

University of Idaho
FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES

2004-2005 Meeting #20, Tuesday, April 5th, 2005

Present: Adams (w/o vote) Anderson, Bailey, Baillargeon, Bechinski, Cloud, Greever, Gunter, McLaughlin, McMurtry, Morris (w/o vote), Reese, Reid, Rinker, Woolston, Young, Zemetra

Absent: Beard, Exon, Farnen, Hammel, McGuire

Observers: 10

Call to Order: A quorum being present, Faculty Council Chair Bailey called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m.

Minutes: The minutes of March 29th were approved as distributed with the correction that Reid was present.

Chair's Report: Chair Bailey reminded council that there was an informal informational meeting set up for 7:45 a.m. this Friday, April 8th with Linda Peavey and Pat Sturko to discuss changes in insurance benefits that will begin with the new fiscal year. He emphasized the fact that this meeting was not about post-retirement benefits.

He also reported that at the last president's cabinet meeting, of which he is a member, the question had arisen as to which mission statement should be the focus of departments and programs as they work through the budget reduction materials and must answer questions about the centrality of their mission. The president was quite firm that the mission statement intended was that embedded in his February 11th presentation to faculty and staff. In response to a question it was pointed out that the board-approved mission statement in the Faculty-Staff Handbook was still the authoritative statement in terms of what is reported to accrediting agencies for instance but the president's mission statement was the one intended for the purposes of the current exercise. The chair thanked councilor McLaughlin for his yeoman's work on this project and thanked all the faculty and staff who had also individually and collectively put in so much time and effort. Bill McLaughlin echoed the thanks for the community's efforts and noted that over 470 of the university's faculty had taken part in one workshop or another that had been held over the past two weeks. These workshops had engendered good discussions and some good times. He noted that Tool Two was finally up and running as of this afternoon. There were a couple of residual computer glitches to be worked through but that would happen soon.

Finally, Chair Bailey reported that the athletic integrity document that this council had approved had been passed by thirty of the thirty-one faculty senates that it had been presented to and so was now an integral part of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics' fundamental documents.

Provost's Report: The provost noted that Glenn Wilde, vice-provost for Library and Instructional Technology, would be retiring at the end of the academic year but as a "last hurrah" he was putting together the workshop, "Educating the Net Generation," which had previously been spoken of by the provost. The provost distributed a flier containing more details of the workshop and noted that faculty participants chosen by their colleges would receive a stipend of \$750 each. In addition, each of these participants would get ten hours of free help from CTI on their individual technology and teaching projects. Additional information would be available on the workshop website which was currently in production.

Responding to a related question, she said that his position would not be refilled on his retirement. There is some anticipated administrative restructuring but the university is reluctant to move too quickly or too far on that restructuring until the new provost can be consulted. The topic of administrative restructuring would be part of the president's "annual report card" which would be made public on April 30th.

General Orders:

FC-05-037: FSH 3520 "Faculty Tenure": Because of Associate University Counsel Danielle Hess's schedule, consideration of this matter was, by common consent, moved to the head of the agenda. She reminded the council that this particular section had been discussed last spring and a proposed amendment had been sent to the university

faculty for its consideration. The amendment was to bring the timing of tenure consideration into conformity with that of the Board of Regents policy. The amendment had been tabled at the university faculty meeting out of concern that the way it was worded would preclude the early consideration for tenure of outstanding faculty. The wording brought now to Faculty Council was intended to address that concern. University Counsel's proposed wording is given below (for clarity's sake it does not include that already agreed upon changes about notification passed at an earlier Faculty Council meeting):

TIME REQUIREMENTS FOR TENURE ELIGIBILITY.

G-1. Probationary or term appointments may be for one year, or for other stated periods not exceeding one year, and are subject to renewal. [See [3900.](#)] Prior to the award of tenure, employment beyond the annual term of appointment may not be legally presumed. ([RGP IIG6](#)). Ordinarily a faculty member is not considered for tenure until the fourth (4th) full year of probationary service, and consideration is mandatory no later than during the faculty member's sixth (6th) full academic year of service. ([RGP IIG6](#)). Credit for prior service may be given in accordance with the provisions in G-4. Faculty members initially employed as full professors can be appointed with tenure when this action is supported by a majority of the tenured faculty in the department or equivalent unit and by the university administration; otherwise, professors are considered for tenure during the fourth full year of service. In this context, unless otherwise specified, the term "year" means the appointment year, whether that is an academic, calendar, or fiscal year. A faculty member who is not awarded tenure may be given written notice of non-reappointment, or be offered a one-year terminal appointment, or be granted an additional short-term probationary appointment for not more than a twelve-month period by mutual agreement between UI and the faculty member. The decision to offer employment following a denial of tenure is in the sole discretion of the president ([RGP IIG6j](#)). [See [3900.](#)] [rev. 7-98, 7-02]

After some informal discussion it was agreed that even great clarity would be achieved by inserting "after" after "until" in the first line of the proposed change.

It was moved and seconded (Rinker, Greever) to accept the proposed changes. There was further discussion about how much further specificity as opposed to flexibility should be inherent in this section. Counselor Hess noted that her proposed revisions already would delete (and thus not present above) some specifying language currently in the handbook concerning the timing of tenure consideration of various ranks of faculty. Further discussion focused on the desirability of having language about the tenure time-table about full professors (or even associate professors) who had been hired at those advanced ranks from outside the university.

It was thus moved and seconded (Cloud, Greever) to amend the motion by striking the second half of line 10 (everything after the semi-colon) and lines 11 and 12 of the proposal, so as to allow for more flexibility in tenuring experienced faculty hired from outside the university. The motion carried unanimously. The main motion, thus amended, also carried unanimously. The resultant document reads as follows:

TIME REQUIREMENTS FOR TENURE ELIGIBILITY.

G-1. Probationary or term appointments may be for one year, or for other stated periods not exceeding one year, and are subject to renewal. [See [3900.](#)] Prior to the award of tenure, employment beyond the annual term of appointment may not be legally presumed. ([RGP IIG6](#)). Ordinarily a faculty member is not considered for tenure until after the fourth (4th) full year of probationary service, and consideration is mandatory no later than during the faculty member's sixth (6th) full academic year of service. ([RGP IIG6](#)). Credit for prior service may be given in accordance with the provisions in G-4. Faculty members initially employed as full professors can be appointed with tenure when this action is supported by a majority of the tenured faculty in the department or equivalent unit and by the university administration. A faculty member who is not awarded tenure may be given written notice of non-reappointment, or be offered a one-year terminal appointment, or be granted an additional short-term probationary appointment for not more than a twelve-month period by mutual agreement between UI and the faculty member. The decision to offer employment following a denial of tenure is in the sole discretion of the president ([RGP IIG6j](#)). [See [3900.](#)] [rev. 7-98, 7-02]

FC-05-035: Regulation H-1, Scheduling Final Exams: Registrar Reta Pikowsky explained that the proposed changes were intended to clarify the relationship between the scheduling of the final exam period for those classes which might consist of both recitation and lab sessions or those classes whose class period moved from day to day in a non-standard fashion in the course of the semester: the final exam would be scheduled on the basis of the first recitation period. The seconded motion from UCC passed unanimously.

FC-05-036: FSH 4130 Standard Course Numbers (limitations on cross-listing): Again Registrar Pikowsky outlined the intent of this second seconded motion from UCC. She explained that UCC thought cross-listing possibilities of special topic (cross-listed with only one other department) and directed study courses (no cross-listing) should be limited because of the nature of those kinds of courses. The motion carried unanimously.

FC-05-038: Notice of Intent to discontinue Doctoral Emphasis in Adult and Organizational Learning at Idaho Falls: Jeanne Christiansen, Interim Dean of the College of Education, presented the history of this proposal. She explained that this program was currently offered at Moscow, Boise, and Idaho Falls. While this was a popular program, under seventy doctoral students at Idaho Falls (who will be seen through the completion of their programs), the college did not have the resources to continue offering it at Idaho Falls where there were no resident college faculty. The university had made this decision and announced it last year but due to some confusion on the part of the Board whose policy on closing down emphases at particular locations was internally contradictory (a flaw subsequently fixed), the university was instructed to bring to the board an official notice of intent. Concern was expressed that we would be shutting down a popular graduate program, one that was growing in numbers. However, both the dean and the provost emphasized that the income generated from the students in the program was substantially less than that needed to offer a quality program in that location. The motion, a seconded one from UCC, passed 13-1.

New Business:

Chair Bailey asked whether in the councilors' opinion we should continue with the historic practice in our minutes of (usually) not specifying which councilor asked which questions in a discussion or move to a system where all (or most) questions had specific names attached to them. The short discussion was taken as unequivocally in favor of the present custom.

Adjournment: The agenda having been successfully taken care of, it was moved and seconded (Baillargeon, Rinker) to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 4:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Q. Adams
Faculty Secretary and Secretary to the Faculty