



# FACULTY SENATE 2023-2024

## ISU Faculty Senate

### Official Minutes

**Monday, November 27, 2023 4:00-6:00 p.m.**

**Location:** Shirley Sargent Family Boardroom, Student Union Building, Pocatello Campus

Or join via Zoom:

<https://isu.zoom.us/j/87633791904?pwd=NWVpckMyZ2c1cm9zOGREEmxYeWkxUT09>

Meeting ID: 876 3379 1904

Passcode: 558391

**\*\*Please note: Technical difficulties prevented the recording of the beginning of this meeting. Recording picks up at open forum.**

**In Attendance:** Fredi Giesler, Ken Aho, Dave Bagley, Samantha Blatt, Mikle Ellis, Caryn Evilia, Elaine Foster, John Holmes, Bob Houghton, Spencer Jardine, Michael Kobus, Paul Yeates

**Appearing by ZOOM:** Michelle Anderson, Suzanne Beasterfield, Elizabeth Fore, David Hanneman, Daniel LaBrier, Diane Ogiela, Neelam Sharma, Amanda Zink

**Absent but Excused:** Colden Baxter, Amanda Henscheid, Kristin Van De Griend

**Absent:** Duane Rawlings, Dave Smith

**Ex-Officio/Guests:** Adam Bradford, Sari Byerly, Dan Dale, Jenn Forshee, Josh Grinath, Andy Holland, Libby Howe, Janet Loxterman, Shannon Lynch, Chance Reynolds, President Kevin Satterlee

**ZOOM Ex-Officio/Guests:** Jack Bradley, Veronica Garcia, Jena Lords, Jean McGivney-Burelle

**Recording Secretary:** Lisa Hunt

**1) Chair Call Meeting to Order/Remarks – Fredi Giesler**

**2) Reading of Tribal Land Acknowledgement – Elaine Foster**

**3) Open Forum – began recording at 0:01**

a) Janet Loxterman (statement is added at the end of these minutes)

**4) Announcements – 6:32**

a) The following positions must be elected **IMMEDIATELY**:

i) Faculty Professional Policies Council

(1) College of Business

(a) Replacing Tesa Stegner

ii) Standing Appeals Panel

(1) College of Business – need 2

(2) College of Health – need 1

b) Update regarding Presidential Search



# FACULTY SENATE 2023-2024

- i) Colden Baxter is absent from FS today as the President Search Committee is deliberating and will make an announcement tomorrow listing the top 5 candidates for ISU President
- c) Dr. Dave Delehanty will complete his three years as an Ombuds Fall 2024 and we will be seeking his replacement

## 5) Approve Today's Meeting Agenda – November 27, 2023 – 7:53

**ACTION** – Bob Houghton motioned to accept today's agenda  
Elizabeth Fore seconded  
Motion carried unanimously

## 6) Faculty Senate Minutes Approval – [November 6, 2023](#) - 8:12

**ACTION** – John Holmes motioned to accept minutes  
Caryn Evilia seconded  
Motion carried unanimously

## 7) Consent Agenda – Approve council or committee actions/decisions (Click link(s) below for document(s)) – 8:36

- a) [ASC Official Minutes October 20, 2023](#)
- b) [FPPC Official Minutes October 25, 2023](#)
- c) [GERC Meeting Minutes October 24, 2023](#)
- d) [RC Official Minutes October 27, 2023](#)
- e) [UCC Meeting Minutes October 26, 2023](#)
- f) [UCC Meeting Minutes November 2, 2023](#)
- g) [UCC Meeting Minutes November 9, 2023](#)
- h) [UCC Meeting Minutes November 16, 2023](#)

**ACTION** – Bob Houghton motioned to accept the Consent Agenda  
Paul Yeates seconded  
Motion carried unanimously

## 8) ASISU Report and Q and A – Chance Reynolds – 9:03

- a) The ASISU Orange and Black Bowl was held Nov. 14 at the Holt Arena and faculty won 16 to 14.
- b) International Students Day held Nov. 17 was very successful and ASISU was there in support
- c) Resolution 622 regarding Closed Week Policy is being considered by Academic Affairs

## 9) Sari Byerly, Assistant VP of Student Affairs – 11:30

- a) Report on survey results of BCSSE (Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement)
- b) Discussion and Q and A

## 10) Ombuds Report – Shannon Lynch – 36:05

- a) Motion to accept the Report

**ACTION** – Mickle Ellis motioned to accept Shannon Lynch's Ombuds Report  
Bob Houghton seconded  
Motion carried unanimously



# FACULTY SENATE 2023-2024

- b) Vote to confirm Shannon Lynch's three-year term

**ACTION** – Mikle Ellis motioned to confirm her three-year term  
Bob Houghton seconded

- i) Discussion

Motion withdrawn – Charter states that each ombuds serves a total of three years as their term, so decision was made that this was not necessary

## 11) Interim Provost/Office of Academic Affairs Report - Adam Bradford – 59:20

- a) Workload Policy
- b) Update on the ISU President search

## 12) New HR Policy – Libby Howe – 1:02:28

- a) Professional Workplace Free from Abusive Conduct Policy
  - i) This policy affects all classifications of employees
  - ii) The intent is to protect academic freedom and expression of opinions and ideas to further our professions
  - iii) Addresses unacceptable behavior and the response (bullying, intimidation and/or threats)
  - iv) Policy is intended so that individuals are encouraged to work through conflict independently and then use resources available for mediation if there is still conflict
  - v) Policy intends that HR's role is not as the enforcer but rather to provide support and guidance
  - vi) FS will not be voting on this policy (because it is not strictly a "faculty policy") but will have the opportunity to provide feedback – policy is in 30-day review until Dec. 1. It is noted that only policies that reside under the Academic Affairs Portfolio are voted on by FS

## 13) Continuing Business – 1:21:45

- a) Report on Indigenous People's Day activities
  - i) Survey results and what was learned/observed
  - ii) Reflections and discussion
- b) Update on Faculty Evaluation Policy – Diane Ogiela - 1:33:30
  - i) Work Group met with HR and Interim Provost Bradford for input
  - ii) Goal was to make requested changes happen this academic year
  - iii) Identified issues
    - (1) Changes in the TMS process system are due by July of the previous year
    - (2) Ratings scale, paperwork processes
  - iv) Academic Affairs' role
    - (1) Provide communication that outlines required annual evaluations and how they are linked to merit raises
    - (2) Clarification of no bell-curve requirement for evaluations
    - (3) Evaluators receive guidance on effective evaluation procedures and guidelines
    - (4) Required face to face meeting if there is a discrepancy in evaluation rating
  - v) Feedback from Deans Council - no reservations, endorses best practices
- c) Review comments on ISUPP 4090 and discuss potential revisions – 1:39:27
  - i) Comment review GoogleDoc in BOX
  - ii) Changes made based on comments



# FACULTY SENATE 2023-2024

- (1) Changes must be submitted to FS for feedback by Dec. 6
- (2) Work Group has been addressing concerns, but no major changes have been made to policy yet
- iii) Intent is that additional comments will be considered and another revised version will be shared with FS by Dec. 6<sup>th</sup>, and will be the focus of discussion at the FS meeting on Dec. 11<sup>th</sup>

## 14) New Business - 2:15:51

- a) Discussion and Q and A on issue regarding Google storage limits being applied to University accounts
  - i) Concerns about reduction in storage space and ability to back up data
    - (1) Expectation is that it will affect mostly alumni, not current faculty and staff

## 15) Adjournment - 6:41pm

**ACTION** - Dave Bagley motioned to adjourn  
Mikle Ellis seconded



27 November 2023

Good afternoon, I am the chair of Biological Sciences Janet Loxterman. I thank you for the opportunity to share my thoughts with you today. There has been considerable conversation over the last several weeks related to the proposed workload policy. This policy has been framed as a mechanism to address inequity and while I am not here to discuss whether this inequity exists or does not, as chair my responsibility is to work with faculty in my department to distribute all aspects of our workload – teaching, research and service. I operate under the expectation that chairs and directors in other departments are responsible for doing the same. I trust that my colleagues across campus are contributing to our educational mission and are actively engaged in instruction. Today I am here to clarify or provide context related to statements made either directly or indirectly about the instructional activities of faculty in biological sciences.

Recently, the president made a statement that I “self-reported or self-disclosed that we do not follow the 3x3 teaching load” or that I told the senate that biology is below the expected instructional load, referring to statements I made at a prior senate meeting. To be clear, according to the current ISU Workload Policy the expectation for tenured and tenure-track faculty is an average of nine workload units of instruction” not 3x3 as was stated by Dr. DiSanza or 3x3 classroom instruction as in the new policy. This is an important distinction since these nine workload units or 60% workload effort involved in instructional activities does not simply include credit hours it includes mentoring undergraduate and graduate students, advising, special projects, honors courses, lab courses, large courses, and many other forms of instruction. Most three-credit courses involve three contact hours, a four-credit course is six (or more) contact hours, yet faculty do not get ‘credit’ for this as it is only a four-credit course. Not surprisingly many of the courses in the sciences, and in biology, are lab courses where the instructor teaches lecture and lab, add to these six contact hours, mentoring students, and a seminar course and faculty in biology are at 60% or 9-workload units of instruction. Interestingly, Dr. DiSanza said he did not want to hear about PhD programs, “tell it to English and Psychology.” I take the opposing view that faculty engaged in these mentoring activities in English and Psychology, and any other graduate program, should be getting instructional workload credit for this, rather than biological sciences faculty not getting credit for this mission critical teaching. This is not a ‘light’ teaching load, this is not ‘cushy’, and no one is getting away with anything, nor are they trying to. On the contrary, the instructional activities in biological sciences are engaging and innovative. As has been noted, change can be hard but I assure you it is something that biological sciences has embraced over the last 5+years. We continue to evolve, following best practices and guidelines outlined by the American Association for the Advancement of Science with respect to teaching science. You teach students science by engaging them in the practice of science, we do biology, and we mentor our students, undergraduate and graduate, in doing biology. Our curriculum has been revised, updated and aligned to provide students authentic, discovery-based research opportunities inside and outside of the classroom. As it turns out, providing these experiences can be more time intensive than more traditional lecture courses in biological sciences. To simply distill instructional activities in all disciplines across all departments into credit bearing instructional units reflects a financial model not one focused on educational outcomes.

I am excited about the teaching happening in biological sciences and I would invite any legislator, SBOE member, or administrator to come experience what we are doing to help our students develop a science identity by learning how to do science. In fact, despite all of the finger pointing and accusations, I have not once been asked what we are doing or how we are teaching. It has just been assumed, and I feel intentionally propagated, that biological sciences contributes to workload inequity. This narrative is false. It is true that faculty are passionate about their research, but that does not come at the expense of instructional work, on the contrary it is complimentary since those that do science are best positioned to help educate students about science.

Another regularly occurring point with regard to this proposed policy is the notion of data. It has been said that we do not need the data since it will simply be confirmatory. This shows little appreciation for the point of collecting data. Data are important not for the sake of having data, it is important because the data provides guidance for a solution. It is the analysis and interpretation of the data that offers critical information if one wants to identify a pattern. Only then can we be positioned to create an effective solution. It was specifically

Department of Biological Sciences

921 South 8th Ave., Stop 8007 | Pocatello, ID 83209-8007 | (208) 282-3765 | [isu.edu/bios](http://isu.edu/bios)



stated at the last meeting that this policy is being developed to address what our university needs with respect to instruction, research and service, that we need to rebalance. How do we know what we need if we have not identified any patterns. Is the inequity in all departments? all colleges? Is there something not being accounted for? These are the important questions that are addressed by having and interpreting the workload data. I refer back to the credit hour metric, if you quantify faculty in biological sciences by credit hours only, you are missing a significant portion of the instructional workload for our faculty. I suspect this will not be unique to my department.

Another misleading statement was made to this body with respect to scheduling biology courses. I will not argue that academic advisors recommend students build their schedule around their biology courses. In many programs these introductory courses are foundational and prerequisite for other required courses. I will, however, say that the presentation of this as a workload issue is inaccurate. Students are unable to get these classes as a result of space not workload. This is completely unrelated to biology not teaching enough courses and no workload policy will address this issue. As I previously stated, these are lab-based courses that require specialized space, equipment and restricted class sizes. We have two rooms that are equipped for these labs and we move 430 students through these rooms each week. Once a lab section is closed, it is closed, we cannot just add another class in Rendezvous or increase enrollment. Not surprisingly there are preferred times that students would like to take their labs and we are unable to accommodate every student in these time slots as a result of space, they will not register for a Friday afternoon lab, so perhaps they decide to take it somewhere else but those decisions are out of our control. We have developed our curriculum and created our course schedules to maximize accessibility for all students and we add seats whenever possible, but space is the limiting factor and this is not something a revised workload policy will fix.

As a final point, I want to discuss research as it seems there has been the suggestion that faculty are favoring research at the expense of instruction. On the contrary, these activities are interrelated. The majority of research funding sought and secured supports students and student research projects. These grant dollars allow faculty to recruit and support graduate students, provide summer funding and research experiences for undergraduates and keep them in our programs, positively impacting retention. As stated in the current workload policy, "ISU is classified by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as a doctoral research university. Doctoral granting institutions are classified as doctoral research, high research, or very high research based on the total level of research and development activities and expenditures, number of faculty in the sciences and engineering, and number of academic doctoral degrees conferred. The expectation for tenured and tenure track faculty at ISU requires significant effort in research/scholarship/creative activities." Clearly, the research activities of faculty in biology, and other programs, are considered instructional and connected to our educational mission. Furthermore, many may be unaware that federal funding agencies NSF, NIH do not fund course buyouts.

In conclusion, it has been stated that we need a new policy to address workload inequity. It has also been stated that a new policy is necessary to address ISU's needs in the areas instruction, research and service, to correct an imbalance. While a third reason has been to afford faculty protection from some existential threat. I would like to posit that these goals may be mutually exclusive, properly addressing our institutional needs may not create equity or prevent weaponization of our policy. Regardless of how this policy is developed or which one of these goals is the actual intent, it should not be constructed based on false suppositions about what faculty are or are not doing. Simply counting credits or identifying a mechanism to pay for credits not taught could have financial implications, but it will not begin to capture all that faculty do in support of our students or the educational mission of this institution.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Janet L. Loxterman'.

Janet L. Loxterman  
Professor and Chair  
Department of Biological Sciences