



FACULTY SENATE 2021-2022

ISU Faculty Senate

Official Minutes

Monday, April 11, 2022 4:00-6:00 p.m.

Location: Join Zoom Meeting

<https://isu.zoom.us/j/93311614308?pwd=OUFr bTBVWng5UUtMTDl lQ2NuQlJ Odz09>

Meeting ID: 933 1161 4308

Passcode: 114735

In Attendance: Anish Sebastian, Jasun Carr, Michael Clarke, Ryan Pitcher, Kent Whitaker, Dan Dale, Tania Harden, Dan Cravens, Fredi Giesler, Dave Hachey, Gesine Hearn, Christy Sabel, Darren Leavitt, Suzanne Beasterfield, Colden Baxter, Duane Rawlings, Michelle Anderson, Chad Yates, Mary Hofle, Paul Yeates, Tyler Jepson, David Coffland, Diane Ogiela, Neelam Sharma, Ken Aho, Dave Bagley

Absent But Excused: Jim Stoutenborough

Absent: Caryn Evilia

Ex-Officio: Dave Delehanty, Stacey Gibson, Mary Nies, Karen Appleby, Craig Chatriand, Nitin Srivastava, Jenn Forshee, Libby Howe, Elizabeth Fore, Adam Bradford, Jerry Leffler, Blake Christensen, Cindy Hill, Tony Forest

Recording Secretary: Ann Medinger

Open Forum:

1) Announcements

- a) Election for a new Faculty Senate Vice Chair will take place at our final Faculty Senate Meeting on April 25th
 - i) All senators are given a charge to recruit good candidates for this position
- b) **All Senators should have names of new senators and council members to Ann Medinger by today, April 11, 2022**
 - i) New senators and council members will be/have been added to the Council Membership Term Staggering Worksheet in Box for your reference
 - ii) **Election Timeline**
 - (1) Monday, April 25th, 2022- New Senators will attend Final Faculty Senate Meeting of the 2021-2022 academic year
- c) Thank you to all those senators who came to our last meeting prepared to make decisions on Emeritus. Academic Affairs was very grateful to us for getting those done in such a timely manner
- d) Our final Faculty Senate Meeting of the 2021-2022 academic year will be held on Monday, April 25th. Thank you all for an amazing year and all the progress we have made as a group.

2) ASISU Update- Zane Webb (ASISU VP)

- a) Voting on constitutional changes
- b) 100 hooded sweatshirts sold out at \$15 each
- c) Pres. And Vice Pres. of ASISU will be traveling to Moscow, Idaho to discuss student fees with the Legislature

3) Student Affairs Update- Craig Chatriand

- a) ROAR into registration has started
 - i) In Pond Student Union Wed, Thurs, Fri of this week (April 11-15)



FACULTY SENATE 2021-2022

4) Academic Affairs Update- Karen Appleby

- a) Tues. April 5, 2022 Distinguished Faculty Awards Ceremony was held
- b) Higher Ed Budget
 - i) Passed by the Legislature
 - ii) No tuition increases

5) Policy News- Kellee Kirkpatrick/Libby Howe

- a) Contract Administration and Execution Policy (ISUPP 1060)
 - i) Currently in 30-day review until April 28th, 2022
 - ii) Want to make sure it's legally sound and consistently and efficiently applied
 - iii) <https://www.isu.edu/policy/thirtydaycomment/>
- b) Student Code of Conduct
 - i) Currently in 30-day review until April 30th, 2022
 - ii) Went from 33 to 24 pages
 - iii) Sexual misconduct information has been removed from this policy as it is addressed in a separate policy (ISUPP 3100 or Title IX policy)
 - iv) Added information for student housing regulations

6) President's Update- Jenn Forshee

- a) In the final stages of the VPR hiring process with an offer to be extended at the end of the week
- b) Strategic plan is nearly complete
- c) Budget is passed and will be presented by President Satterlee at the last Faculty Senate Meeting

7) Guests

- a) Stacey Gibson- Title IX Discussion
 - i) Gibson went over Title IX
 - (1) Gibson talked about how to change Title IX using process A
 - (2) Gibson spoke about Title IX regulations
 - (a) Incident must have occurred in the United States
 - (b) There is a live hearing/questioning
 - (c) Sanctions cannot be imposed without due process
 - (d) <https://www.isu.edu/title-ix/>
 - ii) Delehanty asked if Ombuds should be mandatory Title IX reporters
 - (1) Perhaps an issue for Faculty Senate to take up
 - (2) Gibson and Christensen both agreed that Ombuds should not be Title IX reporters
 - (3) Carr recommended adding the Ombuds role in the Title IX policy as it is updated
- b) Adam Bradford- Curriculum Tool for Addressing Stop-outs
 - i) Bradford went through stop-out data
 - (1) Over a decade- 2011-2021- we lost 13,250 students
 - (a) This is basically an entire year's worth of enrolled students
 - (b) It's like shutting the university down for a whole academic year once every decade
 - (c) This breaks down to 1259 students per year
 - (i) This does not include high school students taking dual-enrollment courses
 - (2) Bradford went over possible solutions to solving this problem
 - (a) One option is the University Studies Degree
 - (b) A second option is the Multidisciplinary Studies Degree



FACULTY SENATE 2021-2022

- (i) We do not currently have an interdisciplinary body of faculty that would over-see this degree and this is a cause for concern
- ii) Bradford's ask is that the Interdisciplinary Degree be overseen by faculty
 - (1) Perhaps Faculty senate could aid in forming a body of faculty to oversee this degree
 - (a) Based on thumb's up reactions from senators, the Faculty Senate is generally in favor of creating a body or committee to oversee the Multidisciplinary Studies Degree
 - (i) Ryan Pitcher is happy to serve on a working committee to put together a proposal for this degree
 - (ii) Jasun Carr will serve
 - (iii) Dan Cravens will serve
 - (iv) Duane Rawlings will serve
- c) President Kevin Satterlee- Budget Discussion- Tabled until next FS meeting due to illness

8) Consent Agenda- Approved

- a) Faculty Senate Official Minutes March 28, 2022
- b) Academic Standards Council Minutes March 18, 2022
- c) FPPC Minutes March 16, 2022
- d) FPPC Minutes March 30, 2022
- e) AAB minutes February 24, 2022

9) Continuing Business

- a) Faculty Trust with Admin- Dave Delehanty
 - i) Delehanty gave his report for trust issues with faculty
 - (1) This report is based on Delehanty's direct communications and research done with faculty at Idaho State University
 - ii) For full report, see end of minutes
- b) Check-ins regarding ongoing work
 - i) Program Health Survey (James Stoutenborough)
 - (1) No update
 - ii) Bylaws (Jerry Leffler)
 - (1) Working on getting updates from folks
 - (2) This will roll-over to the fall
 - iii) Non-TT rights survey and committee
 - (1) First Meeting held Friday, April 8th, 2022
 - (2) They are looking at the three-year contract issue first
 - (a) They may have to have a policy or insert some wording into an existing policy to make this happen

10) New Business

- a) Ratify New Election Results
 - i) Faculty Senate
 - (1) Paul Yeates- CAL
 - (2) John Holmes- KDHS (Pharmacy)
 - (3) Spencer Jardine- Library
 - (4) Colden Baxter- COSE
 - (5) Mickle Ellis- COSE
 - ii) GERC



FACULTY SENATE 2021-2022

- (1) No One Nominated; election to be held in the Fall 2022- CAL
- (2) No One Nominated; election to be held in the Fall 2022- COSE
- iii) UCC
- iv) Academic Standards Council
 - (1) Curtis Whitaker- CAL
- v) Research Council
 - (1) David Lawrimore- CAL
 - (2) Dustin McNulty- COSE
- vi) FPPC
 - (1) Jeehoon Kim- CAL
 - (2) No One Nominated; election to be held in the Fall 2022- COSE
- vii) GEM Gen Ed Objective 1
 - (1) Hal Hellwig- CAL- English and Philosophy
- viii) GEM Gen Ed Objective 5
 - (1) Samantha Blatt- CAL- Anthropology

ACTION- Dale motioned to accept the above names as constitutionally elected individuals
Beasterfield seconded
Motion Carried with 22 yes's and 1 abstention and 0 no's

- b) Approve Faculty Senate Meeting Schedule for 2022-2023
 - i) Fall Semester 2022
 - (1) August 29th, 2022
 - (2) September 12, 2022
 - (3) September 26, 2022
 - (4) October 10, 2022
 - (5) November 7, 2022
 - (6) November 28, 2022
 - (7) December 12, 2022
 - ii) Spring Semester 2023
 - (1) January 16, 2023
 - (2) January 30, 2023
 - (3) February 13, 2023
 - (4) February 27, 2023
 - (5) March 13, 2023
 - (6) March 27, 2023
 - (7) April 10, 2023
 - (8) April 24, 2023

ACTION- Dale motioned to accept the schedule for the 2022-2023 academic year
Hofle seconded
Motion Carried with 21 yes's and 1 abstention and 0 no's

- c) Return to in-person meetings for 2022-2023 academic year
 - i) Update on Faculty Senate meeting space
 - (1) Will be meeting in the Sargent Board Room in the SUB building
 - (2) Remote Attendance needs to be addressed
 - (a) Zoom can be used in the Sargent Board Room



FACULTY SENATE 2021-2022

- (i) Meridian
- (ii) Idaho Falls
- (iii) Twin Falls

11) Executive Session

- a) Last Minute Emeritus- tabled until April 25th meeting
 - i) Dr. Mark Neill- College of Education

12) Adjournment

ACTION- Anderson moved to adjourn
Jepson seconded
Motion carried unanimously
Meeting adjourned at 6:03 pm

Delehanty: ISU Faculty Ombud Report on Culture of Distrust at ISU April 2022

1

Culture of Distrust at ISU

ISU Faculty Ombud Report to the ISU Faculty Senate

David J. Delehanty, ISU Faculty Ombud

April 11, 2022

Executive Summary

At the request of the ISU Faculty Senate following discourse with President Satterlee, Faculty Ombud David Delehanty received and organized voluntary commentary from faculty university wide. Faculty commentary identified wide-ranging actions perceived by faculty to be significant violations of trust and intrusions on faculty rights and prerogatives. Intertwined with the criticisms expressed by faculty was substantial faculty perception of institutional retaliation against faculty expression when faculty expression contradicts preferred messaging by supervisors. Because faculty concerns are widespread, recurring, and substantiated with evidence, faculty distrust within the institution is understandable and likely to continue without significant institutional change.

Background

In March 2022, President Satterlee during discourse with the Faculty Senate identified a culture of distrust prevailing at ISU. Many faculty senators agreed that distrust is preventing ISU from achieving its potential. Under a previous administration, ISU went through a long period of diminishment characterized by faculty disenfranchisement. President Satterlee asked if the culture of distrust at ISU is a carry-over effect from the past or were there continuing issues causing distrust. The ISU Faculty Senate requested that the Faculty Ombuds Program seek to



FACULTY SENATE 2021-2022

identify any drivers of continuing distrust. This report is a product of that request.

Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this report is to initiate a conversation between ISU faculty and administration about a culture of distrust prevailing at ISU. Through their senators, all ISU faculty members were invited to communicate with a faculty ombud regarding member's views on distrust at ISU. This *ad hoc* survey did not invite commentary from administration, staff, or students. Hence, this report provides an exclusively faculty perspective. This report is meant to be used as a starting point for serious discussion on how to establish greater trust, respect, and cooperation between administration and faculty. This report does not presume to solve the issue of distrust. Solving distrust likely will require hard work and mutual intention by ISU administration and ISU faculty.

Disclaimer

This report attempts to portray honestly and concisely the problems and concerns communicated to me, David Delehanty in my role as an ISU faculty ombud, by faculty members from *Delehanty: ISU Faculty Ombud Report on Culture of Distrust at ISU April 2022*

2

throughout ISU over the last few weeks. Any and all deficiencies in this report are exclusively my responsibility. For purely logistic reasons during the short time between the senate request and the due date of the report, I was unable to consult meaningfully with my colleague and fellow faculty ombud, Dr. Rick Wagoner, and he may have additional insights to add. I did consult opportunistically with various anonymous faculty members who of their own accord sought out conversation with me on this matter and I thank them for their thoughtful insights. Critics may see this report as nothing more than a litany of complaints about administration from whining faculty. Others will see dedicated faculty virtually shouting to upper administration and their own colleagues that there are deeply engrained internal problems that must be addressed for ISU to be successful. I hope this report elicits respectful inquiry and thoughtful introspection.

Body of Report

Faculty concerns were broad and robust. It is clear that there is substantial frustration within the ranks of tenured faculty and much fear of retaliation, especially among the non-tenured faculty. In private communications, faculty provided evidence supporting their concerns.

Faculty communicated adamantly that certain VPs and deans, many departmental chairs, and Human Resources act inappropriately. In frank terms, faculty gave strong examples of perceived administrative dishonesty, dismissiveness, cronyism, and sexism. They provided clear evidence of administrative infringement on academic freedom. Faculty were quite insistent that several mid-level administrators are blatantly untrustworthy.

An important ancillary concern expressed by faculty is that upper administration is out of touch with the faculty. Many faculty members expressed support for President Satterlee's words regarding fairness and harmony within the ISU community. However, they felt that President Satterlee did not know what really goes on at mid levels within his administration. Faculty expressed concern that President Satterlee has a poor understanding of how academia works and was poorly positioned to see that faculty initiative is being suppressed. Faculty also pointed to high turnover rate of recently appointed VPs and continuing high-level interim appointments as



FACULTY SENATE 2021-2022

concerning, worrying that this instability indicates systemic dysfunction within administration. In total, faculty expressed approximately 30 serious problems currently engendering distrust at ISU. To make this unwieldy list more manageable, I have attempted to organize the issues under broader categories of my own invention. This list consists solely of concerns supported by some form of evidence and where the concern is something more than a single incident directed at a single faculty member. In other words, this is a list of recurring actions that result in distrust.

List of Prevailing Concerns of Faculty

ISU has a Culture of Retaliation

□ Faculty are acutely aware of the non-renewals (firing) of pre-tenured faculty members (four) who had spoken out in the context of their university service in ways disliked by their respective deans. These non-renewals are widely seen as retaliation. This sense was *Delehanty: ISU Faculty Ombud Report on Culture of Distrust at ISU April 2022*

3

magnified when, in at least one case, the claim was made that the firing was necessary for Covid-19 related financial reasons while simultaneously the VP for Finance was stating that finances had nothing to do with dismissals of pre-tenured faculty at ISU. Soon after these faculty members lost their jobs, new tenure-track positions were announced. Less than 5% of American universities dismissed tenure-track faculty due to Covid issues. ISU's actions bring shame to ISU. A great many non-tenured faculty members now decline to address institutional problems out of fear of retaliation.

□ Many faculty members question whether they should complete dean and/or chair evaluations because they do not believe that their confidentiality is secure and they anticipate retaliation if they are 'caught' criticizing decisions. At least one faculty member reports finding trackers attached to the online evaluation s/he was asked to complete. (There was no allegation of nefarious behavior. The point was that the survey actually could be tracked despite contrary claims.) This clear manifestation of faculty distrust results in problems festering. Under the current process and current attitudes, deans are not receiving accurate information on how faculty feel about their chair's performance and the provost is not receiving accurate information on faculty perception of their dean's performance.

□ Mandated Program Prioritization Mischaracterized and Misused.

□ Example: The Department of Physics was told that it would not be made smaller yet it was. President Satterlee indicated that he did not intend to cut programs yet shortly after, the Physics Department was told for the first time in its 17-year history that its graduate program would not be admitting students due to faculty cuts. President Satterlee commissioned a Physics Viability Study in response to concerns about support for the program but the study was not conducted.

Meanwhile, Physics faculty members are told that their 'non-collegiality' is a barrier to university support for the Physics program.

□ "Weaponizing" annual evaluations.

□ Annual evaluations continue to be retaliatory. A particular problem is the use of unsupported allegations of lack of collegiality placed in the annual evaluations of faculty members who dare to express disagreements. President Satterlee stated to



FACULTY SENATE 2021-2022

the Faculty Senate that this should not happen. Faculty are extremely disappointed to see that it has continued.

□ Annual evaluation ranking system has devolved into the bizarre and invites retaliation and favoritism. For example, an annual judgment of “*meets expectations*” is subjective in what constitutes ‘*meets*’ but also is subjective in what constitutes ‘*expectations*.’ Furthermore, ‘*expectations*’ seem to vary at the whim of the evaluator. Lastly, weighting of the relative contributions of *teaching*, *research/creative activity*, and *service* in the annual evaluation rank appears to be *Delehanty: ISU Faculty Ombud Report on Culture of Distrust at ISU April 2022*

4

unmoored from the faculty member’s appointment. In particular, *service* is given exaggerated weight when a faculty member is declared to be “non-collegial” in his or her service because s/he has disagreed with the supervisor on one or more issues. This is a significant generator of mistrust.

□ In-house salary inequity and the subjective basis for merit-based pay raises is seen as unfair. Faculty ‘liked’ by their chair or dean get merit pay raises while ‘troublemakers’ with equal professional success get passed over.

□ Here is one quote that encapsulates frustration expressed by pre-tenure faculty members who fear retaliation regarding annual performance reviews. There is a “*glaring lack of specificity in the college regarding tenure expectations.*”

Subverting Faculty Representation

□ A recurring problem is pre-screening by chairs, directors, or deans of faculty members who are ‘allowed’ to run for elected committee positions. In other words, faculty do not actually get to decide who represents them. Rather, they only can vote for colleagues an administrator has pre-selected. In this way, faculty do not have true representation on certain college executive committees, for example. This disenfranchises faculty.

□ Department chairs increasingly dictate departmental-level committee appointments without consultation and consent from faculty. In this way, faculty lose the ability to guide departmental direction.

□ Faculty systematically are being excluded from decision-making on faculty hiring. This is a fundamental violation of faculty prerogative. Departmental faculty are being expressly told they do not have a say in who chairs a departmental faculty search committee, who populates the search committee, what candidates are invited for campus interviews, and even are told that they may not participate in ranking the interviewed candidates. In some cases, candidate’s CV or candidate’s statements are withheld from the departmental faculty. Gallingly, departmental faculty later are asked to support, review, and mentor new faculty members improperly brought into their department under these secretive processes.

□ Here is one quote that encapsulates a commonly heard complaint from faculty regarding overall disenfranchisement when providing their views on departmental matters. “*I have learned from experience that [my] thoughts and concerns will be treated respectfully but will not be given any meaningful consideration. This includes suggestions about hiring*



FACULTY SENATE 2021-2022

decisions, curriculum assignments, strategic priorities of the department, ways of improving student experience, and ways to improve support for research. I maintain significant concerns in all of these areas.”

“Weaponizing” lecturers to dilute the influence of regular faculty.

Without the support of tenure/tenure track faculty, lecturers who may not have terminal degrees and who are subject to ‘right-to-work’ non-renewal (firing), are given influential appointments where any non-preferred actions expose them to retaliatory firing. This *Delehanty: ISU Faculty Ombud Report on Culture of Distrust at ISU April 2022*

5

system overrides one purpose of tenure which is to allow faculty influence without fear of retaliation.

Secretive and Authoritarian Administration

ISU has chosen an authoritarian, top-down administrative model. This model contradicts the concept that faculty are vested in determining university direction and have expertise that should inform policy.

Faculty from multiple departments report that favored faculty members are given undue opportunity to influence decision-making while non-favored faculty members are excluded.

Some faculty report pervasive denigration by their chairs or deans

Absence of Administrative Accountability

Administration regularly disregards policy and procedure when convenient

○ Example: The Division of Health Sciences decided, unilaterally, to deny faculty timely evaluation of their deans. This has deeply angered DHS faculty, is objectively unfair, and contradicts policy.

○ Example: Chick-Fil-A, a controversial enterprise in the eyes of many due to its history of social intolerance, was controversially selected to be brought to campus.

Soon after, the Dean of the College of Business appeared on national commercials as an advocate for the company. Faculty see this as an example of actual or apparent disregard for conflict of interest policy. What is acceptable for administrators would be condemned if done by faculty.

Administrators are alleged to hire friends, including girlfriends, into positions under their supervision.

A VP culpable in the failure to ameliorate the circumstances of a victim of sexual harassment remains in his supervisory position.

Faculty members report college governance based on, “*cronyism, deceit, personal loyalty and blatant favoritism*” without restraint or admonition from the Provost.

Pressuring Retirements or Departures

Senior faculty or faculty disliked by deans or chairs are pressured to retire by giving them unfavorable annual evaluations and assigning them prohibitively difficult teaching schedules. There are many allegations of this have been reported to me that appear to be



FACULTY SENATE 2021-2022

substantiated. However, this report is the wrong venue for identifying individual faculty members and administrators by name.

Delehanty: ISU Faculty Ombud Report on Culture of Distrust at ISU April 2022

6

Administration Seen as Unstable and Out of Touch

□ Substantial administrative turnover is feared to signal deeply rooted dysfunction. To be clear, faculty welcomed the departure of a suite of upper administrators from the previous administration and praised President Satterlee for ‘cleaning house.’ The concern is that the current administration now appears to be unstable. Faculty worry, is there something fundamentally wrong such that people do not want to work at ISU? This means that faculty do not have full faith in decisions or understandings formed with current administrators. They soon will no longer occupy that position. Some examples raised by faculty:

- Multiple VPs named by President Satterlee already have left their new positions.
- Two Interim VPs are yet to be replaced (though replacements likely on horizon).
- Both Registrars recently left ISU, seemingly abruptly.
- High level of turnover noted in the CoSE dean's staff.

Human Resources is Seen as Untrustworthy and No Friend of the Faculty

- HR endorses seemingly unlawful restrictions on faculty service-related speech issued by university administration (chairs, directors, deans).
- HR endorses unsupported claims of ‘non-collegiality’ on annual evaluations by informing faculty members that they must reform their purported non-collegiality.
- HR does not post information to inform potential faculty complainants of the Human Rights Commission (HRC) 180-day deadline to submit complaints regarding harassment and discrimination. One result is that ISU complainants unwittingly miss the deadline to file complaints.

Poor Prioritization of University Resources

- Resources seem to be focused on non-academic endeavors while the academic need remains unmet. Examples:
 - \$11 million Alumni Center.
 - \$7 million soccer/track field renovation.
 - \$1 million rebranding campaign.
 - Direction of the development effort does not adequately prioritize academics.
- Space and renovation allocation - two moves and re-modellings of the COSE dean’s office while the Biology Building remains dilapidated. Physics space substantially reduced in the process.
- Faculty were furloughed while ISU was hiring new faculty.
- Idaho Falls Polytechnic School is debacle. Virtually nonexistent outreach to students. Unclear if enrollment actually happening. Faculty hired without consulting the existing faculty. Despite years of support, little or no evidence of ‘product.’



FACULTY SENATE 2021-2022

Delehanty: ISU Faculty Ombud Report on Culture of Distrust at ISU April 2022

7

Issues that Continue to Fester

The RISE fiasco was covered up by the current administration, which inherited the mess.

This means that there was no public accountability. This continues to be seen as unfair to the ISU community and signals secretiveness. It does not engender trust in faculty when administration claims to be transparent.

Critical Race Theory. University presidents, including President Satterlee, did not publicly stand up for faculty an academic freedom in a prominent way.

This list portrays a sour environment at ISU, at least as seen by faculty, and one in great need of reform. Undoubtedly, this report will anger some and their reaction may be one of denial, denigration, and condemnation. Others who already are angry and frustrated may take glee in the harshness of this report. These kinds of reactions will not be helpful. ISU is a diminished institution, currently far from achieving its potential, but has substantial unrealized potential. The simple fact that administration and faculty want to engage in serious dialogue for improvement is a sign progress and reason for hope. This report is not the final word. It is a starting point.