53 Conclusions drawn by this committee led to the creation of the Core Reform Task Force. The Task Force was charged to (i) examine Boise State’s current philosophy, learning objectives and structure for the core and (ii) develop recommendations to the Faculty Senate as to how Boise State’s Core requirements might best facilitate student learning of Core intended learning outcomes. Potential outcomes include modification of the current structure or objectives, an alternative Core path, and/or reaffirmation of existing learning outcomes or structure. Further discussion may be found in Standard 2.

- So as to be able to have input on budget priorities during the current economic crisis, the Faculty Senate’s Financial Affairs Committee met every two weeks with the Provost to provide her with input regarding faculty priorities.

According to former (2002-2005) President of Faculty Senate, George Murgel, there has been increased faculty involvement in planning and policy development since the hiring of President Bob Kustra.
“The beginnings of the changes in faculty involvement began right at the time of President Kustra’s hire. During a lunch meeting with him as senate president he had asked me the question of what was the best single thing he could do to help/aid the faculty on campus. My response was initially a single word - communication. I went on to explain some of the issues that there had been with the lack thereof and that his ability to keep the faculty as fully informed as possible would be the single best thing he could do to foster cooperation and support from the faculty. I will note that he has and still recounts this advice to those around him even to this day based upon a recent conversation with him.”

Similarly, according to former (2005-2008) President of the Faculty Senate, David Saunders,

“The faculty’s role in institutional governance has evolved considerably. The Senate’s role to provide faculty a forum for a free and public exchange of ideas has not changed…. But what has changed with the new administration is the effectiveness of proposals regarding policy development and other issues affecting the academic climate at Boise State. The highest levels of the administration have demonstrated a sincere commitment to the ongoing involvement of faculty in contributions to institutional progress. This takes place through committees that report to and make recommendations through the Senate as well as lively discussions in Senate meetings.”

Dr. Saunders goes on to cite an example of this commitment to involve faculty: the proposal to change the grading system to the plus/minus type. In 2000, the first time this idea was proposed, the Senate and the faculty supported it, but the proposal was rejected by the then-Provost, who communicated his rationale to the Senate in a letter:

“When the proposal was brought forth again in 2005, the current Provost engaged in discussion with the Senate and because the faculty fully supported the proposal, it was passed. The attitude has since been that in academic areas, faculty will have effective input. The Senate President sends Senate Action Forms to the administration to report on policy actions proposed in Senate meetings. And upper administration representatives are always present at Senate meetings.”

Dr. Will Rainford, Faculty Senate President during 2008-09, reported that communication and collaboration between the administration and the faculty was crucial to successful navigation through very uncertain budgetary waters caused by economic recession and related state budget retrenchments in educational investments.
“President Kustra, Provost Andrews, and Vice President Stacy Pearson (VP, Finance and Administration) spent considerable time and effort working closely with the Faculty Senate to ensure that any budget decisions included the Faculty’s perspective and concerns. Budget discussions with the Faculty Senate began in October 2008 and continued through May 2009. Two special sessions of the Faculty Senate were convened at which Administration and Senators dialogued for two hours each regarding budget issues. Three campus-wide sessions were also convened by Administration for Faculty who could not attend the Faculty Senate meetings. In response to discussions with Administration, the Faculty Senate charged the Faculty Senate Financial Affairs Committee to review proposals presented by Administration. Provost Andrews was not only receptive to the committee’s inquiries, but was more than ready to facilitate the process of review. These discussions provided the Faculty Senate with thorough and on-going budgetary information, proposed responses by Administration, and the opportunity for Faculty to respond with divergent perspectives. Provost Andrews, in particular, ensured that Faculty had a strong voice in budgetary decision-making. Due to successful collaboration with the Faculty Senate, Administration was able to avoid any layoffs or decreases in tenured/tenure track faculty salary and benefits.”

Staff Role in Governance

The Association of Classified Employees and the Professional Staff Association represent staff members on campus and both have a role in the governance of Boise State.

According to their constitutions, those two associations exist:

- To promote and develop activities, policies, and procedures that enhance Boise State University in pursuit of its mission;
- To promote an active role for the staff in University governance structures;
- To achieve formal representation in the process of establishing University educational and operating procedures and policies;
- To represent the staff in policy matters pertaining to personal and professional welfare.

Both associations have their influence on institutional governance via inclusion of their members on a wide range of committees on campus, for example: Affirmative Action Committee, Student Fee Budget Committee, Safety & Security Advisory Board, Facility Naming Committee, Parking Advisory Committee, Health & Well-
ness Advisory Boards, Parking Citation Appeals Review Board, Cultural Center Advisory Board, Recreation Board of Directors, Food Service Advisory Committee, Children’s Center Advisory Board, and the Women’s Center Advisory Board.

Student Role in Governance

6.E The role of students in institutional governance, planning, budgeting, and policy development is made clear and public; students are supported in fulfilling that role.

The Associated Students of Boise State University (ASBSU) acts as the official voice of the student body, providing for the organized conduct of student affairs; promoting educational, social, and cultural activities for students; financing student clubs and activities; and facilitating student participation. ASBSU is supported in its activities by the Division of Student Affairs.

ASBSU is comprised of an executive branch, legislative branch, and judicial branch. The President and Vice President administer the affairs of ASBSU and carry out the policies adopted by the student senate. The Senate is the policy making body of the student government. The Judiciary interprets the ASBSU Constitution and the acts of the other branches. They hear all cases involving alleged violations of ASBSU regulations, rules, and laws as well as recognize student organizations and review changes in the constitutions of those organizations.

It is not unusual for the ASBSU resolutions to reference the University’s strategic plan. Some recent examples are:

- Sponsorship of a poetry workshop, which referenced the CTC goal of promoting diverse communities that foster faculty, staff, and student interaction
- Sponsorship of the Journey of Hope HIV/AIDS Awareness Program, which referenced the CTC destination of Vibrant Culture
- A resolution supporting Boise State Forensics as being integral to the CTC destinations of Academic Excellence, Public Engagement, Vibrant Culture, and Exceptional Research.

Students have input to institutional governance primarily through their participation in the ~60 University committees that specify student representation; examples of these committees are the Faculty Senate Academic Standards Committee, Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action Committee, Boise State Scholarship Committee, Faculty Senate Financial Affairs Committee, Health and Wellness Advisory Board, Campus Recreation Advisory Board, and
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the Student Union Board of Governors. Students also frequently play an active role on search committees for new administrators and other faculty.

Student participation on these committees is facilitated by the ASBSU Secretary of Personnel Recruitment, who communicates with the committee chairs via email both asking if they need student representatives and giving them the names and email addresses of the interested students. It is up to the committee chair to contact the student and maintain student involvement in the committee. Although students are provided the opportunity to have a voice on matters pertaining to institutional governance through their standing membership on University committees, it has been a challenge for student government leaders to find enough interested students to fill the vacant seats each year. In practice, it has been difficult for some student appointees to find the time to attend meetings.

A key area of student involvement pertains to proposed increases in tuition and fees. Students must be adequately notified of proposed increases and are invited to submit oral or written testimony regarding the proposals. The ASBSU President and Vice President are members of both the Executive Budget Committee and the Student Activity Fee Committee. The Executive Budget Committee makes recommendations regarding the level of general tuition and regarding increases to the Strategic Facilities and Technology fees. The Student Activity Fee Committee makes recommendations regarding increases to other components of student fees. The membership of the Activity Fee Committee was expanded in 2008 to include, in addition to ASBSU representation, two at-large student representatives.

### Institutional Advancement and Institutional Research

6.C.4 Institutional advancement activities (which may include development and fund raising, institutional relations, alumni and parent programs) are clearly and directly related to the mission and goals of the institution.

6.C.7 Administrators responsible for institutional research ensure that the results are widely distributed to inform planning and subsequent decisions that contribute to the improvement of the teaching-learning process.

The Division of University Advancement includes the Boise State Foundation, the Alumni Association, and the Bronco Athletic Association.

---
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The Boise State Foundation is the primary fundraising entity for the University and its activities are described in more detail in our response to Standard 7. The relation of the Boise State Foundation’s activities to the mission and goals of the University is best demonstrated by the structure of the comprehensive fundraising campaign presently underway, Destination Distinction.59

The campaign focuses on obtaining funds to enhance the University’s ability to: (i) integrate research and teaching in high-quality programs that spark the process of discovery for faculty and students, (ii) serve the state through partnerships that contribute to regional growth and development, (iii) provide a center for cultural and intellectual exchange that enriches students and the community at large, and (iv) create a research culture defined by exceptional scholarship and quality graduate programs. Note the close and highly deliberate parallels with the four destinations of our strategic plan, Charting the Course: Academic Excellence, Public Engagement, Vibrant Culture, and Exceptional Research.

The Boise State Alumni Association actively seeks to support the endeavors of the University. Their mission statement states that they will help to “build lifelong relationships that support the future of our University.”

The Bronco Athletic Association is the fundraising arm of the Athletics Department.61 Their mission is to promote and advance Bronco Athletics. More information can be found in Standard 3.

The office of Institutional Assessment, Analysis, and Reporting (IAAR) has the mission of supporting “the mission of Boise State University through data analysis and reports that are responsive, effective, and widely available to its internal and external audiences.” The effectiveness of IAAR is discussed in detail in Standard 1B.

Affirmative Action and Nondiscrimination

Policy 6.1 Educational institutions should contain within their environment the essence of the qualities they endeavor to impart, including the essential of nondiscrimination. They have a responsibility to develop selection and promotion standards and procedures based on principles which consider qualities, aptitudes, or talents simply as they pertain to the requirements of the position, with due regard for affirmative action. Institutions are expected to review their policies and procedures regularly to determine their validity in keeping with these principles.

Boise State University’s Policy 106062 is a comprehensive treatment of non-discrimination and affirmative action. Policy 1060 has the
objectives of (i) developing and maintaining equal employment and educational opportunities, (ii) eliminating all traces of unlawful discrimination in employment practices and educational programs, (iii) developing a workforce reflecting equitable employment distributions of underrepresented groups, (iv) providing resources for affirmative action programs, and (v) meeting state and federal requirements.

Ultimate responsibility for implementation of Policy 1060 rests with the President, but is delegated to the Director of Affirmative Action (DOAA). 63 The duties of the DOAA include (i) ensuring that analysis of hiring processes is conducted so as to identify potential problem areas such as job classifications that show consistent underrepresentation of minority groups, (ii) proactively working with units to ensure that they cast a wide net in searches for employees, and (iii) monitoring and certifying compliance of institutional practices with appropriate institutional, state, and federal policies.

The DOAA also facilitates the operation of the Affirmative Action Committee, which has duties that include (i) annually reviewing the University’s Affirmative Action Plan and making recommendations for appropriate actions, (ii) serving as a grievance committee for discrimination claims, and (iii) making recommendations for University-wide initiatives and programs to strengthen affirmative action and non-discrimination at Boise State.

The newly created Faculty Ombuds also has an impact on the University’s affirmative action and nondiscriminatory climate and policies. The Ombuds assists faculty in resolving matters before they become major issues. The Ombuds is also in the process of proposing changes to policies based on data and cases.

Commendations, Recommendations, and Action Plan

—COMMENDATIONS

- The University has well-respected administrative leadership that has proven to be effective in working with state government, community organizations and businesses, and on-campus entities.

- The University has three active and robust employee senates and a strong student government. The university administration is clearly committed to supporting, working with, and communicating with those organizations. Important changes
to policy emerge from collaborative work among campus entities, and are vetted with all interested parties.

- The University receives sufficient, but not excessive, oversight and guidance from its governing board, the SBOE. The SBOE has made important advances in creating a structure of regular self-evaluation and improvement.

- The creation of the Faculty Ombuds position has provided a key avenue for the successful prevention of and resolution of disputes involving faculty members.

—RECOMMENDATIONS

- The University has gone through several revisions of the process by which it makes new policy and revises existing policy. Attention should be paid to the effectiveness of this process in ensuring that the institution is able to modify its policies in a timely fashion so as to not be burdened by outdated policies. The institution must also ensure that the campus community is kept informed of changes in policy.

- Although the University’s shared governance model is effective, it is important that all involved continue to work together to provide input in campus decision making.

—ACTION PLAN

- The University will closely monitor its policy creation/vision processes to ensure their effectiveness and timeliness, then revise the processes as necessary.

- The University will continue to develop ways in which to ensure that input from employee senates, student government, and individuals is taken into account and is recognized for its value.