A quorum being present, the Chair opened the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

Minutes: It was moved (Padaghm-Albrecht, Murphy) to accept the minutes of meeting #12 of the Faculty Senate. Approved.

Chair’s Report: The Chair addressed the SBOE policy changes (salary reductions etc previously contained in financial exigency policy). A redraft of the policy had been returned to faculty leadership and will be distributed to senators. The Chair noted that the returned version bore little resemblance to the version he had sent to the General Counsel. One representative from each university will be in attendance at the SBOE December meeting to address the issue. The Chair announced that the final forty minutes of the meeting would be reserved for discussion of the Provost’s Efficiency memo. There were a lot of items on the agenda and he hoped that senate would move forward deliberately.

Provost’s Report: The Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs, Jeanne Christiansen was again representing the Provost today. The Provost was currently returning from the national meeting of APLU. The Vice-Provost indicated the Provost was working on a response to previous discussions about the efficiency memo and would convey the senate’s request to receive a written response.

FS-10-015 NOI Discontinue Masters Economics mayor (M.S.). Approved.

FS-10-016 NOI Rename teaching minor in Industrial Technology Education. Approved.

FS-10-017 NOI Discontinue academic minor in Arboiculture and Urban Forestry. Approved.

FS-10-009 - FSH 3560 Faculty Promotion.
It was moved (Murphy, Eveleth) to call up the item from the table. Approved.

The senate Chair noted that there was a complicated revision proposed to language around “presumption in favor of …..” lower level committee support by the University-level Promotion Committee. He supported the version of this policy as it stood. The present language supports the ability of the University-level committee to develop and deliver an independent view of a faculty who was being considered for promotion. The proposed change to the language adds unnecessary complexity to the policy.

Another view was that the change was needed because regular faculty (who were not lawyers) can interpret the “presumption” as invoking compliance, rather than taking the position that the “presumption” could be overcome with a justified argument.

There was extensive discussion of the proposed change in the “presumption” language.
Mr. Graham from the General Counsel’s office noted that the intent of the change was to ensure that lower level committees supported their position with respect to nominees by observing and documenting criteria though to university level criteria for candidates recommended for promotion.

There was additional discussion about the value of the independence of the University-level Promotions Committee.

There being no further discussion the question was called in support of the FAC-proposed changes to FSH 3560. Nine in favor, 11 against. Motion defeated.

**FS-10-010** - FSH 3520 Tenure. It was noted that there were only minor changes proposed to the policy. There being no further discussion the question was called. Twenty-one in favor, 0 opposed. Approved.

**FS-10-018, FS-10-019, FS-10-020** NOIs closures of Parma, Sandpoint and Tetonia R & E Centers.

The Chair noted that these closure NOIs were being brought forward in parallel to efforts to find external funding to continue support to keep the Centers open. As state funding was almost exhausted, efforts to bring the policy forward was designed to be in place and revoked if external funding was negotiated in time to prevent closure. The Parma Center was the main focus for external funding.

Cherryl Sodorff, Director, CALS Admin Services/Fiscal Officer was in attendance to provide some context and answer questions about the closures. The Agriculture R & E budget had suffered an 11.5% reduction and funds were not available to maintain all of the R & E Centers. A task-force consisting of state legislators, alumni, Idaho agricultural industry representatives and other constituency representatives had met for three days in September and reviewed all of the R & E Centers. The task-force had drafted a prioritized list of R & E Centers. The three nominated for closure were identified because either the work being done at the Center could be done elsewhere or the focus of the work would be discontinued. It was noted that the work at Parma could continue although the staff and faculty would be housed at Caldwell if the closure goes ahead. There were no faculty members at Tetonia and there was one faculty member at Sandpoint who could be relocated to another site at Sandpoint.

Questions: **Were there faculty members included on the task-force?** No. However, faculty in the college Academic Programs Committee had reviewed and unanimously supported the proposed closures.

**What is the amount of external funds required to prevent closure of Parma?** $255,000 would be needed to keep the Center open until the end of the fiscal year. Additional on-going funds would be needed there-after.

**What is the critical date for external support to be verified to prevent closure going forward?** The policy will be reviewed by the SBOE at their December 10 meeting. The absolute final critical date for confirmation of external support would be December 31, but the SBOE meeting deadline is the limiting factor, thus December 10 is the real deadline.

**How will technical and support staff be supported if the Centers close?** Other sources including external grant funds will be used to support these positions.

The Vice-Provost noted that procedurally, if external funds were verified even in the event of closures being approved by senate, the President would withdraw the item from the SBOE agenda.
Nick Gier, a guest in attendance was invited to speak. He indicated that he had been in attendance at a meeting in support of the Parma R & E Center and that the meeting was strongly supported and producers had pledged support for the Center. Growers were willing to implement a land-tax in order to provide on-going support for the Center.

Ms Sodorff replied that the dean of CALS was engaged in negotiations with growers.

There was extensive discussion about the need for senate to make a recommendation after only short deliberations. There was discussion about the impact of delaying a recommendation and waiting until Dean Hammel was available to answer further questions from the senate.

It was moved to table all three items: FS-10-018, FS-10-019, FS-10-020 NOIs closures of Parma, Sand Point and Tetonia R & E Centers (Sullivan, Geist). Approved, unanimously.

**Efficiency Cost Reduction Policy Memo.**

To clarify, senate had made recommendations about the issues of class sizes and Y accounts and was awaiting a written response from the Provost. The discussion today would address department consolidation.

One view was that enforcing a minimum department size (nine faculty) and forcing department mergers led to faculty losing discipline identity. This was devastating and problematic. For example, having a department head who had no idea about the discipline culture of the faculty member would be problematic during performance evaluation or consideration for promotion and tenure. In addition, departments in which accreditation was required would face significant challenges if department heads knew little about the requirements for accreditation in a different discipline context.

The number of nine faculty as a minimum department size was arbitrary and not well-considered.

Several senators noted that they had been involved in discussions about department consolidation for two to five years. There were very many difficulties raised as a result of this proposal. **What is the gain to the institution? Is there really any salary savings as a department head would still be retained as faculty? Once a department is closed or consolidated, where then does faculty tenure reside (from the closed department)? How does closing a department improve efficiency? Are we looking for efficiencies or are we just looking to save money?**

It was suggested that the senate may try to find a positive alternative that addressed this proposed policy change. Perhaps mergers could be based upon strategic interdisciplinary opportunities rather than using a set number of faculty to define a cut-off.

Another suggestion was that administrative units could be asked to justify their size and efficiency. Yet another view was that administrative support had been seriously down-sized over the past several years and was at a much lower level when compared to our peer institutions. Yet another view was that it may be time to review the relative size of administrative units.

It was suggested that it is not appropriate to debate these issues. Rather, it was more important to consider factors that contribute to the overall culture of the university. **What is the appropriate mix of undergraduate and graduate students if we are to grow the institution?**
The hour being late, the Chair suggested that with the fall break next week, it would be two weeks until senate meets again and that senators may wish to consider whether a motion should be brought forward to address the department consolidation issue.

**Adjournment:** It was moved (Murphy, Battaglia) to adjourn at 5:00 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Rodney A. Hill, Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Senate.