

IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE  
MINUTES

VOLUME XXVII, MEMO 4

October 15, 2007

4:00 PM

Faculty Senate Conference Room, REND 301

In Attendance: Nilson (proxy for Adler), Beard, Bowen, Campbell, Cellucci, Crews (telecommunication), Curtis, De Jesus (sabbatical replacement), Delehanty, Dye, Frantz, Guryan (telecommunication), Kangas, Kantabutra, Kearns, Keeter, Manopoulos, Masserini (Chair), Moulton, Murphy, Norman, Oliphant (telecommunication), Payne, Sieber, Smith, Thomas, Wilson,  
Non-voting: Carpenter, Fullerton, Wallace (Recording Secretary), Layman (Work Study Assistant)  
Excused: Attebery, Vik  
Absent: Edwards, Womack; Brown, Vailas, Wharton  
Guest: Adamcik from Provost/V.P. Academic Affairs office

**I. Preliminaries and Announcements**

Masserini introduced and welcomed the new Faculty Senate work study student, Ben Layman.

A. Website update - Chair Announcements link

There is a new link on the Faculty Senate website for the Senate Chair to post updates, announcements, pertinent public information and documents for Senators and others to read. Masserini has already started using this link; Senators are encouraged to visit the site and read the information posted there.

B. Faculty/Staff Handbook change – non-existent, obsolete “Handbook Committee” dissolved

In a recent President’s Cabinet meeting, Masserini brought attention to the fact that the “Handbook Committee” referenced in the Handbook no longer exists, and some of the members listed were long gone from the University. The members of the Committee were supposed to be hand-picked by the University President; Dr. Vailas expressed his disinclination to pick committee members. The Administration’s response to Masserini’s suggested process was favorable, and will likely be implemented. The obsolete “Handbook Committee” was officially dissolved.

**II. Consent Calendar**

A. *Faculty Senate Minutes – pulled from Consent Calendar, incomplete*

1. Minutes of October 1, 2007 are not quite finished; the draft will be completed this week and posted to the Senate website for Senators to review.

B. Minutes from Councils

1. *Campus Planning Council – pulled from Consent Calendar for discussion*

a. Minutes of September 26, 2007

2. *Cultural Affairs Council*

a. Minutes of August 23, 2007

C. *Faculty Appointments to Councils – pulled from Consent Calendar for discussion*

1. Health Professions representative for Research Coordinating Council  
(brief biographical information attached)

**nomination for Galen Louis, Health & Nutrition Sciences (Boise)**

**nomination for Jeff Housman, Health & Nutrition Sciences (Pocatello)**

**nomination for Deana Molinari, School of Nursing (Pocatello)**

2. Curriculum Council (every Thursday from 3-5, starting in October)-
  - a. Health Professions – *no nominations, carry forward to next meeting*
- D. Student Conduct Board (Judicial Board) faculty member appointment – pulled from Consent Calendar for discussion
  - 3-year term – **nomination for Tina Mladenka**, School of Nursing  
added new **nomination for Albert Tay**, College of Business
- E. Faculty/Staff Handbook Change – pulled from Consent Calendar for further discussion
  - Part 4, Section III.A Academic Rank** – Recommendation by Faculty Professional Policies Council
- F. Revised Bylaws – Research Coordinating Council

**ACTION:** Smith moved to **approve** the two items remaining on the Consent Calendar: the **Cultural Affairs Council Minutes** of August 23, 2007 and the **Revised Bylaws** for the Research Coordinating Council. Seconded by Keeter. The **motion passed** unanimously.

### Consent Calendar Items Pulled

#### B.1. Campus Planning Council Minutes of September 26, 2007

There was a question about the flow chart and tracking forms referenced in Section I.B. of the Council minutes. Bowen, who is the Chair and Senate Representative for the Campus Planning Council, clarified that those forms were part of the ongoing process of tightening up how action items are tracked through the University's administrative steps towards implementation. This process is in the spirit of facilitating more openness and communication among the various entities on campus.

**ACTION:** Beard moved to **approve** the **Campus Planning Council Minutes**, seconded by Frantz. The **motion passed** unanimously.

#### C. Faculty Appointments to Councils

1. Health Professions representative for Research Coordinating Council
  - nomination for Galen Louis**, Health & Nutrition Sciences (Boise)
  - nomination for Jeff Housman**, Health & Nutrition Sciences (Pocatello)
  - nomination for Deana Molinari**, School of Nursing (Pocatello)

Several Senators spoke up on behalf of each of the candidates, commending their individual character, accomplishments, and commitment to research and the University as a whole. Votes were cast and counted for each of the candidates, with Galen Lewis garnering the most votes.

**ACTION:** A motion was made by Bowen and seconded by Smith to **appoint Galen Lewis** as the College of Health Professions representative on the **Research Coordinating Council**. The **motion passed** unanimously. A letter of appointment will be sent out this week.

#### D. Student Conduct Board (Judicial Board) faculty member appointment

- 3-year term – **nomination for Tina Mladenka**, School of Nursing  
**nomination for Albert Tay**, College of Business

A couple of Senators spoke in support of each candidate. Jim Fullerton, who is on the Judicial Board, reminded Senators that Mladenka and Edwards were the original two nominees carried over from the last Senate meeting. The Board needed one representative from the academic Faculty, and one representative from the College of Technology. Edwards has filled the College of Technology seat, so only one Senate

appointee is needed. Mladenka, as the appointee-apparent, has already attended two of the Student Conduct Board meetings. The Senators voted on the two nominees, and Mladenka received a majority of the votes.

**ACTION:** Frantz moved to **appoint Tina Mladenka** as this year's Faculty representative to the **Student Conduct Board**, seconded by Nilson. The motion was **passed**. A letter will be sent to Mladenka informing her of the appointment.

E. Faculty/Staff Handbook Change

**Part 4, Section III.A Academic Rank** – Recommendation by Faculty Professional Policies Council

Some Senators were not comfortable with the proposed changes in criteria for the academic rankings, especially if the changes involve losing the distinction between upper level academic college degrees and professional degrees. There was also some concern about possible implications that have not yet been fully considered. There are a plethora of Master's and Doctorate degrees, depending on the field and area of study – which ones are acceptable and for which disciplines? One Senator pointed out that the original charge to the Faculty Professional Policies Council came at the request of the College of Technology, which is not affected by the section of the Handbook that is currently in question. Payne sits on the FPPC and clarified that the Council's recommendation is an attempt to reconcile official policy with actual current hiring and ranking practices. A couple of Senators suggested collecting reactions and input from faculty constituents before remanding this issue back to FPPC.

**ACTION:** Sieber made a motion to **table the issue for now**, Norman seconded the motion.

Discussion: A synopsis of Senators' concerns that could be taken back to constituents would be helpful. It also might be useful to explore changing the language in *Parts 2.c Special Instructional Faculty* and/or *2.d Exceptions* instead in addressing this issue.

A vote was taken on the motion to **table** this Handbook change recommendation. It **passed** unanimously and **the recommendation was tabled**.

### III. Unfinished Business

A. University-wide Tenure and Promotion procedures

Delehanty updated Senators about last Monday's Executive Committee meeting with Dr. Barbara Adamcik from the Provost's office. The discussion centered around the problems Adamcik has encountered with tenure and promotion applications and procedures. The Executive Committee formed the opinion that a better approach to solving the problem would be to start at the beginning of the tenure and promotion process rather than at the end. The Committee recommends forming a temporary Task Force to do a one-time examination of every Department and College's written Tenure and Promotion policies. This would identify discrepancies and problems that need rectifying as well as ensure that newer faculty know exactly what is expected of them before they become eligible for promotion or tenure.

Ideally, every Department has written Tenure and Promotion procedures that have been approved by its Faculty, and every College has written procedures that have also been approved by its Faculty members. Having faculty involved in writing and approving the procedures ensures the necessary flexibility of criteria between disciplines, while also disallowing certain practices and abuses that have recently come to light. Adherence to these faculty-approved written policies and procedures would help ensure that all tenure and promotion applications are thoroughly vetted by the time they reach the Provost's office.

Dr. Adamcik then addressed the Senators. She emphasized that this issue had come to the attention of the Provost's office and Administration precisely because of the evident lack of equity, fairness, and quality control they encountered while going through the applications received. She estimated that 10% of the portfolios were questionable in regards to equity and fairness, yet each had been signed off by their respective Colleges. There were even a couple of cases where no portfolio had been submitted, only a letter recommending the change in status be granted. She agreed that many of the problems could be eliminated by measures taken at the Department and College level, but a general University-wide policy regarding minimum guidelines on the process, procedures and criteria that all Departments and Colleges adhere to would help ensure the equity and fairness that is currently lacking. It would also give the Administration better guidance in deciding which applications did not meet the minimum criteria established by the Faculty at the relevant College or Department.

Some Senators pointed out that there are discrepancies in how promotion and tenure committees are formed: in some cases the entire committee is appointed by the Department Chair, in some only the committee chair is appointed, and in some others, the committee is selected by the faculty member in question. Some require outside reviewers, some do not. It was also pointed out that not all Department or College policies have been approved by the faculty members affected by them.

Other Senators cautioned that achieving uniformity and consistency in policies will be difficult because of the disparate nature of the disciplines themselves. There was some disagreement as to whether the Faculty/Staff Handbook already specifies a general policy regarding tenure and promotion; that can be independently verified. Handbook changes can certainly be made if necessary. There was concern that any attempt to create a general policy would undermine some Colleges' own recent efforts to review, update and revamp their procedures, some in accordance with rigorous accreditation standards.

Some discussion focused on the role of the Administration. Administration has the power to have Departments and Colleges create written policies and procedures if none exist, or to revise inadequacies in existing ones. If the Administration is not doing their part, no amount of effort on the part of Faculty will have any effect. A few Senators emphasized that the Administration bears responsibility for ensuring that promotion and/or tenure is granted when shown to be warranted and not granted when undeserved. Others pointed out it is the Faculty's responsibility to make sure the process involved is fair. That responsibility cannot and should not be delegated or shirked. The Administration is asking the Faculty Senate for help. By working together, the problems can be resolved to the satisfaction of all parties. Unlike in prior years, Faculty is now being given an opportunity to help fix a problem many of them know exists.

Masserini reminded that the Senate only needs to decide whether a limited-term Task Force be formed to handle the issue; the details can be hammered out later.

**ACTION:** De Jesus made a motion to form a limited term task force that would oversee the Promotion and Tenure guidelines and procedures for the three tiers: University, College and Departments. Sieber seconded the motion. A **friendly amendment to change "oversee" to "examine"** was accepted.

Discussion: Some Senators were concerned about who would be on the task force and how much power they would wield. The Faculty Professional Policies Council will likely be involved in this project. However, it is up to the Senate to decide exactly what should be done and give some guidance towards accomplishing those goals to the Councils or Task Force members that are assigned to work on the project. It was clarified that "limited term" means that once the examination of the procedures and guidelines is finished, the task force would be dissolved. It is likely that those Departments who have already had their Faculty review and revamp their Promotion and Tenure guidelines will not have to do anything

further. It is the Departments that have not gone through this process that will need to do so, and the departmental Faculty members themselves are best qualified to judge what Promotion and Tenure criteria are appropriate for their particular field. It was reiterated that the purpose of reviewing the written policy, process and criteria of each College and Department was to ensure fairness for all Faculty campus-wide.

Another **friendly amendment** to have **the Task Force report to the Faculty Senate** was made and accepted. The **amended motion** in question was “to form a limited term Task Force that would examine the Promotion and Tenure guidelines and procedures for the three tiers: University, College and Departments. This Task force would report to the Faculty Senate.”

Discussion: Consistency of process is under consideration here, but not consistency of standards. The purview of the Task Force would be to make sure each Department’s and College’s written Promotion and Tenure guidelines address three specific elements: *policy*, *procedure* and *criteria*. The Task Force would have limited authority and would report its findings to the Faculty Senate.

**ACTION:** Manopoulos moved and Bowen seconded to **add the amendment “examine and make recommendations.”**

Discussion: Several Senators were uncomfortable with giving the Task Force any executive power. They were reminded that the Task Force will report back to the Faculty Senate and any recommendations would have to be approved by the Senate before any action could be taken.

Masserini called the question on the amendment for the Task Force to make recommendations to the Senate. The **amendment passed** with 11 for, 10 against and 1 abstention.

**ACTION:** The **motion as amended** was reread: “to form a limited term Task Force that would examine and make recommendations regarding the Promotion and Tenure guidelines and procedures for the three tiers: University, College and Departments. This Task Force would report to the Faculty Senate.” The vote was 21 for, 1 against and no abstentions; **the motion passed.**

B. Senate Goals 2007-2008 (handout)

*skipped - no discussion about goals, deferred until next Senate meeting*

**IV. New Business**

A. Ombudsperson under purview of Faculty Senate

The Ombudsperson is appointed by the Faculty Senate to handle Faculty concerns. In practice the current Ombudsman, John Gribas, reports to the Faculty Senate; however, in the Faculty/Staff Handbook it states he reports to the President. Masserini has talked to both Gribas and President Vailas and they agree the Handbook should be changed to reflect current practice. In response to a request for clarification on what it means to “report” to the Senate, Masserini clarified that the Faculty Senate selects the Ombudsperson, but does not directly “supervise” his or her activities. The Ombudsperson submits an annual report that is posted on the Senate website that summarizes the types of cases and approximate caseload dealt with by the Ombudsperson over the past year. Specific details are not given in the report due to the confidential nature of the Ombudsperson’s role.

Masserini and Gribas will work on revising the Handbook and will bring them to the Senate for consideration during the next meeting.

**Adjournment:** 5:58 p.m.

The next Faculty Senate meeting is scheduled for October 29, 2007.

---

Dr. John Masserini, Chair

---

Catherine Wallace,  
Administrative Assistant 1

Approved by Faculty Senate: October 29, 2007

Documents:

Cultural Affairs Council Minutes of August 23, 2007

Campus Planning Council Minutes of September 26, 2007

Research Coordinating Council revised Bylaws