

IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES

VOLUME XXVII, MEMO 5

Monday, October 29, 2007

4:00 p.m.

Faculty Senate Conference Room, REND 301

In Attendance: Doug Nilson (proxy for Adler), Beard, Bowen, Campbell, Cellucci, Crews (telecommunication), Curtis, De Jesus (sabbatical replacement), Delehanty, Dye, Edwards, Frantz, Kangas, Kantabutra, Kearns, Keeter, Manopoulos, Masserini (Chair), Moulton, Murphy, Norman, Sieber, Smith, Thomas, Vik, Womack

Non-voting: Attebery, Carpenter, Fullerton, Layman (Work Study Assistant), Wallace (Recording Secretary)

Excused: Guryan, Oliphant, Payne

Absent: Wilson; Brown, Vailas, Wharton

I. Preliminaries and Announcements

Masserini opened the meeting and welcomed everyone.

The **Fall General Assembly** is scheduled for November 15, 2007 from 3:30-5:00 p.m. in the Student Union Building Theatre. A **Faculty Party** has been tentatively set for December 6, 2007 in the Rotunda of the Performing Arts Center from 5:30-7:30 p.m. in recognition of the hard work Faculty do. It is also a chance for them to meet and talk with their Senators, and voice their concerns. Senators were urged to help get the word out to their constituents about both these events.

The **Faculty Senate website** is still experiencing technical difficulties; the problems are being worked on and should be fixed soon.

Masserini recently attended a meeting of **ICHEF, the Idaho Council of Higher Education Faculty** from the colleges and universities in Idaho. In talking with the other Faculty Senate Chairs, it became clear that ISU's Faculty Senate and Faculty really are leaders in the State and are doing very good work. The other Chairs were taking notes on what ISU's Faculty have been up to.

Be patient, everyone. The infrastructure needs work, but things truly are getting done – albeit slowly. We are trying to follow up and make sure things don't fall through the cracks.

A. Faculty representatives needed for:

1. **Diversity Center Advisory Board**

Norman reported that as a result of the Diversity Task Force's efforts last year, there will be a new Diversity Center located above the Early Learning Center which will house both the Student and Faculty/Staff branches of the Diversity Center. The Advisory Board has a vacancy for a Faculty representative who has experience and background in diversity issues. Senators were asked to talk to their constituents and forward names of any volunteers to the Faculty Senate office for consideration in the next Senate meeting.

II. Consent Calendar

A. Faculty Senate Minutes

- a. Minutes of October 1, 2007
- b. Minutes of October 15, 2007

- B. Minutes from Councils
 - 1. **Research Coordinating Council – pulled from Consent Calendar for clarification**
 - a. Minutes of September 20, 2007
 - 2. **Campus Planning Council**
 - a. Minutes of September 26, 2007
 - b. Minutes of October 10, 2007
 - c. new Charge for 2007-08
 - 3. **Curriculum Council**
 - a. Minutes of October 4, 2007
 - b. Minutes of October 11, 2007
 - i. **Bachelor of Applied Technology Committee**
 - 1. Minutes from April 24, 2006
 - ii. Bachelor of Applied Science – Catalog revision 2007
- C. Honorary Degrees – new language added
- D. Faculty Appointments to Councils
 - 2. **Curriculum Council** (every Thursday from 3-5, starting in October)
 - a. College of Arts & Sciences (Social Sciences) **(1-year replacement term) nomination for Rick Holmer**
 - b. Health Professions – *no nominations*

ACTION: De Jesus **moved to approve** the Consent Calendar with the exception of the Research Coordinating Council Minutes, seconded by Frantz. **Passed** unanimously. **Rick Holmer was appointed** to the Curriculum Council as nominated.

Consent Calendar Items Pulled

B.1. Research Coordinating Council

- a. Minutes of September 20, 2007

There was a question regarding the estimates of monies available to the internal grant committees on page 4 of the Minutes. Beard suggested approving the minutes then sending a request to Research Coordinating Council asking for clarification.

ACTION: Moulton **moved to approve** the Research Coordinating Council Minutes, seconded by Sieber. **Passed** unanimously. **Masserini will request clarification from RCC regarding the financial estimates.**

III. Unfinished Business

- A. Faculty Staff Handbook Change – **Part 4, Section III.A Academic Rank** (Recommendation from Faculty Professional Policies Council)

Masserini has received feedback from faculty expressing concern that “Master’s Degree” alone is not sufficient in formulating a university-wide policy that is still flexible enough to cover varying Departmental requirements. Beard agreed that there is no way to articulate all the acceptable degrees for each Department. Curtis reminded that the College of Technology is different than the rest of the University in that there is no defined way for someone with a Professional Technical degree to move into the Academic side in terms of promotion, even though their teaching responsibilities might put them in that classification. The monies come from different sources, which complicates matters. The College of Technology wants to make sure there is some provision for promotions for those folks.

Several Senators were concerned about Accreditation requirements, both for individual Departments and Programs, and for the University as a whole. There should be some language in the policy that addresses a requirement for accredited and/or

recognized degrees as opposed to non-accredited degrees. After some discussion, the Senators agreed that the issue should be **remanded back to Faculty Professional Policies Council to refine the policy's language** to address these concerns.

B. University-wide Tenure and Promotion Task Force Composition and Charge

Item #1: Composition of the Task Force

There was some discussion about the merits of requiring Task Force members be full, tenured professors immune to repercussions as opposed to the possibility of continuing the “old-boy network”. It was pointed out that College of Technology Faculty are not eligible for tenure, only promotion. Clinical, Library and Research Faculty should be considered as well. There needs to be a balance that protects the interests of younger faculty while also protecting the interests of the Academy. All documents related to tenure and promotion from all aspects of the University will be reviewed by this committee. The Task Force ideally should:

- Be small enough to be efficient and effective
- Consist of trusted, well-qualified and respected scholars
- Have tenured faculty reviewing tenure procedures and criteria

ACTION: Moved by Thomas and seconded by Beard to **approve the Composition and Charge of the Tenure and Promotion Review Task Force document as-is**, then tweak the language later. (No vote taken yet.)

ACTION: Frantz moved to amend the motion to **add one Library and one Clinical faculty representative** to the Task Force's membership. Seconded by Kangas. De Jesus made a **friendly amendment to separate the Library and Clinical representatives and vote on them separately**. The friendly amendment was **accepted**.

Discussion: Kangas suggested all Faculty be surveyed to make sure all their interests are addressed. Another Senator suggested separating tenure and promotion guidelines from promotion only. Delehanty reminded that the purpose of the Task Force was simply to review all the guidelines to see what they each say and compare the content. De Jesus pointed out that on all the other Councils and committees, the Library is represented.

ACTION: The current **motion on the table** was to **add a Library Representative** to the Task Force. The vote to **pass** the amendment was unanimous.

ACTION: The **motion** now was to **add a Clinical Representative** to the Task Force.

Discussion: Clinical Faculty are quite different and cannot simply be folded into the Academic enclave. Research and Lecture Faculty should be considered as well. However, since all Academic Faculty also conduct research, they understand what is involved and should be qualified to review tenure and promotion guidelines for Research Faculty. Curtis reminded that the Task Force will be simply reading descriptions of criteria, procedures and processes and noting what elements are included or omitted, not making value judgments.

ACTION: Beard made a **motion to amend to add Research Faculty, Adjunct Faculty and Lecturer representatives** to the Task Force. Seconded by Keeter. Bowen made a **friendly amendment** to take out Adjunct Faculty since they are by

description part of the Academic Faculty. The friendly amendment to **strike Adjunct Faculty** was accepted.

ACTION: The **amended motion** now on the table was to **add Research and Lecturer representatives to the Task Force**. The vote was 8 for and 12 against, with 3 abstentions; the motion **failed**.

ACTION: Now back to the **original motion** to **add Clinical Faculty** to the Tenure and Promotion Task Force: the vote was 12 for and 11 against. The **motion carried**.

Final result: The document **will be revised** to include **one Clinical Faculty representative and one Library Faculty representative** on the Task Force.

Item #2: Obtaining copies of the Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

ACTION: Beard made a **friendly amendment** to **add “State Board and appropriate accrediting bodies”** at the end of the sentence. Thomas agreed to the friendly amendment; it **passed** unanimously.

Bowen pointed out that not all units grant tenure, so **“and”** should be **changed** to **“and/or”** throughout the document. **This oversight will be corrected**.

Item #3: Guidelines contain clear, fair and appropriate policy, procedures and criteria for Tenure and Promotion.

Kangas expressed concern about using “fair and appropriate” because that involves making value judgments instead of simply reviewing.

ACTION: Dye **moved to strike “fair and appropriate”**. Seconded by Curtis.

Discussion: Manopoulos was concerned that striking “fair” eliminates the whole purpose of the Task Force. De Jesus made a **friendly amendment** to **substitute “complete”** in place of “fair and appropriate”.

ACTION: Kearns moved to **call the question on Item #3**, seconded by De Jesus. Senators **voted in favor** of calling the question.

ACTION: The **motion now under consideration** was read back: “...ascertain whether there are **clear and complete** policy, procedures and merit-based criteria for Tenure and Promotion.” The vote was 21 for, 2 against, no abstentions. The motion **passed**.

Item #4: Policy elements

Bowen suggested re-writing Items #4 thru #6 to review whether the guidelines are fair, reasonable and based on peer-reviewed recommendations. De Jesus wants clarification on the word “stand” in order to make it more explicit.

ACTION: Kearns made a **friendly amendment**, seconded by Nilson, to **change “stand” to “apply”**. The amendment **passed** with 1 “no” vote and no abstentions.

Item #5: Merit-based criteria elements

Kangas argued c) is unnecessary, since it again involves value judgments and is essentially covered in a) and b).

ACTION: Kangas made a **friendly amendment to strike c) altogether**. Other Senators disagreed because there have to be some expectations as to what the guidelines should contain. Thomas **rejected** the amendment to **strike c)** but would **accept** an amendment to **remove a)**. Seconded by Sieber.

Discussion: De Jesus suggested “are the guidelines consistent with State or other Universities’ standards” to address the issue of appropriateness in a more formal sense. Kangas didn’t want to strike a) because it contains the word “clear”, which should stay. Delehanty clarified that the use of the word “appropriate”, which apparently is rather threatening to some, was chosen in light of the heavy teaching load and fewer resources that ISU faculty have that is not shared by faculty at other universities.

ACTION: Kangas **moved to reinstate a) and strike c)**; seconded by De Jesus.

Discussion: Bowen suggested changing “appropriate” to “reasonable” and keep “clear” somewhere in the document. Kangas still concerned that any university-wide review of guidelines is too broad for making any judgments; faculty input should be considered.

Masserini **put the question** to vote on the **motion to reinstate a) and strike c)**. The motion **passed**. The document was re-read without a).

ACTION: De Jesus suggested a **friendly amendment** substituting “clear and reasonable” for “appropriate” in #5 c). Thomas and Delehanty accepted the friendly amendment.

Masserini **put the question**; the vote was taken and the amendment **carried**.

ACTION: Kangas **moved to insert a statement** after #3 (thereby changing the numbering) to the effect that “**the Task Force will survey Faculty input relative to tenure and promotion.**” Bowen seconded.

Discussion: One Senator was wary of specifying how the Task Force should conduct the survey. De Jesus suggested the Faculty Senate conduct the survey instead of asking the Task Force to take on such an additional burden. Masserini advocated the Task Force gather their information first, then the Faculty Senate can decide what the next step should be. Faculty input about the guidelines (e.g., how well known they are, whether written and approved by the Faculty members affected by them, and other such issues) are very important to determining how effective the guidelines are. An important point not brought up until now is that the Tenure and Promotion Guidelines should all be faculty-approved. Another issue is what kinds of questions should be on the survey? It is important to remember that procedures can be changed. Bowen mentioned that the spirit of the motion on the table is to make sure all faculty members have a chance to comment on the guidelines that govern their tenure and promotion opportunities. The Task Force should be left to decide how best to get faculty input. A **friendly amendment** to change the motion’s wording to “solicit faculty input” was **accepted**.

ACTION: Masserini **called the question**. The motion to insert the above statement was **passed** (with 3 against and 2 abstentions). The **statement regarding soliciting faculty input will be inserted as a new Item #3** and the subsequent Items will be renumbered accordingly.

ACTION: Kangas **moved to table** the rest of the document until next time; seconded by De Jesus. The motion **carried**.

C. Senate Goals 2007-2008 (handout) – *not discussed*

IV. New Business

A. Salary Schedule -- *not discussed; carry forward to future Agenda*

Motion: (to be considered and discussed)

“Charge FPPC to research the use and implementation of salary schedules for Faculty among other universities. FPPC will then produce a suggested salary schedule for the Faculty at Idaho State University that will be presented to the Faculty Senate and the Administration.”

There was no discussion on Senate Goals or the Salary Schedule issue. They were deferred until later.

Adjournment: 6:05 p.m.

The next Faculty Senate meeting is scheduled for **November 12, 2007** at 4:00 p.m.

Dr. John Masserini, Chair

Catherine Wallace,
Administrative Assistant I

Approved by Faculty Senate: December 3, 2007

Documents:

Faculty Senate Minutes of October 1, 2007
Faculty Senate Minutes of October 15, 2007
Campus Planning Council Minutes of September 26, 2007
Campus Planning Council Minutes of October 10, 2007
New Charge to Campus Planning Council for 2007-08
Curriculum Council Minutes of October 4, 2007
Curriculum Council Minutes of October 11, 2007
Bachelor of Applied Technology Committee Minutes of April 24, 2007
Bachelor of Applied Science Catalog revision 2007
Faculty/Staff Handbook revision -- Honorary Degree Criteria (revised)
Research Coordinating Council Minutes of September 20, 2007
Composition and Charge of Tenure and Promotion Review Task Force, Items #1 thru #5