

University of Idaho

2019 – 2020 Faculty Senate – **Pending Approval**

Meeting # 9

Tuesday, October 15, 2019 at 3:30 pm

Paul Joyce Faculty- Staff Lounge & Zoom

Present: Bacon, Bridges, Caplan, Chapman, Chopin, Cosens, Dezzani, Fairley, Grieb (Chair), Hill, Jeffery, Keim, Kirchmeier (Vice- Chair), Lawrence (Proxy for Wiencek, w/o vote), Lee-Painter Lockhart, Paul, Sammaruca (w/o vote), Schab, Schwarzlaender, A. Smith, R. Smith, Tibbals,

Present via Zoom: Kern, McKellar, Tenuto, Sears.

Absent: DeAngelis, Luckhart, Raja, Wiencek.

Guests: 4.

Guest Speakers: Torrey Lawrence, Vice Provost for Faculty

F. Marty Ytreberg, Member of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)

- I. **Call to Order:** Chair Grieb called the meeting to order at 3:33 PM.

- II. **Approval of Minutes (vote):** A motion to approve the minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 8 (October 8, 2019) (Lee-Painter/Dezzani) passed unanimously.

- III. **Consent Agenda:** There was no Consent Agenda

- IV. **Chair's Report**
 - We had a recent loss in the Vandal Family: Adam Seo (Senior chemistry major and active in the Air Force ROTC program), passed away on Oct. 4th, 2019. Chair Grieb called for a moment of silence to honor Adam Seo.
 - For the purpose of providing better acoustics to our Zoom participants and better audio in the room, from next week we will go back to the “U-shaped” seating arrangement, with chairs on the inside and the outside of the tables. The microphone will be in a better (more central) location.
 - Comments to Bookstore Vendor Committee are due tomorrow. Bookstore Committee will meet next week. Chair Grieb thanked A. Smith for volunteering to be the Senate representative on the committee. The committee will meet on October 23rd and 24th at the Wallace Center.
 - Update on the GESC process. Chair Grieb thanked Cher Hendricks for her visit last week. He clarified that the report of the GESC will go to the Provost first for budget reasons, and also per State Board policy. The GESC will then report to the UCGE and follow the regular channels to the University Faculty Meeting (UFM).

V. **Provost's Report** (Presented by VP Torrey Lawrence)

- Homecoming events this weekend!
- Benefits Open Forum – Tuesday, Oct 22, 1:00 pm @ ISUB Summit Rooms (Zoom available)
- NWCCU president will meet with campus on Thursday, Oct 24, 11:00 am @ ISUB Horizon Room (Zoom available)
- University Leadership Weekend: Thursday, Oct 31 – Saturday, Nov 2
- Sabbatical applications are due Oct 31; however, pay attention to college deadlines that are likely before Oct 31.

VI. **Committee Reports:** Faculty Affairs Committee reported on the review of Tenure (FSH 3520) and Promotion (FSH 3560) policies (Torrey Lawrence, VP for Faculty & Marty Ytreberg, FAC)

- VP Lawrence highlighted the goals of the new policy and the target timeline for presenting it at the December UFM. The overarching goal is to develop a policy which unifies FSH provisions for promotion and tenure at the unit, college, and university levels, thus removing existing internal contradictions and inconsistencies. The document is not a Redline because there have been multiple changes since the beginning of the project. The plan is to circulate broadly the current version of the document. There is a website through which one can submit questions and comments (the link is on the cover memo accompanying the revised policy).
- Discussion: To the recurrent question as to whether all changes to the original policy are reflected in the present version, it was replied that this is a very advanced version. In response to a question, it was suggested that broad distribution among faculty may be more useful than among staff, although staff members who assist with P&T packages would benefit from having it. Senators were encouraged to share it as broadly as they see fit.

Marty Ytreberg, representative of Faculty Affairs Committee, remarked that in the past much of the P&T committee membership was left to unit and college bylaws, but with the new policy those processes will be “unified”. Some senators thought that more clarity is needed, in particular for newly hired faculty members who may choose to go through the P&T process according to existing bylaws. In response to these concerns, VP Lawrence said that this point was discussed with General Counsel. The current process is so confusing and contradictory that new faculty members are not likely to favor it. If approved by Senate and at the December UFM, it will be implemented on April 1st, 2020. The new process will be used but the “old” timelines will be honored if a faculty member chooses to go by those. Early implementation is the “cleanest” thing to do. It will remove many inconsistencies which have created problems, legally or otherwise.

The discussion moved to the relation between the new policy and the current definitions of ranks. It was replied that the P&T policy stands on its own without any reference to changes in ranks.

With regard to Third Year Review, a senator asked whether the new policy still allows for termination after an unsuccessful Third Year Review. VP Lawrence replied that the Third Year Review process has now a more formative nature. However, a report from Third Year Review could still trigger non-renewal proceedings.

The question was raised whether the new policy would render college and unit bylaws obsolete. VP Lawrence answered that college and unit bylaws are still needed, for instance for P&T committee compositions. Also, the criteria are still a prerogative of each unit and college. A Senator emphasized that it is important to stress this aspect, namely that procedures, not criteria, have been changed in the new policy. As for the need of units and colleges to revisit their bylaws in view of the new policy, it was recalled that those are supposed to be revised every 5 years anyways.

A senator expressed skepticism about a unified “FSH 3500” policy being able to function at all levels. Another senator inquired about a version that had come before the Senate in April 2019. It was noted by VP Lawrence that it was an earlier version which had undergone many changes ever since.

Senators raised questions about the timeline for promotion. It was noted that this question had generated a lot of discussion and feedback since last year from Senate, deans, associate deans, unit administrators, and the Faculty Affairs Committee. As a result of the extensive feedback, many revisions were implemented.

The issue of ranks was brought up again. VP Lawrence reiterated that rank revision is being worked on by a different group that he is part of. Some terminology may have to be changed eventually, but the P&T revisions being presented will stand. There are no conflicts. There was some discussion about whether clinical faculty should be explicitly mentioned in FSH 3500 A-4 a; on the other hand, it was noted, they are implicitly included by the language of that section. Senior instructor and research professor positions can be either tenure- (we do have some) or non-tenure track, as stated in FSH 3500 A-3 d (p.2 of the provided pdf document). FSH 3500 A-3 d defines tenurable ranks, not all ranks (that is done in FSH 1565). There is no contradiction with FSH 1565.

The role of service as a unit administrator in promotion consideration was discussed. VP Lawrence noted that, even though a larger percentage of administration may be present in a faculty member’s Position Description (PD), the same promotion criteria as reflected in the college or unit bylaws must be satisfied.

A suggestion was presented to replace “academic” with “academic, scholarly, and creative” on p.2 of FSH 3500 A-3 a. Clarifications were asked about the information that goes out to external reviewers. It was replied that the information is about scholarly accomplishments, not service or teaching. Requiring peer review of teaching was seen positively. Additional clarifications were asked about whether the external reviewers would also receive the candidate’s PD. Indeed, that will be included to provide better context. On the other hand, annual professional evaluations are not included, to avoid any possibility of influencing opinions. A senator expressed some concern about the selection of peer reviewers, especially the number that must be taken from a list provided by the candidate. VP Lawrence explained that stating such number as “at least one” makes it easier to complete the selection process, because some invited reviewers decline the request. Some senators argued that the candidate should be able to “strike” reviewers from the list, due to the possibility of conflicts of interest. It was then noted that conflicts of interest can be managed early in the process, since candidates are asked to disclose them.

The discussion shifted to the criteria for early promotion or early tenure. It was explained that the need to secure the Provost's approval in the latter case is motivated by the much more serious consequences of going up for early tenure and being unsuccessful. Senators observed that the need to be nominated by a full professor in the unit before early promotion consideration can begin is no longer present. In response, it was noted that the former policy was unclear. With the present revisions, the Dean's approval is still needed. Also, even if nominated, it wouldn't be wise to go up early without the Dean's support.

It was suggested to clarify that Clinical Associate Professors can advance in rank.

Concern was raised about the selection of the unit-level P&T committee, which, in a senator's opinion, gives too much power to the unit administrator.

A Senator expressed some concern with the timescale for promotion to Full Professor as compared to the typical timescale in her college. The senator added that the proposed timelines are inconsistent with typical ones across other law schools, which may make it difficult to recruit new faculty. On the other hand—it was replied—it's best to have a uniform process with an appropriate timeline. There is still a lot of flexibility in the proposed policy.

Finally, the question whether an open forum would be welcome was raised, and an "unofficial vote" was taken. A large majority of senators did not support the idea, but off-site senators said it was difficult for them to feel well informed. The discussion ended with the plan to reach out to the centers with a communication strategy involving a face-to-face component.

- VII. **Other Announcements and Communications:** There were none.

- VIII. **Special Orders:** There were none.

- IX. **New Business:** There was none.

- X. **Adjournment:** A motion to adjourn (Tibbals/Dezzani) passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 5:06 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francesca Sammarruca
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate