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

Minutes. The council accepted the minutes of the March 5, 2002, meeting as distributed.

Chair's Report. Chair Smelser reported to the council on the following matters:

- reorganization of the council will be required because of the elimination of the Colleges of Mines and Earth Resources and Art and Architecture, plus the reorganization of the College of Letters and Science into two new colleges – the College of Science and the College of Letters, Arts and Architecture – he and the Faculty Secretary are working out the details, but must wait until decisions are made about the location of individual departments.
- he is receiving an inordinate amount of email concerning rumors of budget cuts and layoffs – everyone should do their best to dispel these rumors and wait until the final reorganization plans are formally approved and announced.
- the recommendations on the final revision of the handbook on tenure review and faculty development will be ready for council consideration next week – all of the materials are available at the Faculty Affairs Committee web site (www.its.uidaho.edu/fac) which can also be accessed through a link at the Faculty Council home page web site – council members should come prepared to discuss this proposal next week.

Provost's Report. Provost Brian Pitcher reported to the council on the following matters:

- all responsibility center managers have been asked to take no action concerning notifications of layoffs of personnel until all policies have been clarified and the process fully articulated – however, some normal non-renewals of contracts are being processed, as would be the case in any other year.
- the budget reduction web site (also accessible through the council web site) has all of the up-to-date information on the budget crisis and the U of Idaho's plans for budget restructuring and organizational changes.
- bids for the delivery of health services to employees and students have been received and are being reviewed – decisions will be made in the next few weeks – all decisions will be based on quality of care and a broad range of options for medical coverage – the university is optimistic that it will be able to maintain or even improve the current level of health services for students and employees.

Campus Mail. Chair Smelser said that the rules and regulations for campus mail had been distributed to the council members. Ken White, Director of Facilities Management and Operations, had been invited to have someone attend a council meeting to discuss mail issues. Campus mail personnel preferred not to attend an open meeting. They would rather discuss mail issues on an individual case basis.

Smelser also said that the Moscow Postmaster had responded to the ASUI/Faculty Council petition for a new mailbox at the Idaho Commons by saying that there were already enough mail boxes on the campus. Instead, the council was invited to request the U of Idaho campus mail service to provide a mail-pick-up station at the Idaho Commons.

FC-02-023 – UCGE Recommendations for a New Core Curriculum – Changes in University of Idaho Catalog Section J-3-a and J-3-d. The University Committee on General Education (UCGE) via the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) recommended to the Faculty Council (a seconded motion from UCC) two major changes in the University Core Curriculum as reflected in changes to University Regulations J-3-a and J-3-d.

The change in Regulation J-3-d removes any reference to Foreign Language from the requirements and options under the heading of Communication. The requirement in Communication would refer only to the general core requirements and the courses offered by the School of Communication (Public Speaking) and the English Department (written English) that will satisfy the Communication section of the University Core Curriculum.

The change in Regulation J-3-a removes the existing wording in sections J-3-d and J-3-e in their entirety and replaces them with a single section J-3-d reading:
J-3-d. General Core Studies (GCS) (18 credits including the following:)

1. **Core Discovery**: Core 101 or Core 102 (at least one course).

2. **Cluster Courses**: Three courses chosen from one UCGE (University Committee on General Education) approved core cluster. (Students in the University Honors Program (UHP) are not restricted to the core cluster courses, but may elect to choose Honors courses.) The three courses must include at least two different disciplines, must include one upper-division course, and can include no more than one 100-level course.

3. **International Course**. One UCGE approved international course with a contemporary international or global focus.

4. **Humanities/Social Sciences**: 14 credits in a combination of humanities and social science courses with a minimum of six credits in humanities and six credits in social sciences.

Additional credits to total the required 18 credits may be selected from courses in any core cluster, the international course listing, and the UCGE approved listing of general elective core courses.

Core Discovery courses and the cluster courses may also be international courses, as well as humanities or social science courses. A course may be used toward more than one of the above requirements, but may count only once toward the required 18 credits. Courses used to satisfy requirements in J-3-a, J-3-b, and J-3-c may not be used toward the above requirements.

See web site [http://www.its.uidaho.edu/core](http://www.its.uidaho.edu/core) for a listing of cluster courses, international courses, and general core elective courses.

Professor Jeff Harkins, Chair of the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) and Professor William Voxman, Director of the University Core Curriculum, provided the council with additional background material on the proposal. The council had already heard several presentations on the new core curriculum from Professor Voxman and those were recorded in the minutes of earlier council meetings. Professor Harkins spoke of the very focused discussions that occurred in three recent meetings of the UCC devoted to the new core curriculum. He noted that the core was not a “perfect solution” to core issues, but was a “work in progress.” If looked at in that light, faculty members can note the infinite possibilities for growth and development of a core curriculum and its requisite courses, a process that would test and then discard or keep courses and clusters.

Harkins also refuted rumors that somehow the new core was created by an administration decree. He emphasized that the core grew out of the desire of members of the faculty to have a first class core curriculum. The faculty has worked very hard over the past four years to come up with a core curriculum that would inspire faculty to change old courses and develop new courses that would engage students in a demanding and rewarding core instruction program.

Several members of the council engaged Harkins and Voxman in an informative discussion concerning the financing and viability of the core curriculum. Concerns included: 1) ignorance of the actual cost of the new core, 2) the impact the core would have on departmental budgets, 3) the close association with generating revenue via responsibility center management – RCM seems to be driving too many curriculum decisions, 4) the cost to departments (dropping majors, releasing faculty, restricting the number of majors, dropping courses) when trying to drastically reduce the student-teacher ratio in the classroom, 5) the expectations of efficiency in class sizes (are small classes an efficient use of resources?), and 6) the impact on specialized curriculums with “traditional” courses when core courses are added to the workload of the faculty.

Referencing these concerns, the response was that there are a variety of ways to look at the cost factors of the new core: Recognize and accept 1) that the new core will cost more than the old core, and initially some of the expenses must be subsidized, 2) that eventually the core would probably become “revenue neutral,” 3) that departments may need to shift resources internally and make course load adjustments to participate in the core, 4) that the size of a class (50 or 150) may not be a good indicator of a quality course – quality of instruction is a good indicator, 5) that departments and colleges may have to rethink their offerings and restructure (how many small enrollment inefficient courses would you give up for a couple of efficient core courses?), 6) that departments that participate in the core will generate additional revenue under responsibility center management rules, 7) that the core can and will attract public and private gifts and grants, 8) that this new core creates opportunities for more faculty members from more disciplines to participate and find a role in the core, and 9) that a few hundred thousand dollars is a small price to pay for 30-40 new courses - “affordable quality” education that can get students off to a good start on the road to life-long learning.
Provost Pitcher reminded the council that it should be focusing on the proposal before them and not so much on conjecture about what might happen under a variety of possible circumstances. Other council members, including several students attending the meeting, spoke highly of the new courses and clusters that have been experimentally used up to this point in the old core curriculum. These courses provide the model of what should be happening in all classrooms. Students are invited and encouraged to participate in class discussions, make presentations, and improve their reading and writing skills in these courses. It has been the experience of some instructors that freshman core students not only are retained by the university, but they also stay in close contact with the core faculty and show an intensified interest in their academic major. Faculty are excited about teaching core courses and students actually want to take the new courses early, rather than putting them off until their last year at the university. Other council members pointed out that a first-rate core curriculum is an excellent tool to recruit and retain good students.

Professor Voxman, in response to a question, said that the experimental courses being used in the core this year are undergoing a variety of assessments, some from outside the university. Students are being tracked on their writing and reading improvement, as well as their ability to engage in critical thinking. Vice Chair Bitterwolf asked the UCGE to entertain the notion that students might be a better source of possible core cluster course configurations than the faculty.

The council was also in receipt of Associated Students of the University of Idaho (ASUI) Resolution #S02-20, which gave strong support for the UCGE proposal for the new core curriculum and encouraged its adoption by the faculty. Also received was ASUI Presidential Proclamation #S02-01, which stated that the new core curriculum was in the best interests of both the students and the university, and that the new core would add to the U of Idaho’s prestige and the degrees it awarded would be even more valuable.

There was general agreement by the members of the Faculty Council that the new core curriculum proposal was sound and should be sent to the general faculty for review and a vote at the May General Faculty Meeting. The motion was adopted by unanimous voice vote.

**FC-02-024 – Proposal to Change the Wording of Faculty-Staff Handbook Section 3710H – Leave for Professional Improvement.** Provost Pitcher provided the council with background information on this proposal. The proposed change originated in the College of Engineering in their search for new ways to reduce personnel costs during this period of budget reductions. The provost suggested changes in the language of that section of the handbook to allow for expanded professional leave opportunities.

The section would be changed as follows:

H. LEAVE FOR PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT. Members of the faculty who hold the rank of instructor or above, or nonfaculty exempt staff who hold the equivalent of such academic rank, are encouraged to participate in programs of professional improvement because they are advantageous both to UI and to the employee. On the recommendation of an applicant's administrative superiors, the provost may approve a leave under the following conditions: UI participates with the employee as follows:

H-1. The employee may request approval to use accrued vacation leave and to have an equal amount of administrative leave with pay granted to permit his or her participation in a program of professional improvement. In addition, the dean of any college may offer a program of professional leave funded by the college that does not require the use of annual leave and is available to all tenured faculty in the college. The dean may add requirements for eligibility and compensation that are not part of this policy with the approval of the Provost.

H-2. To participate in any plan under this policy plan, the faculty or staff member must have completed four years of service before the time the leave is to begin.

H-3. Generally, at least two years of service must intervene between a sabbatical leave and a leave for professional improvement.

H-4. Applications should be submitted at least three months before the leave is to begin. For college funded programs, the dean establishes the application process.

H-5. A faculty or staff member can use no more vacation leave eligibility for this purpose than he or she has already accrued.

H-6. Persons granted leave under this policy are expected either to return to the active service of UI for at least one academic year after completion of the leave or to repay the money received from UI for the period of administrative leave granted. This requirement may be waived by the Provost upon written request from the faculty member with the approval of the department administrator and college dean.
H-7. The employee must submit to the president a report of his or her activities each month while on leave at the conclusion of the leave.

H-8. The budget office and human resource services should be notified when a dean offers a program of professional leave that is funded by the college.

It was moved and seconded (Dangerfield, Meier) to approve the proposed change in FSH Section 3710H (with one editorial change in H-7) as presented by the provost. The motion was adopted by unanimous voice vote.

Council Discussion of Administrative Structure/Leadership Changes for the University of Idaho Library. Professor Mary Bolin, Head of the Library Technical Services and representing the library faculty, presented the council with the document “UI Library Faculty Response to Proposed Organizational Change,” which outlined the concerns of the library faculty regarding the changes being made to the library’s administrative structure.

Two central concerns are 1) the perceived “value” of having faculty status for the members of the library faculty, and 2) the insertion of a non-faculty member into the administrative reporting line. That reporting line does not end with a person holding a library degree (the present dean) or the provost, but with a vice provost in charge of information technology. She also emphasized the following points made in the written statement presented to the council:

- the expected outcomes of the reorganization are unclear
- the organizational structure seems anomalous among peer institutions
- the library faculty was involved in general discussions, but did not get to discuss the current reorganization plan
- the change is opposed by many faculty members across the campus
- the library faculty knows that its services can be improved, but would rather see these improvements come from an “Information Technology Council,” rather than a change in administrative structure

Provost Pitcher distributed to the council his point-by-point written response to the concerns raised by the library faculty. He encouraged the library faculty to continue this discussion and to focus on finding solutions to the issues surrounding the change in administrative structure. Several council members indicated that they saw no real problem with the new organizational structure. However, Councilor Lillard wondered whether the administration had considered having Information Technology Services (ITS) report to the library dean rather than the library reporting to the new vice provost. The provost responded that the current head of ITS had many years of experience as the dean of a university library, and is highly qualified to be the vice provost responsible for both areas.

Provost Pitcher said that the U of Idaho decision on the organizational change was based on, 1) the eight years of previous experience as a university library dean of Glenn Wilde, the current head of ITS, 2) the organizational plan being one that has been adopted by many major universities, and 3) the organizational plan offering the most possibilities for development and growth of information technology and library services on the U of Idaho campus. Bolin pointed out that the soon to be named vice provost (Wilde) and the provost, had in the early 1990's created a similar administrative structure at Utah State University. She said that structure is now being dismantled because the library faculty had lost their voice in academic affairs.

There seemed to be general agreement in the Faculty Council that the library faculty and staff should be encouraged to continue their dialog with the provost, with the goal of finding acceptable solutions to the issues presented by the reorganization of the library’s administrative structure and reporting line.

Adjournment. It was moved and seconded (Lillard, McClure) 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 meeting of the Faculty Council will be on Tuesday, April 2, 2002.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter A. Haggart
Secretary of the Faculty Council