

IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES

VOLUME XXVII, MEMO 6

Monday, November 12, 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, Cindy Seiger (proxy for Dye), Edwards, Frantz, Guryan, Kangas, Kantabutra, Kearns, Keeter, Manopoulos, Masserini (Chair), Moulton, Murphy, Norman, Oliphant, Payne, Sieber, Smith, Thomas, Vik, Womack
Non-voting: Attebery, Carpenter, Fullerton, Layman (Work Study Assistant), Wallace (Recording Secretary)
Absent: Wilson; Brown, Vailas, Wharton

I. Preliminaries and Announcements

Masserini opened the meeting and updated Senators on several items from previous meetings.

Research Coordinating Council grant money

Deb Easterly agreed to have the RCC minutes more accurately reflect available funds for grant proposals. There are times where they do not know how much money they will have, but that will be made more clear as well.

Curriculum Council NOIs

The NOI process is being addressed and tightened up by cooperative efforts among Academic Affairs, Curriculum Council and the Faculty Senate office.

WebCT issue

Masserini contacted Alex Urfer who relayed they had gone ahead with the transition because all support of WebCT will stop in June 2008. He understands that ISU simply cannot support two platforms and reported that Randy Gaines' office was being very supportive and putting in lots of hours helping them iron out difficulties.

Daycare for Faculty Members' Children

ISU is exploring forming a cooperative with PMC, AMIS and Farm Bureau Insurance. Dyer Hall is being considered as a possible location because it could potentially accommodate 100-150 students. The Campus Architect will review the building and come up with a design.

Faculty Party

The original purpose behind the idea was to help unify the Faculty and get together without any motive other than to enjoy themselves. The problem is in funding such an event. Although the Faculty Senate Materials & Supplies budget has a little more money than usual this year, being State funds it cannot be used to throw a party.

There is some money available in a Local Account that could be used; Masserini presented the idea for Senators to decide what they want to do. Most were **not in favor** of this particular party, though open to planning ahead for future parties, including maybe starting a new fund for such purposes. There will be **no Faculty party** this holiday season.

II. Consent Calendar

A. Minutes from Councils

1. **Athletics Advisory Board – for information only**

a. Minutes of September 13, 2007

2. **Cultural Affairs Council**

a. Minutes of October 11, 2007

3. **Curriculum Council**

a. Minutes of October 18, 2007

b. Minutes of October 25, 2007

c. **NOI 2007-COT-07** plus Attachments for AAS degree in Marketing & Management Technology

d. **NOI 2007-A&S-002** for Military Minor

4. **University Library Committee – pulled from Consent Calendar**

(as part of Curriculum Council Minutes 10/18/07)

a. Minutes for 2006-2007 (8 sets)

b. Library Budget Summary FY2007-08

B. Faculty Appointments to Councils

1. Diversity Center Advisory Board

nomination for Laura Woodworth-Ney, Dept. of History Chair

2. **Curriculum Council** (every Thursday from 3-5, starting in October)

Health Professions – **nomination for Mel Miller**, Audiology (in Boise)

C. **Honorary Degree Criteria** – final version

ACTION: Bowen **moved to approve** the remainder of Consent Calendar, seconded by Moulton. **Passed** unanimously. **Laura Woodworth-Ney and Mel Miller were appointed** as nominated.

Point of order (from Roberts Rules of Order)

Masserini reported that he spent a couple of hours reading Roberts Rules of Order and realized that the Senate had been handling amendments to motions incorrectly. The motion is made and seconded. Any **grammatical or wordsmithing changes should be made at this time**. The Chair then states the question. Once the question is stated, the ownership of the motion transfers to the body, and is no longer under the control of the original mover or second. **Friendly amendments are treated the same as regular amendments and are voted upon**. The amendment can be amended **once**, but no more. Amendments should be well thought out and stated clearly. Once the amendment is seconded, it cannot be changed. However, **for today only** on the Tenure and Promotion document to keep things moving, minor grammar and punctuation changes can be emailed to Masserini after the meeting. The debate should stick to substantive issues.

Consent Calendar Items Pulled

B. 4. University Library Committee

(as part of Curriculum Council Minutes 10/18/07)

a. Minutes for 2006-2007 (8 sets)

b. Library Budget Summary FY2007-08

ACTION: Bowen **moved to table** the minutes until the next meeting to give Senators more time to consider them. There are a lot of budget and journal cuts included that could be important and should not be lightly skimmed. Seconded by Beard.

Discussion: Kantabutra was Chair of that Committee last year and would like feedback about what could be done to help the Library. Bowen suggested more active support for the Library might be warranted, especially in light of ISU's increased emphasis on research. De Jesus reminded that the Faculty Senate Chair and Vice Chair are key members of the Budget

Planning Committee. The Senate has the potential to have a substantial impact on the committee's decisions. Senators recognize these issues are not pertinent to approving or not approving the ULC Minutes, but serve to open further discussion later.

Keeter asked for clarification about the results of the proposed reallocation of indirect costs. Kearns answered that the increase did not happen, but is once again on the table for discussion. The current increase is 2%, with a possible increase to 5%.

Masserini redirected and **put the question**. The vote was 20 for, 4 against, no abstentions. The motion **passed**; the minutes were **tabled until the next meeting**.

III. Unfinished Business

A. University-wide Tenure and Promotion Task Force Charge (as revised during last meeting October 29, 2007)

ACTION: Norman made a **motion to approve the current document** related to the Composition and Charge of the Tenure and/or Promotion Task Force; seconded by Thomas. Masserini stated the question, then clarified that all the changes made and approved during the last meeting have been incorporated into the current document Senators have before them.

Discussion: Payne noted that there is no timeline specified for when applications and materials for tenure and/or promotion are due. De Jesus pointed out that would be part of the Task Force's job.

ACTION: Payne **moved to amend Item #7 a)** to read: "...material and information (including appropriate dates and deadlines)..." Seconded by Smith.

Discussion: Beard suggests the dates be flexible and be changed as needed. Crews reminded that the purpose is simply to review the guidelines to make sure they are clear, reasonable and fair. Changes can be made later.

The vote was 21 for, none against and 3 abstentions. The **amendment passed**.

ACTION: The **original motion to approve the document itself** was again under consideration.

Discussion: There was some concern that the document is too quantitative and needs more qualitative language. Suggestions were to add peer review, Faculty autonomy, and a minority report by peers on the review committee to the procedures section. Another issue was whether the document was too detailed and cumbersome to be followed; as well as differences about whether the word "rigorous" should be deleted or kept. Senators were reminded that part of what led Dr. Wharton and Dr. Adamcik to bring this issue to the attention of the Faculty Senate in the first place were concerns that in some cases guidelines were either not rigorous enough, or were not being followed rigorously enough.

Cellucci brought up concerns expressed by the Kasiska College of Health Professions faculty:

- Not happy that Research faculty are excluded from the Task Force
- The Clinical Faculty representative should be from the Health Professions since it has the most Clinical Faculty
- Departments should determine the amount of rigor required, not the Task Force.

Senators' responses were that the Task Force's job was to make sure the guidelines each documented in writing the amount of rigor required for tenure and/or promotion, not to determine the adequacy of the rigor described. Tenured professors are the only ones qualified to review tenure procedures. Clinical Faculty should be represented because their work is too unfamiliar to most professors, whereas research procedures and policies

are not so foreign, even though the workload proportions are different between Academic and Research faculty. The size of the Task Force needs to remain small.

ACTION: Kangas moved to **amend the actual charge** in the document to eliminate Items #5, #6, #7, and #8 altogether, and substitute for #8 “**create a report for the Faculty Senate of results and recommendations**”, then pick up with #9 timeline. Seconded by Smith.

Discussion: Eliminating these Items leaves the Task Force members without enough guidance to do the job Senators are asking them to do. An unofficial version might suffice as guidance without dictating exactly what to look for. The problem the Senate wants to address is whether the existing guidelines are specific enough for new faculty members to know what is expected of them and are the procedures reasonably similar across the university. The criteria and rigor will obviously vary, but the actual procedures should not deviate much from College to College. This is the particular issue Faculty should be concerned about; whether it addresses the problems encountered by the Provost’s Office is not the Senate’s concern at the moment. The Senate needs to trust the Task Force members to do the job asked of them.

ACTION: Thomas moved to amend the amendment to keep Item #8. The **motion died** for lack of a second.

ACTION: The **motion to amend** to eliminate Items #5, #6, #7, #8 and substitute the statement above for #8 was voted upon: 12 for, 15 against. The motion **failed**.

ACTION: Cellucci **moved to amend** to include Items #1 and #2 on the KCHPFAC handout in Item #1 on the Task Force document, and that KCHPFAC Item #3 be included in Item #8 on the Task Force document. Seconded by Bowen.

Discussion: Concern was expressed that Arts & Sciences only will have one representative even though it has more tenure-track faculty than any other College. Clinical Faculty from any College should be able to represent Clinical Faculty in the College of Health Professions; no reason to limit the nominations, if Clinical should be represented at all on a Task Force reviewing tenure guidelines. Clinical Faculty are not eligible for tenure.

The vote was 3 for, and the rest against; the **amendment failed**.

ACTION: Payne moved to amend Item #6 c) to read: “**Is there a process for polling appropriate Departmental faculty non-committee members and what information based on the specific candidate’s credentials is provided to the voters?**” Seconded by Thomas.

No discussion. The vote was 8 for, 10 against. The **amendment failed**.

ACTION: The original **motion to approve the document** was now back on the table.

Discussion: One Senator was against the Task Force entirely as it is more of an Administration problem, and the Faculty should not be burdened by the onerous task being set forth here.

ACTION: Bowen **moved to amend** the motion to **insert the KCHPFAC Item #3** at the end of the first paragraph of the Tenure and/or Promotion document: “The Faculty Senate recognizes and notes that Colleges/Departments determine discipline-specific rigor and define merit.” Nilson seconded.

No discussion. The **amendment passed** with 1 opposed.

ACTION: The **motion to approve** the Composition and Charge of the Tenure and/or Promotion Task Force document as amended above was voted upon.

No discussion. It **passed** with 22 in favor, and 2 against.

IV. **New Business**

A. Salary Schedule

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.”

Background: Masserini reminded that increasing Faculty salaries has been a top priority for the Senate for several years. Approaching the Administration with a tangible plan of action is a very effective way of accomplishing things and implementing changes. The salary schedule idea fits under the purview of the Faculty Professional Policies Council, and they can do the necessary research and come up with a workable salary schedule for ISU Faculty.

ACTION: Norman moved and Keeter seconded **to approve the above motion** as written.

Discussion: Norman informed Senators that University of Idaho uses a salary schedule which bases salary ranges on rank, time served and productivity/merit. Thomas outlined how the salary structure works. Kangas favors the first sentence, but contends that the second sentence makes an unsupported assumption that a salary schedule is the right thing for ISU’s Faculty.

ACTION: Kangas **moved to amend to strike the second sentence.** Norman seconded.

Discussion: Fixed salaries based on rank and time can create problems in hiring if potential recruits are better paid where they are. However, if a salary schedule is created, it gives a platform from which to start discussions with the Administration. It also builds regular pay raises into the budget.

The amendment was voted down, it **did not pass.**

ACTION: Bowen **moved to amend the second sentence** to insert “or other specific salary recommendations.” The sentence now read: “FPPC will then produce a suggested salary schedule **or other specific salary recommendations** for the Faculty at Idaho State University....” Seconded by De Jesus.

The vote was taken; the **amendment passed.**

Frantz put forth a suggestion from one of his constituents to monitor Administrative salaries to see how close they are to CUPA, the benchmark for Faculty salaries. Bowen suggested this should be posed to the Budget Council.

ACTION: Delehanty **moved to amend the motion to drop “and the Administration”** from the end of the second sentence. Seconded by Kearns.

The **amendment passed** with only 2 opposed.

The language was left open enough for FPPC to make whatever recommendations they think appropriate, including a recommendation against having a salary schedule at all.

ACTION: Masserini **put the question** and re-read the motion as amended: Should the Senate forward the “Charge FPPC to research the use and implementation of salary schedules for Faculty among other universities. FPPC will then produce a suggested salary schedule **or other specific salary recommendations** for the Faculty at Idaho State University that will be presented to the Faculty Senate. ~~and the Administration.”~~

The **amended motion passed** with 22 in favor and 2 against. **The charge will be forwarded** to the Faculty Professional Policies Council.

Adjournment: 5:43 p.m.

The next Faculty Senate meeting is scheduled for **December 3, 2007** at 4:00 p.m.

Dr. John Masserini, Chair

Catherine Wallace,
Administrative Assistant 1

Approved by Faculty Senate: December 3, 2007

Documents:

Athletics Advisory Board Minutes of September 13, 2007
Cultural Affairs Council Minutes of October 11, 2007
Curriculum Council Minutes of October 18, 2007
Curriculum Council Minutes of October 25, 2007
NOI 2007-COT-07 AAS degree in Marketing & Management Technology
NOI 2007-A&S-002 for Military Minor
Faculty/Staff Handbook change – Honorary Degree Criteria (final version)
Composition and Charge of Tenure and/or Promotion Review Task Force (revised) – as amended
Salary Schedule Charge to Faculty Professional Policies Council