Minutes for Faculty Affairs meeting at University of Idaho
Date: 8:30 am Friday September 28, 2018

Present: Brandt (ex officio w/o vote), Brown, Eveleth, Ibrahim, Lawrence (ex officio w/o vote), Shrestha, Ytreberg. Absent: Freeman, Isenbarger, McCollough, Powell

A motion (Shrestha/Eveleth) to approve the minutes of September 21st passed.

Chair Ytreberg reminded the committee that we would not be holding a meeting on October 5th.

The committee spent the hour discussing a memo from the College of Law that proposes changes to FSH 1420. D-1(b). Specifically, the proposed changes are the underlined wording in the following FSH language:

When a vacancy in the position of dean occurs, the provost convenes a search committee to advise in the selection of a new dean. The provost determines the size of the committee, including the number of members from outside UI, and appoints the members. The provost also names a person to chair the committee. To ensure adequate representation and participation of the college faculty in the search and selection process [see 1520 I-4-A], the following will be observed: (a) faculty members from the college concerned comprise at least 50 percent a majority of the membership; and (b) these faculty representatives are selected by the provost from a pool of faculty members presented to him or her through procedures established in the college bylaws that provide for the representation of the major academic disciplines in the college. The pool must contain at least half again the number of members needed from the college for the committee. Additionally, search procedures must provide some means for the entire college faculty to participate in the interviewing of finalists; and for individual faculty members, staff, students, and/or external constituents to forward their comments and recommendations directly to the president. If required for program accreditation, the search procedures shall ensure that a dean shall not be appointed or reappointed to a new term over the stated objection of a substantial majority of the faculty. The search committee forwards a list of acceptable candidates to the provost who, in turn, forwards a recommendation from the list to the president.

The stated reason for the proposed changes is that the College of Law’s accrediting body (i.e., ABA) requires a specific form and level of involvement by faculty in the selection of a permanent Dean. Specifically, ABA policy states that “[e]xcept for good cause, a dean should not be appointed or reappointed to a new term over the stated objection of a substantial majority of the faculty.”

After a lengthy discussion the committee concluded that it would be best if Dr. Lawrence talked with the Provost about the tradeoffs of making a change to FSH to address this ‘local problem’, relative to making a change to the College of Law’s bylaws. Given the proposed wording “If required for program accreditation”, it is clear that the proposed change would likely only affect the College of Law. If that is the case, the question is where best to add that provision.

Prior to closing the meeting the chair announced that at our next meeting we would continue or discussions about performance pay.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30.

Respectfully Submitted,
Dan Eveleth