Call to Order. A quorum being present, Faculty Council Chair, Professor Ronald Smelser, called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m. in the Brink Hall Faculty Lounge.

Amended Agenda. Chair Smelser announced the following changes to the meeting agenda:
- **FC-02-022** – change in Regulation E-5-b – was returned to the Committee on Committees at the request of the committee chair for further clarification and revisions in wording
- the item dealing with campus parking has been deferred
- the item dealing with campus mail has been deferred
- memorandums from Professors Chandler and Flores concerning the new Core Curriculum proposal were distributed to the council

Minutes. The council accepted the minutes of the February 19, 2002, meeting as distributed.

Chair's Report. Chair Smelser reported the following items to the council:
- the Idaho Council of Higher Education Faculty (ICHEF) made presentations to the house and senate education committees – it appears that an “education” of some legislators is needed on faculty job descriptions – many legislators still have an erroneous concept of the typical work day of a university faculty member
- the State Board of Education (SBOE/Regents) meets this week
- he visited with the members of the U of Idaho faculty in the Boise Center – they are always eager for a visit and to have a chance to ask questions and give their viewpoints on university issues
- the next university campus-wide meeting on the budget will be held on March 13th at 1:30 p.m.
- a presentation on Penn State University’s “e-Lion System” of academic advising will be presented in the Student Union Building (SUB) on Friday, March 8th

Provost's Report. Provost Brian Pitcher reported the following items to the council:
- the SBOE/Regents agenda includes items of particular interest to the U of Idaho
  - U of Idaho will propose a differential fee for the integrated business curriculum – a dollar amount for the fee will not be requested until the FY2004 budget is presented
  - SBOE/Regents have been advised that a differential fee – if used for non-instructional purposes – would be acceptable under the state of Idaho Constitution
  - the board is considering a change in policy regarding Non-Faculty Exempt (NFE) positions from annual appointments to an “at will” employment designation – this allows easier dismissal (60 days notice) of persons holding those positions – U of Idaho will not change its employment practice until it has been mandated – Idaho Public Broadcasting is requesting a declaration of financial exigency and needs this flexibility to release employees
  - the intellectual property debate continues – no resolution is in sight
  - the NSF/EPSCoR program review has been favorable and two more grants totaling almost $20 million have been awarded to U of Idaho multi-discipline researchers
- the legislature is considering approving state funding for the U of Idaho’s “Idaho Place” initiative
- recent requests for proposals (RFP's) concerning university health care are causing concern among local dentists – one RFP involves finding a provider of dental services for students under the new student health plan and the other RFP concerns dental services for university employees – both have raised issues that need to be addressed by university officials and advisory committees
Associated Students of the University of Idaho (ASUI) Report. Councilor Netzer noted that the Student Achievement Award nominations had been extended to March 12th.

Student Evaluation of Advising. ASUI representative and councilor Kacey Murray distributed a draft instrument for eliciting an evaluation of the advising duties currently performed by faculty members, as well as a student self-evaluation of their own objectives in seeking help from an academic advisor. She requested that the draft be sent to the Faculty Affairs Committee for study. She said that student leaders wanted to continue to call attention to advising issues. The overall objective is to improve advising and make it more uniform and consistent across the campus.

A reading of the draft document led to an extended discussion of advising, mentoring, and the evaluation of advising. The following major points were raised during the discussion:

- how evaluations of advising are used in a faculty member's annual performance evaluation
- the document needs a “context” – it seems much too general to be of practical use
- any evaluation of advising needs to include graduate as well as undergraduate students
- a clear distinction needs to be made between “advising” in the sense of the mechanics of registration and meeting requirements and that of “mentoring” a student who is making academic discipline and career choices
- advising – in the context of the mechanics – tends to consume too much faculty time
- a lot of advising related materials are available to the student – many students simply do not use the materials that are already available to them
- the form that is being presented by the student leaders is one that has been used successfully by students and faculty in the College of Natural Resources – the form allows the faculty to see what they are doing that is right and wrong

Provost Pitcher capped the discussion by noting that the Faculty Affairs Committee should look at advising as a “system,” rather than as something that happens to a person. All parts of the system need to be examined with an eye to adjusting the system that we now use for advising.

It was moved and seconded (Kraut, Fairchild) to send the draft document and council comments to the Faculty Affairs Committee for consideration. The motion was adopted by unanimous voice vote.

New Core Curriculum. Professor William Voxman, Coordinator of the Core Curriculum, presented the council with information concerning the work of a number of individuals and committees over the past three years to develop a new core curriculum for the U of Idaho. The University Committee on General Education (UCGE) gave the proposed core their unanimous approval. He said that the new core will be presented to the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) next Monday (March 11th) for formal approval. His purpose in meeting with the council was to review the proposal and to prepare the council for future debate should the UCC decide to approve the plan and send it on to the Faculty Council for consideration.

The plan is to implement the new core in two phases, the first phase beginning in the 2003-2004 academic year. The second phase, the following year, is dependent on funding for the development of the new core cluster courses required for the full implementation of the new core curriculum. The new core adds a total of three credits to the present core credits, but does not affect the total number of credits needed for graduation. The changes from the old core come from a new section called “General Core Studies (GCS)” – a section requiring a minimum of 18 credits of course work in the core “clusters,” general electives, and a required “international” course. The other significant change is that foreign language courses would be removed from the communications part of the core and be included in the “international” and other parts of the new core curriculum.

All of the components and objectives of the new core are available for review at the core curriculum web site: http://www.its.uidaho.edu/core/.
After a thorough review of all of the components of the core curriculum, referencing materials previously supplied to the council, Professor Voxman responded to questions and engaged in a discussion with the members of the council. Councilors’ questions and discussion points are given first, followed by the responses of Voxman in italic:

- what are the cost comparisons between the old core and the fully implemented new core? we have not studied the cost differentials – we do know that we need stipends for faculty teaching in the core and replacement costs paid to departments – Responsibility Center Management (RCM) calls for double weighting of core courses and the extra funding to go back to the originating department(s) to cover instructor replacement costs – the new core will eventually cost more and should be given a high funding priority by the university – it is a good recruiting tool and shows prospective students that the U of Idaho will emphasize writing and critical thinking in quality core courses
- can you keep the enrollment cap in the core courses at 40? we actually plan to keep them at 35 for the single semester offerings – however that may not be possible when the core is fully functional with year long discovery courses – general elective core courses will have no enrollment limitations and current basic introductory level courses could be used as general electives – enrollment caps only apply to the discovery and cluster courses
- how does the new core apply to the transfer students? transfer students need to meet the SBOE core requirements – which are different than that of the U of Idaho – they can complete the SBOE requirements using the new core courses and the approved general elective courses
- are the new core courses that are being presently taught being thoroughly evaluated? yes there is a real emphasis on evaluation in all of the experimental core courses – 600 students involved in core discovery courses are participating this year and their progress is being carefully followed now and will be in future semesters – these courses all emphasize writing and comparisons are being done between students in the new and old core – the core is also undergoing a professional outside evaluation
- we need to advertise what we are doing to the rest of the world! we are presently doing that on our web site and through recruitment venues
- will students on international exchange be able to use that experience/credit for the international requirement of the new core? yes – in 99% of the cases this will probably happen – the student would satisfy that part of the core requirement
- there are major concerns by some departments that the addition of three credits to the core will create problems for academic programs that have no room in their curriculum for any more courses – we are trying to get those concerned academic departments actively involved in developing and teaching new core discovery and cluster courses – part of the answer lies in the use of courses from those curriculums in the new core cluster, capstone, and general elective categories
- those involved in the scientific/technology/mathematics disciplines have a genuine concern for what appears to be an imbalance of subject areas covered in the core – there is more emphasis and twice the credit requirements in the social science/humanities as there is in the scientific areas – what can we do to correct that imbalance? the core discovery area requires a multidisciplinary approach that should include science areas in the development of new courses – there needs to be an emphasis coming from these academic areas – a strong commitment to participate fully in the new core to help balance the core offerings – we also need to break down some of the walls that have been built up between disciplines
- core requirements seem to preclude that course development just suggested – the requirements lead one to believe that science and technology will never be in balance with the rest of the core offerings – can that be corrected? our program matches what is being done by other land-grant universities and our peers – what is being done here? – this balance question needs further discussion and attention! even more credits devoted to the core program would be one answer!
- look at the minimums we are asking students to take in these core academic areas – it favors the social sciences and humanities – perhaps some thought should be given to looking at having a different minimum science and technology requirement for non-science majors – something that would then balance out the requirements for all majors – science or not – a central problem is that students constantly change majors making it difficult to track the completion of core requirements
- there is a major change in the core communications requirement – what is happening here? the communication school is being asked to look at new ways of structuring and delivering basic communication courses – perhaps tying these basic communications courses to core discovery courses – also looking at the focus on presentation and technology, rather than having a “one size fits all” concept – the other change is the removal of foreign language and literature courses from the communications core and using them in other parts of the core where they naturally belong
• other than the obvious increase in costs for the new core, there seems to be very little difference between the old core and the new core curriculum – what are the differences? ask anyone that teaches a core course and they can list a great number of differences – for example, more required writing, smaller sections, interdisciplinary in nature, integration of themes, teaching and use of critical thinking skills, open discussions, the use of 300 and 400 level courses in the cluster – the new core is only open to freshmen students, thus no competition with upper class students – look at the web site and read the material on course objectives – the changes from the old core are numerous and very significant – there is potential for even more dramatic changes

• what is the procedure for approving the new core curriculum? the new core will be presented to the UCC next week and, if approved by that committee, then it will come to the faculty council following spring break and if approved by that body, then it will be on the agenda of the general faculty meeting in early May

• there has been a lot of positive feedback on the experiences of the freshmen students and the faculty teaching these new core courses – it seems to be a rewarding experience

At the end of the discussion, Councilor Chandler called the council's attention to the memoranda that he had written and also the one written by Professor Flores that had been circulated to the Faculty Council, the UCGE, and the Committee on Committees. Chandler claimed that the new core is not really any improvement over the existing core curriculum. For example, he questioned the concept of cluster courses in the core, labeling them “empty concepts” that strung courses together with little attention to a coherent theme and without any historical links. Professor Chandler urged the council to carefully read those statements and consider what they had to say about the core curriculum. Professor Voxman responded that everyone needed to keep in mind that the current clusters are experimental and that new stricter criteria will be applied to the new clusters. In fact, almost all of the current clusters will go off the books and new cluster courses will be designed to meet the specific criteria as outlined in the core guidelines (see the core web site for more information).

Clarification of Recent Research Team Appointments. The provost provided the council with a response to questions raised about the tenure status of the members of the new research team announced last week. Only the two senior members of the Center for Advanced Microelectronics Biomolecular Research (CAMER) team at the U of Idaho Research Park will be in tenured positions. The other positions on the team have been clearly classified by the provost as non-tenured research positions.

Councilor Chun Welcomed Back. Professor Chun was welcomed back to the council table following his absence arising from open-heart surgery and the post-operative recovery period. Councilor Chun attempted to set a good example for the rest of the council by passing on the assortment of cookies (and Boise Bronco color scheme M&M’s) being offered at the meeting. However, few of the members followed his exceptional display of abstinence from the consumption of sugar and chocolate (your scribe included).

Adjournment. It was moved and seconded (Lillard, Guenthner) to adjourn. The motion was adopted by unanimous voice vote, and Chair Smelser adjourned the meeting at 5:05 p.m.

Next Meeting. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council will be held on Tuesday, March 26th. The agenda for that meeting will be available the week before the meeting and on the Faculty Council web site: http://www.its.uidaho.edu/facultycouncil/.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter A. Haggart
Secretary of the Faculty Council