Call to Order. A quorum being present, Faculty Council Chair, Professor Kerry McKeever, called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. in the Brink Hall Faculty Lounge.

Minutes. The council had a brief discussion concerning the origin and appropriateness of one of the bulleted statements on page 3 of the minutes. Councilor Bitterwolf suggested that the phrase “drudge” work was not descriptive of the discussion. However, it was pointed out by the secretary that this is exactly what the unnamed councilor actually said. The secretary said he would make an effort to provide proper attribution for such references in the future. The council accepted the minutes of the April 17, 2001, meeting as distributed.

Chair’s Report. Chair McKeever asked council members to refer to the SBOE/Regents web site for information and discussion on student fees at the last board meeting. She also attended a couple of alumni meetings and was pleased with the strong support that U of Idaho alumni show toward their alma mater. McKeever reminded the council of the upcoming visit to the U of Idaho campus by Governor Dirk Kempthorne. She asked council members to urge their colleagues to attend the reception for the governor on Monday, April 30th.

Provost’s Report. Provost Brian Pitcher provided the council with a written report concerning the SBOE/Regents’ ongoing review of board personnel policies, as reported by the board’s Business Affairs and Human Resources Committee. He called particular attention to the policies concerning the periodic performance review of tenured faculty members. The board is considering postponing this requirement if the faculty member is under consideration for promotion at the time the 5-year review is mandated. He said that there are other changes in personnel and intellectual property policies that are under consideration. The full text of these proposals can be viewed at the SBOE/Regents web site. Pitcher advised the council to keep abreast of these changes.

Distinctions for Classroom Scheduling. Vice Chair Ronald Smelser presented an information item sent to the council from the Registrar’s Office concerning the scheduling of classrooms for non-teaching activities. The council had asked for the clarification several weeks ago, and a committee from the Registrar’s Office forwarded the following editorial refinement of the classroom scheduling policy for inclusion in the Faculty-Staff Handbook:

It was moved and seconded (Smelser, Foltz) to add the following explanatory information regarding distinctions used to approve requests for the use of classroom space to FSH section 4610:

1. Student organizations that are academically focused may request one-time scheduling in classrooms regardless of whether space in the Commons or SUB is available. The requirement to first seek space in the Commons or SUB is suspended for these groups. The definition of an “academically focused” student organization includes the following:
   • Students in the same curriculum that meet on a regular basis to explore issues and stage events directly related to their major course of study
   • Groups sponsored by an academic department where the curriculum is offered
2. Student organizations with interests that are not related to a specific UI curriculum and that are not directly sponsored by an academic department, must first seek a meeting room in the Commons or SUB before contacting the Registrar’s Office for possible classroom space. Classroom space will be reserved only if the Commons or the SUB cannot accommodate the request.

After a brief discussion the motion was adopted by unanimous voice vote. The chair ruled that this item was of an editorial/explanatory nature and, therefore, did not require further approval by the faculty. It will be transmitted by the secretary to the editor of the handbook and the registrar.

FC-01-026. Proposal to drop the major in Plant Science (College of Agriculture). The council received from the University Curriculum Committee a proposal to drop the Plant Science major in the College of Agriculture. Professor John Hammel provided the council with background information on the proposal. The council had previously approved revisions in the majors for this department which, if approved by the SBOE/Regents, would make this degree obsolete. The motion was adopted by unanimous voice vote. The proposal will appear on the agenda of the May 8th General Faculty Meeting.
FC-01-027. Proposed new name for the College of Agriculture. The University Curriculum Committee forwarded to the council a proposal from the College of Agriculture to change the college’s name to the “College of Agricultural and Life Sciences.” College of Agriculture Dean, Larry Branen, provided the council with the background information leading up to the requested name change. He said that in the evolution of the college the definition of the word “agriculture” has been defined as much by the fundamental life sciences as it has by agricultural production. He said that all of the constituencies of the College of Agriculture had been consulted and strongly support the name change. Provost Pitcher added that this name change provides a name that is a better reflection of the makeup of this college. Branen said that other academic units had been consulted, in particular the Department of Biological Sciences in the College of Letters and Science. A letter of agreement and memorandum of understanding has been signed by all of the affected college deans. After a brief discussion concerning the “science” offerings at the U of Idaho, the need for cooperation and cooperative programs, and the notion of creating a new “College of Science,” the motion was adopted by unanimous voice vote. The proposal will appear on the agenda of the May 8th General Faculty Meeting.

FC-01-021. Proposal for changes to Faculty-Staff Handbook sections 3050 (Position Descriptions) and 3320 (Periodic Performance Evaluations and Salary Determination for Faculty Members). Professor Jeffrey Harkins, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, reviewed the latest draft that included changes suggested at the last council meeting. The motion had been divided by a previous “friendly agreement” and each section was to be considered and voted on separately. The council took up section 3050 first. In the process of give and take on the discussion, there were several “friendly amendments” to section 3050. The final draft voted on by the council reads as follows: (new material is underlined – deleted material is a strikethrough)

3050 – POSITION DESCRIPTIONS

A. GENERAL. Specific responsibilities of each faculty member are established in position descriptions. These position descriptions serve a variety of important functions; in particular, they constitute the essential frame of reference in annual performance evaluations of faculty members [see 3320 A-1-b; periodic review of tenured faculty members [see 3320 D], and consideration of faculty members for tenure and promotion [see 3520 and 3560] [rev. 7-98, ed. 7-00]

B. PROCEDURE.
B-1. During the fall semester (with a due date announced by the provost) each faculty member’s calendar-year position description is recorded on a form that provides for the classification of responsibilities in conformity with the statewide reporting system. A copy of this form is appended to this section. (An alternate form is available for use when the position description is perceived by the faculty member, unit administrator, and dean to be exactly the same as for the preceding contract year.)

B-2. The form should be filled out in collaboration with the unit administrator, signed by the faculty member, approved by the unit administrator, approved by the dean, and sent to the Provost's Office.

B-3. When the faculty activity audit is completed in the spring, the unit administrator should compare the data obtained for each faculty member with the corresponding position description. Perfect agreement between the position description and the record of actual performance is not necessarily expected, but it is desirable that any discrepancy between them be as small as is feasible.

UI FACULTY POSITION DESCRIPTION FOR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW for 20__ (REVISED)

Date: ________________ Department: _______________________
Name:  ______________________________________________________ Title/Rank: ________________________
Appointment: Academic Year: Fiscal Year: Other:  ___________________
Tenure Status: Nontenured Tenured Year Tenured: ____________
RESPONSIBILITIES
1. Instruction/Pedagogy:

Statement of Goals and Objectives for the Year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Coursework:</th>
<th>Course No.</th>
<th>Cr. Hr</th>
<th>Course No.</th>
<th>Cr. Hr</th>
<th>Course No. Summer</th>
<th>Cr. Hr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Est % per term

Additional Instructional Responsibilities (Describe):

Est. Percentage of Time:  Spring: _______ Fall: _______ Summer: _______
2. Scholarship (Including Teaching/Learning, Artistic Creativity, Discovery, and Application/Integration Activities)
   Statement of Goals and Objectives for the Year:

   Est. Percentage of Time:  Spring:  ________  Fall:  ________  Summer:  ________

3. Advising
   Statement of Goals and Objectives for the Year:

   No. of Advisees: Undergrad (Approx):  _______  Grad (as Major Professor):  _________
   Other Service to Students (organization/program advisers, masters/doctoral committees, etc.):

   Est. Percentage of Time:  Spring:  ________  Fall:  ________  Summer:  ________

4. Extramural Service and/or On-Campus Service
   Statement of Goals, Objectives and Planned Activities:

   Est. Percentage of Time:  Spring:  ________  Fall:  ________  Summer:  ________

5. Extension (Outreach) Activities
   Statement of Goals, Objectives and Planned Activities:

   Est. Percentage of Time:  Spring:  ________  Fall:  ________  Summer:  ________

6. Administration
   Statement of Goals, Objectives and Planned Activities:

   Est. Percentage of Time:  Spring:  ________  Fall:  ________  Summer:  ________

7. Other Support
   Statement of Goals, Objectives and Planned Activities:

   Est. Percentage of Time:  Spring:  ________  Fall:  ________  Summer:  ________

| Summary of Percentage Time Allocations by Responsibility Area for Period |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Area                                            | Planned Percentage Allocation |
|                                                 | Spring | Fall | Summer | Annual |
| Teaching/Pedagogy                               |        |      |        |        |
| Scholarship                                     |        |      |        |        |
| Advising                                        |        |      |        |        |
| Extramural Service/On-Campus Service            |        |      |        |        |
| Extension (Outreach) Activities                 |        |      |        |        |
| Administration                                  |        |      |        |        |
| Other Support                                   |        |      |        |        |
| **Total (All must equal 100%)**                 |        |      |        |        |

**AUTHENTICATION**

1. Incumbent Faculty Member: I agree that this is a reasonable definition of my responsibilities to the University of Idaho for the current contract forthcoming calendar year.

   ______________________________________________  
   Signature of Faculty Member

2. Approval of Unit Administrator: I agree that this position description is a reasonable reflection of the stated expectations for progress towards tenure, promotion and/or continued satisfactory performance evaluation (Per FSH 3140 B2).

   ______________________________________________  
   Signature of Unit Administrator

3. Approval of College Dean: I agree that this position description is a reasonable reflection of the stated expectations for progress towards tenure, promotion and/or continued satisfactory performance evaluation (Per FSH 3140 B2).

   ______________________________________________  
   Signature of Dean
Revised Section 3050 of the Faculty-Staff Handbook (with its “friendly amendments”) was adopted by unanimous voice vote. The revisions will appear on the agenda of the May 8th General Faculty Meeting.

The council then moved on to a discussion of Faculty-Staff Handbook section 3320. Professor Harkins provided the council with some background information on the changes in this section and noted in particular that this section should be considered in the context of “defining a process.” The process will also include those faculty members identified as having “diminished performance.” Another important step in the revision of section 3320 is to provide steps to improve the allocation of resources subsequent to the evaluation process. He said that the council should keep in mind that the Faculty Affairs Committee will be discussing and recommending additional material in the fall regarding this subject. He noted that one issue being considered was a rating system with fewer categories, so that the available resources could reach a broader spectrum of the faculty. Harkins reminded the council that these were topics for later discussion – today we should only look at the “process.”

A thorough discussion of the recommended changes to the current handbook policy on periodic performance evaluation and salary determination (parts A-1 and A-2 of section 3320) was undertaken by Professor Harkins, observers to the meeting, and members of the council. Items and concerns brought up during the discussion included:

- the time frame in which comparative evaluations would be available to faculty members
- the need for faculty members to see how they compare with other faculty members in the same academic department
- the need to have advising evaluated by students
- the fact that the requirement of a “mandatory” meeting with the unit administrator was deleted in favor of simply the “opportunity” of a meeting to discuss the evaluation – if you want revisions you will ask for a meeting – if everything is fine you will not need to meet – there is no requirement that the faculty member has to meet with anyone
- the signing off on the evaluation by all parties is extremely important, as is the ability to file a dissenting report
- the need for protection from “retaliation” by an administrator against a faculty member who submits a dissenting statement
- that a faculty member meeting with both a unit administrator and a dean would be intimidating – other parties, such as an ombudsman or attorney, need to be present
- the ombudsman can be contacted at any point in the evaluation process – not just where it is indicated in the wording of the document
- the necessity of remembering that the ombudsman is not a representative of either party in a dispute – the ombudsman’s role is to provide a means of dialogue between the parties and to determine the fairness of the procedures that have taken place up to that point, and the justness of the actions taken – don’t put the ombudsman in a compromising position
- the need to keep in mind that complex processes are really not better, especially if you try to take into consideration all of the “what if” circumstances that could arise – keep the process simple and straightforward
- the addition of sub-section A-2, g., concerning carrying forward annual review scores during periods of time that merit-based salary increases are not available, would be an important addition to the handbook

There was one “friendly amendment” on page 8, adding the words “as they become available” to the notation concerning the availability of comparative numerical ratings. It was moved and seconded (Goble, Smelser) that section 3320 be divided and considered one sub-section at a time (i.e. A-1, A-2, B-1, etc.). The motion was adopted by a majority vote.

Sub-section A-1 of section 3320 was then adopted by majority vote. Following a brief discussion sub-section A-2 of section 3320 was adopted by majority vote. Both will be presented for faculty approval at the May 8th General Faculty Meeting.

The sub-sections of Faculty-Staff Handbook section 3320 as adopted by the Faculty Council reads as follows:

3320
PERIODIC PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS AND SALARY DETERMINATION FOR FACULTY MEMBERS

CONTENTS:
A. Annual Performance Evaluation and Salary Determination for Faculty Members
B. Diminished Performance of Academic Personnel (not yet taken up for action by the Faculty Council)
C. Performance Evaluation of Academic Administrators (not yet taken up for action by the Faculty Council)
D. Periodic Performance Review of Tenured Faculty Members (not yet taken up for action by the Faculty Council)

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND SALARY DETERMINATION FOR FACULTY MEMBERS

A-1. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION. Annual evaluation of the performance of each member of the faculty is, primarily, the responsibility of the faculty member and the unit administrator concerned. The provost is responsible for preparing supplementary instructions each year, including the schedule for completion of the successive steps. The forms to be used (#1, “Teaching-Research”; #2, “Extension and Service”; #3, “Administration”; #4, “Summary Evaluation”; and #5, “Salary Recommendation”) are appended to this section. [See above 3380 C-1].

a. Forms Distributed. Supplies of the forms to be used in the evaluation process are procured by deans and unit administrators. The immediate administrative officer is responsible for ensuring that each faculty member receives the proper form(s) together with a copy of the supplementary instructions. This officer may also provide additional interpretation of the procedure as it is to be applied in the unit.
b. **Annual Report of Efforts and Accomplishments by Faculty Member.** Each faculty member shall provide his or her unit administrator with the following materials for use in the annual performance evaluation:

1. Current Curriculum Vitae
2. UI Faculty Position Description For Annual Performance Review
3. Detailed Faculty Activity Summary for Annual Performance Review
4. Other materials deemed necessary to document efforts and accomplishments for the period under review.

c. **Evaluation of Faculty by Unit Administrators.**

Unit administrators evaluate their faculty members; and the performance of each faculty member over the period covered by the evaluation is judged on the basis of the position description(s) in effect during that period.

In the case of faculty members holding joint appointments in two or more academic or administrative units, it is the responsibility of the administrator in the faculty member’s primary academic discipline to solicit and consider relevant information on job performance from other administrators with responsibility for the faculty member’s work. [See also 3080 E-1]

Ratings are determined by comparing the faculty member, primarily, with other members of the unit faculty and, secondarily, with other members of the same profession nationally.

The results of the student evaluation of teaching are carefully weighed and used as a factor in this evaluation.

For each area of responsibility evaluated, the unit administrator shall describe the basis for conclusion/judgment in assessing the performance of the faculty member.

The ratings and additional comments or narrative as the evaluator deems appropriate are entered as indicated on the form(s).

After the unit administrator has completed written evaluations and ratings of faculty for the annual review, he or she shall provide, as they become available:

- a copy of the written evaluation and ratings to the faculty member;
- comparative information to help assess their performance evaluation and numerical ratings, including, but not limited to:
  - Frequency distribution for overall ratings for the unit
  - Frequency distribution for overall ratings for the college

**d. Self-Evaluation and Conference.**

Each faculty member is given an opportunity to use the forms and procedures described in A-2 and make an evaluation of his or her own performance.

The unit administrator shall provide each faculty member with the opportunity to meet to discuss the unit administrator’s annual evaluation. (Suitable alternate arrangements are made for off-campus personnel.)

The purpose of this meeting is to review and discuss Together they go over the administrator’s evaluation and the self-evaluation, if any. The unit administrator explains his or her ratings and comments related to the faculty member’s performance during the year and any revisions in professional goals and objectives for the coming year. The faculty member and the unit administrator work to identify strategies that would help the individual improve his or her performance. The ratings may be modified as a result of the discussion.

At the conclusion of the review process for the annual evaluation, each faculty member shall sign a statement indicating that they have had the opportunity to read the evaluation report and to discuss it with the unit administrator.

If the faculty member disagrees with the contents of the review, the faculty member shall be permitted to append a report to the unit administrators’ evaluation, detailing the nature of the dissent.

A copy of the administrator’s final evaluation is given to the faculty member.

In smaller UI colleges, deans may have conferences with individual faculty members to discuss the evaluation and possible means of improvement; also, a faculty member may request a conference with the dean.

e. **College-Level Action.**

Copies of the performance-evaluation materials, including the narrative evaluation by the unit administrator, a dissent report (if any) by the faculty member, and the rating forms (1, 2, or 3, as applicable, and 4) are forwarded to the dean for evaluation at the college level.

In the event of a report of dissent by the faculty member, the dean shall arrange a meeting with the unit administrator and the faculty member to attempt to resolve the relevant issues.

The dean enters an evaluation in the space provided on Form 4.

A copy of that form is given to the faculty member and another copy is forwarded to the President’s Office for permanent filing. The evaluation forms (1-3) are retained in the college office.

If the dean concurs with the overall evaluation and rating of the faculty member by the unit administrator, no additional signature is required from the faculty member. However, if the dean’s evaluation and rating is different from that of the unit administrator, a second and subsequent signature by the faculty member acknowledging receipt of the dean’s evaluation and rating is required.
If the faculty member disagrees with the Dean’s evaluation and the difference cannot be resolved at the college level, either party may choose to refer the matter to the University Ombudsman. If the matter remains unresolved at the college level, the Provost shall be notified of the dissent.

A-2. SALARY DETERMINATION. This process is carried out at the departmental and higher levels of academic administration. Each year the provost specifies the definitions of the salary-increment categories to be used and prescribes their proportionate distribution. A “Salary Recommendation” form is completed for each faculty member according to the schedule established by the provost. [See also 3380 and 3420]

a. Departmental Action. The unit administrator enters a recommended salary-increment category in the space provided on each Form 5. This recommendation will reflect the performance evaluation described in A, relative salary position, and other relevant factors. Special considerations should be noted in the “Comments” section at the bottom of the form or by an accompanying written statement. The unit administrator will submit written justification if his or her assignment of specified salary-increment categories departs substantially from the prescribed distribution. Such justifications are taken into consideration by the dean in arriving at an equitable college-wide distribution among the categories. The unit administrator forwards the Form 5 for each faculty member to the dean, together with a listing of all members of the unit.

b. College Action. Deans, at their discretion, may require administrative officers under their jurisdiction to supplement their salary-increment recommendations by such means as copies of the evaluation forms, written statements, or personal conference. The dean enters a recommended salary-increment category in the space provided on each Form 5. The dean’s distribution of faculty members among the salary categories is guided by the recommended proportions and takes into account possible differences in qualifications and merit among departments; e.g., it may be that the average members of an outstanding department are given consideration equal to that accorded the top members of an average department. When this stage has been completed, the dean meets individually with each unit administrator for review of the dean’s recommendations. The dean forwards the Form 5 for each faculty member to the provost.

c. Presidential Action. Review and action by the provost consists primarily of making adjustments necessary to arrive at an equitable distribution of faculty members among salary-increment categories for UI as a whole. After a recommended salary-increment category has been established at the departmental, college, and presidential levels, a copy is sent to the faculty member. The president determines, on the basis of funds available, the salary-increment range applicable to each category.

d. Budget Office Action. The Budget Office provides computer printouts showing current salary and tentative salary for the coming year and sends the appropriate list to each dean.

e. Review and Adjustment. The dean, in consultation with each unit administrator in the college, makes corrections and minor adjustments as necessary to place each faculty member on the proper salary basis within the department. The aggregate of final salary recommendations must fall within the total salary-increase budget established for the college.

f. Final Approval. The provost, after consultation with the deans, approves the corrected lists. When they have been approved by the president and the regents, faculty members are officially notified of their salaries for the coming year and “Salary Agreement” forms [see 3080] are sent to them for completion. [ed. 7-97]

g. Merit-based Salary Increases Not Funded. If, in any year or consecutive preceding years, funding is not provided for merit-based salary increases or funding is only provided for cost-of-living increases, the annual review reports will be retained at the unit level. At such time that merit-based salary increases are available, the recommendation for merit increases shall be based upon the average scores of the current period and any preceding consecutive periods for which merit-based funding was not provided.

Professor Harkins gave the council more background information on the remaining portions of section 3320. As the time for adjournment had passed, Chair McKeever polled the council on the possibility of extending today’s meeting or having an additional meeting this week to discuss and vote on the remainder of section 3320 and still be able to meet the notice deadline for the General Faculty Meeting. This proposal met with solid opposition. It was then moved and seconded (Goble, Smelser) that the rest of the report on section 3320 be sent to the new council for further consideration in the fall. That motion was adopted by unanimous voice vote.

Professor Nielsen announced that his teacher evaluation task force recommendations for changes in the evaluation instrument were available for viewing at the web site http://ww.uidaho.edu/~markn/eval. Professor Harkins announced that the Department of Accounting of the College of Business and Economics had just received notification that its accounting program had been awarded separate accreditation from the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business. This accreditation is the result of fifteen years of work by the U of Idaho and he thanked the administration and faculty for making this accreditation a reality. The college is extremely proud of this accomplishment. The council responded to the announcement with a warm round of applause.

Adjournment. Chair McKeever adjourned the meeting at 5:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter A. Haggart,
Secretary of the Faculty Council