Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Consent Agenda.

III. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2014-15 Faculty Senate Meeting #17, February 3, 2015 (vote)

IV. Chair’s Report.

V. Provost’s Report.

VI. Committee Reports.

   Faculty Appeals Hearing Board (Nelson)
   Graduate Council
   • FS-15-040: FSH 1700 – College of Graduate Studies Bylaws (introduced)

   University Curriculum Committee
   • FS-15-041 (UCC-15-067): Science: Pre-Health Professions Studies (Brewick/Bryant)(vote)

VII. Other Announcements and Communications.

VIII. Special Orders.

IX. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

X. New Business.

XI. Adjournment.

Professor Marty Ytreberg, Chair 2014-2015, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2014-2015 FS Meeting #17
               FAHB Documents
               FS-15-040
               FS-15-041
Present: Jeanne Stevenson for Aiken (w/o vote), Boschetti, Brandt, Caplan, Chung, Couture (Boise), Crowley (w/o vote), Flores, Foster, Frey, Godfrey (Coeur d’Alene), Hiromoto (Idaho Falls), Jeffery, Karsky, Kennelly, Lowe, Mahoney, Murphy, Nyavor, Qualls, Safaii, Stauffer, Stoll, Ytreberg. Absent: Aiken (w/o vote), Earl, Folwell, Perret, Teal, Wolf. Guests: 3

The meeting was called to order at 3:33. The Senate continued to struggle with getting the new cloud based system to work appropriately. As the chair observed, we are having issues with both seeing and hearing senators at other sites.

A motion (Brandt/Lowe) to approve the minutes for meeting # 16, January 27, 2015 passed without objection.

Chairs Report: Chair Ytreberg announced that next week Sarah Nelson, Chair of Faculty Appeals Hearing Board will come to the Senate to discuss that committee and its role. Next week the Senate will also take a first look at proposed revisions to the College of Graduate Studies Bylaws. Senators should share these proposed changes with their constituents in preparation for a vote in several weeks. Two weeks from now Trish Hartzell will return with a revised version of the student evaluation forms. Sabbatical applications for 2016-17 are due Fri. March 27th. Those applying should be reminded that the applications need to be submitted to their unit administrator and their dean two weeks prior to the deadline. The spring University Faculty Meeting has been scheduled for 3pm May 5th in the International Ballroom of the recently renamed Bruce Pitman Center. The search committee for a new Provost has conducted some preliminary interviews and the finalists will be invited to campus in the near future. There will be an effort to schedule sessions for the Provost candidates to meet with senators.

Provost Report: Vice Provost Stevenson discussed ongoing searches other than the Provost Search. Candidates for the Marketing and Communications Director are interviewing on campus in a couple of weeks. There is also a search in progress for the Idaho Falls Center Executive.

University Budget & Finance Committee (UBFC): The chair invited UBFC chair Norman Pendegraft and Executive Director of Planning and Budget, Keith Ickes, to discuss the proposal for CEC (Change in Employee Compensation) from UBFC. The full proposal is included in the agenda packet for today’s meeting. Professor Pendegraft began the conversation noting that the actual recommendation from UBFC is on page 8 of the handout. He wanted to highlight that the committee considered a wide variety of issues but eventually decided to lump together the issues of merit, inversion, and compression believing that they were inseparable. This left the committee with three categories for consideration: low pay, across the board, and the combined concerns of merit, inversion, and compression.

Chair Ytreberg wondered how the committee dealt with concerns about how merit pay will be distributed. Is this based on annual performance evaluations or the discretion of unit administrators? Professor Pendegraft stated that this led to some spirited debate on UBFC. The committee ended up deciding that merit would be based on the results of the annual performance review. The question of how such evaluations were determined and whether they were uniform across the University was not germane to the committee’s charge.

Chair Ytreberg continued the inquiry into merit by asking whether a person receiving a 4.0 rating in English would be considered more meritorious than a faculty member in Math who received a 3.8. He
expressed concerns about whether these evaluations would be comparable across units and colleges. The faculty secretary noted that the scores were not comparable across departments and colleges. Senator Brandt who was also a member of UBFC acknowledged that the current system of determining merit was a blunt instrument. She also expressed concerns about artificial limits—like the need to give most everyone a 3—being placed on the annual evaluation. Despite her concerns about how merit is determined she noted that the committee did not try to investigate alternate methods of determining merit. Professor Pendegraft stated that had the committee sought to do this he would have ruled it out of order. A senator inquired about how the funds were distributed across colleges which was answered that typically funds are distributed as a percentage of the total salary in that college.

A senator asked whether merit was determined based on this particular year’s evaluations or whether there was an attempt to look back at previous years? Professor Pendegraft mentioned that his college had discussed the use of “rolling averages” but had not done that. Generally, he was under the impression that such decisions were made college by college. More discussion followed about whether there was a movement to make evaluations for both faculty and staff more consistent across colleges. There is a committee looking into faculty evaluations but it wasn’t known if anyone was looking at issues related to staff evaluations. Having discussed, but clearly not resolved, concerns with merit evaluations the Senate returned to the proposal from the UBFC.

The Faculty Secretary thanked Professor Pendegraft and the UBFC for making a recommendation to spend $140,000 to bring all employees up to at least $25,000. A proposal, similar in intent, came from UBFC last year. Professor Pendegraft commented on the use of the term “low pay” and stated that the committee had rejected other terms that had certain legal connotations in labor law. He stated that the committee had been close to unanimous in making this “low pay” recommendation and he complimented the University for avoiding making low wage hires in recent years. In response to a question from a senator Mr. Ickes stated that raising everyone to $25,000 would not take anyone out of their current pay grade. The $25,000 would become the new floor and no hires would be made below that. Mr. Ickes noted that $140,000 would represent less than 0.1% of a 3% raise.

UBFC looked at three different scenarios of possible increases from the state:
   1. CEC of 1% allocate funds across the board.
   2. CEC of 2% should be allocated as follows:
      a. 1% across the board, and
      b. 1% according to the combined factors of merit, inversion, and compression.
   3. CEC of 2.5% or more the University should:
      a. commit $140,000 to alleviate low pay concerns,
      b. provide 1% across the board, and
      c. allocate the remainder according to the combined factors of merit, inversion, and compression.

Professor Pendegraft noted that while members of the UBFC were very talented and worked very hard to arrive at this proposal, he did not believe the UBFC was as representative of the total campus community as the Senate. Thus he stated he would not be offended if the Senate decided to play with the recommendations.

A senator asked about where this recommendation would go. Chair Ytreberg stated that if the Senate endorsed this proposal, or one like it, than it would be sent to the President and the Provost. He observed that both had indicated an interest in what the Senate recommends.
A senator reflected that earlier in the academic year the question of whether across the board raises should be based on percentages or be a flat amount had been brought up. Had the UBFC considered that? Professor Pendegraft noted that the committee’s discussions had been spirited and far ranging and yes this issue had been raised. Ultimately, it was rejected since it had the potential to undermine the University’s ability to recruit at a high level. Keith Ickes suggested that allotting across the board on a flat dollar amount would reduce our ability to raise faculty salaries above its current position of 84% of our peers. A senator suggested that a flat raise as opposed to a percentage might help with staff retention. Mr. Ickes did not think there would be any interest in redirecting faculty dollars to help staff. He argued that this would not be desirable institutionally which needs to maintain salary scales that reflect market forces.

A concern was expressed that the UBFC’s recommendation would seem to allow for the possibility that a person receiving a satisfactory evaluation might still only receive a 1% across the board raise out of a 3% CEC. A UBFC member stated that this was possible although not likely. If a dean or unit administrator decided that the merit and compression funds needed to be allocated to others than a person might receive only 1%. If the people determining the raises are to have flexibility than it is possible someone with satisfactory ratings will not receive more than the across the board raise. Ickes suggested that there will have to be a forthcoming discussion of whether there should be caps on merit/compression increases. Chair Ytreberg noted that a plan like this one places trust in the dean’s to be consistent and to equalize different evaluation scores from supervisors.

As the conversation began to wane Professor Pendegraft stated that the committee felt strongly that the compression issue was very serious and that this was something that we would have to begin to address. If we start to address this issue now than perhaps over a period of years this will become less of a problem. He also recommended that senators look at the WSU web site that lays out in some detail how faculty should be evaluated and how CEC’s should be distributed.

It was moved (Foster/Safaii) to endorse the proposal from UBFC. There was no further discussion and the motion to endorse passed 17-3.

The chair suggested that the Senate would work on some of the wording before sending the proposal forward to the President.

**Hiring Costs:** A further report from UBFC was produced by a sub-committee led by Senator Brandt. This report sought to approximate the costs of hiring new faculty. Professor Pendegraft praised the efforts of the sub-committee and suggested that he thought the costs were considerably higher than those listed in the report. The report came to the conclusion that the average cost of a faculty search is $5,800 but did not include faculty and staff time to engage in the search. The average cost of moving expenses is $7,000. The start-up costs for new faculty ranged from $2,500 to $600,000.

A senator thanked the sub-committee for their efforts. He also suggested that if the faculty time is included, his quick calculations resulted in a cost of over $12,500 per search. Senator Brandt agreed that this was a reasonable approximation.

There was a short discussion of the faculty turnover rate. Although no one had a precise estimate, the chair noted he had seen a report suggesting that we had a faculty turnover rate of about twice that of our peers. Professor Brandt agreed that the turnover rate was startling and that the opportunity costs were significant. Another senator pointed out that it frequently takes new faculty several years to become a productive and contributing member of the faculty. Although no vote was taken it seemed
apparent that there was widespread agreement that the results of this study were troubling and that the costs of replacing faculty and adding new ones raised serious concerns. A senator noted that some of the faculty leaving actually wanted to stay but there seemed to be no established procedure for trying to retain such faculty. Another senator was disturbed by the suggestion that one should seek another job offer as a way to leverage a higher salary.

A question was also raised about whether our recently completed University fundraising campaign might help to address some of these concerns. Mr. Ickes noted that the recent campaign did place a priority on the establishment of endowed chairs. This is a pattern long followed by private universities. He felt that our current level of endowed chairs was appropriate for a university of our size and fundraising. A fully endowed chair costs 3-4 million. The strategy of partially endowing chairs was a reasonable one given our fundraising environment.

The chair asked the Senate what they would like to do with this report. While many senators suggested that this was a key issue that we needed to return to, another wondered whether such discussions would lead to any concrete policy proposals. The chair noted that it was certainly within the scope of Senate to recommend changes to the FSH. Beyond that, the Senate could clearly raise such concerns with the President and Provost.

Adjournment: With the time now at 5:15 pm a motion (Murphy/Lowe) to adjourn passed unanimously.

Don Crowley, Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Senate
A. FUNCTION. This board will conduct a hearing at the request of a faculty member who wishes to appeal an institutional decision, see FSH 3840 B. In each case referred to it, the board has the following responsibilities:

A-1. To review all documentary evidence submitted by the parties prior to the hearing and all evidence submitted by the parties at the hearing. The board may require the parties to submit evidence deemed relevant by the board.

A-2. To determine whether there has been any (1) failure to comply with prescribed procedures, (2) application of inappropriate considerations, (3) abuse of discretion, or (4) abuse of the appellant’s academic rights and privileges.

A-3. To make recommendations to the president.

B. STRUCTURE AND MEMBERSHIP: Five faculty members, one of whom is a departmental administrator, are principal members. In addition, five other faculty members, two other departmental administrators, and three off-campus faculty members are appointed as alternate members of the board. In appointing members, including alternates, the Committee on Committees must ensure that the majority of the members are tenured and each of them have been employed at the UI for longer than two years. The term of membership is three years, with initial terms staggered to form a rotation pattern. The off-campus alternates will serve, in place of principal faculty members chosen by lot, when an appeal by an off-campus faculty member is to be heard. The other alternate members will serve, as appropriate, when a principal member is deemed to have a conflict of interest. Once the panel for an individual has been determined, it will meet at the direction of the chair of the Faculty Appeals Hearings Committee and elects its own panel chair. [rev. 7-99, 1-09]

C. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: Faculty members serving on the Faculty Appeals Hearing Board (FAHB) should take careful note of the following additional considerations and conditions for service: 1) appeals usually occur following tenure, promotion, and salary decisions in the middle of the Spring semester, 2) appeal hearings usually require a 2-4 hour time block which will require meeting on a weekday evening or Saturday to accommodate the schedules of all of the parties involved in a hearing, and 3) the term of office of a member of the FAHB ends when the last active case final report is submitted. Faculty members not willing to abide by these conditions should not apply for service on the Faculty Appeals Hearing Board. [add. 7-02]
CHAPTER THREE: 3840
EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION CONCERNING FACULTY AND STAFF
April 2014

3840

PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY APPEALS

PREAMBLE: This section deals with the procedures for faculty appeals. It formed a part of the 1979 Handbook and was revised in July of 1994 to add harassment on the basis of race, color, religion, gender, national origin, age or disability to the "areas of concern" and in January of 1996 so as to remove the Faculty Affairs Committee from those bodies through which an appeal had to travel before being heard. The section was substantially revised in July 1999 and again in July 2002 to clarify the committee’s scope and its procedures, and A was revised in 2007 to add a process for addressing retaliation complaints. In 2008 the committee composition previously in C and D was moved into FSH 1640 Committee Directory. In April 2014 changes were made to E-3 to bring the policy into alignment with Regents policy. Further information is available from the Provost’s Office (208-885-6448) or the Office of the Faculty Secretary (208-885-6151). [rev. 7-99, 7-02, 7-07, 7-08, ed. 7-00, 7-05, 4-14]

CONTENTS:
A. Areas of Concern
B. Procedures for Initiating an Appeal
C. Faculty Appeals Hearing Board
D. Hearing Procedures
E. Procedures Following the Hearing

A. AREAS OF CONCERN. The procedures provided in this policy are to be used by faculty members to appeal administrative decisions, including without limitation decisions in such matters as denial of tenure, denial of promotion, position description, performance evaluation, salary determination, and to challenge the contents of personnel files. Applicability of these procedures to some matters is subject to certain limitations and exclusions — nonrenewal of fixed-term appointments [see 3900 E and F], dismissal for cause [see 3910, in particular, 3910 D-5-a], and layoff resulting from a declaration of financial exigency [see 3970]. Allegations of sexual harassment or discrimination based on race, color, sex, national origin, religion, age, sexual orientation, or disability are not subject to this policy, but should be brought to the Director of Human Rights, Access and Inclusion. Decisions of the president concerning administrative assignments are not appealable under this policy. A faculty member alleging retaliation is required to follow the process set forth in FSH 3810 before proceeding under this policy. The time period for appeal will begin to run upon completion of the process set forth in 3810. [rev. 7-99, 7-02, 7-07, 7-12, ed. 9-06, 6-09]

B. PROCEDURES FOR INITIATING AN APPEAL.
B-1. Before, or in addition to, filing an appeal, the faculty member should seek satisfaction informally by discussing his or her complaint with the administrator who made the decision. If the issue is not resolved by this means, the faculty member should then go to the next administrative level for redress. Reference to these discussions should be included in the request for a hearing.

B-2. A faculty member who wishes to appeal an institutional decision may do so by submitting a written request for a formal hearing. Such a request must be made within 30 calendar days after he or she receives written notice of the institutional decision, except that a 20-day period is allowed in cases of nonrenewal of fixed-term appointments [see 3900 F], a 14-day period is allowed in cases of denial of tenure or promotion, and a 15-day period is allowed in cases of dismissal for cause [see 3910 D-5-a]. If the appeal concerns salary determination, the 30-day period allowed for filing begins with receipt of notice of the dollar amount of salary assigned [see 3420 B-3, B-6]; the earlier assignment to a salary-increment category [see 3420 B-3] may be appealed by the informal means described in A-1 or may be included in the appeal after the salary amount has been fixed. In the request, the faculty member must state clearly what decision is being appealed and, briefly, the grounds on which the appeal is based. If the time deadlines contained in this provision or in any rules or procedures adopted by the Faculty Appeals Hearing Board are not complied with the appeal shall be dismissed unless the Faculty Appeals Hearing Board determines that an
attempt at informal resolution through the Ombuds Office or extraordinary circumstances justified the delay. [rev. 7-99, 2-07, ed. 7-01, 7-02, 3-14]

B-3. The request for a hearing is addressed to the chair of the Faculty Appeals Hearing Board (FAHB) (see FSH 1640.43). The FAHB chair will forward copies of the request to the provost, and other administrators concerned. The provost, or another administrator designated by the provost, will furnish the FAHB chair and the faculty member a written statement of the reasons for the administrative decision. [rev. and ren. 7-99, ed. 7-02, 7-08]

B-4. A request for a hearing does not affect the effective date of the decision being appealed. [add. 7-02]

C. THE FACULTY APPEALS HEARING BOARD. (see FSH 1640.43)

D. HEARING PROCEDURES. [ren. 7-08]
D-1. The hearing board may adopt rules of procedure from time to time. In a particular case these rules may be altered by the Board in the interest of fairness. These rules are available on request from the chair of the board and the faculty secretary. [add. 7-99, ren. 7-08]

D-2. The board will meet before the hearing to consider the nature of the parties’ expected presentations, to make decisions about the procedure that will be followed in the hearing, and to set mutually acceptable dates for the hearing, including the time and duration of the presentations. The board communicates these decisions in writing to the parties and allows each of them five working days in which to respond. The chair of the board negotiates any disputed matters. [ed. and ren. 7-99, ren. 7-08]

D-3. The chair of the board summons the faculty member and the officer (or a representative of the body) whose decision is under appeal. The chair also summons other UI employees or students to appear on the request of either party or of the board itself; the summons must set a reasonable time and place to appear and must give due notice. Persons summoned have the obligation to respond as though summoned by the president. Either party may be assisted by counsel of its choice in an advisory capacity only. Both parties are entitled to be present during the entire hearing. [rev. and ren. 7-99, ed. 7-02, ren. 7-08]

D-4. During the hearing, the faculty member’s case will be presented first, in whatever manner he or she desires: e.g., through the testimony of witnesses, submission of documents, or oral statements. The board may then question the faculty member. The administration then presents its case, followed by questions from the board. The faculty member is given an opportunity to respond and to summarize his or her case. [ed. 7-97; ren. 7-99, 7-08, ed. 7-02]

D-5. As a general rule, the board admits, rather than excludes, presentations that either party desires to make. The chair may rule against presentations that are clearly repetitive or irrelevant. [ren. 7-99, 7-08]

D-6. The faculty member and the board should know of the existence and substance of all materials on which the administration has relied in making the decision being appealed [see 3040]; there should be no means by which the substance of any charge, or other adverse information or allegation, can be kept secret from the faculty member. [ren. 7-99, 7-08, ed. 7-02]

E. PROCEDURES FOLLOWING THE HEARING. [ren. 7-08]
E-1. The findings and recommendations of the hearing board are reported promptly in writing to the faculty member, his or her departmental administrator and dean, the provost, and the president. [rev. 7-99, ed. 7-02, ren. 7-08]

E-2. The president, following receipt of the report of the hearing board, has the responsibility of promptly responding in writing—and in any case within 45 days—to the faculty member, and the hearing board, and of providing a statement of the rationale for his or her decision. [rev. 7-99, ed. 7-02, ren. 7-08]

E-3. No Appeal to the Regents. The Regents have delegated authority for personnel matters to the president (RGPIIB2b), specifically stating that employee grievances are not appealable to the Board (RGPIIM2). [add. 7-02, ren. 7-08, rev. 4-14]

E-4. The chair of the board shall report annually to the Faculty Senate regarding the nature of the matters considered by the board during the preceding year. [add. 7-99, ren. 7-02, 7-08, ed. 6-09]
Faculty Appeals Hearing Board Procedures
for appeals under FSH 3840 (administrative decisions)

1. Filing and processing of appeal:
   - The appellant files a written request for a formal hearing with the FAHB chair.
   - The FAHB chair checks the timeliness of the request for hearing. (FSH 3840 B-2). If filed late, the FAHB is required to either dismiss the appeal or make a determination under FSH 3840 B-2 that “extraordinary circumstances” justify the delay.
   - Once a decision has been made regarding timeliness, the FAHB must notify both the appellant and the provost and other administrators. If the appeal is dismissed for failure to timely file, then the notice just needs to state the basic details, and the decision of the FAHB.
   - If the FAHB accepts the request for hearing, (either because it is timely filed or based on an extraordinary circumstances determination) the chair then forwards a copy of the request to the provost and other administrator(s) concerned. The forwarded request should have a cover letter to both the provost and the appellant notifying them of receipt and acceptance of the request, and, if acceptance is based on a finding of extraordinary circumstances, the findings of the FAHB regarding the extraordinary circumstances. The letter also should notify the parties of the following process points and deadlines:
     - Administration’s response to the appeal must be filed with the FAHB chair within 30 days of request.
       - Must provide copy to appellant and submit original to FAHB chair.
     - Appellant may, within 21 days of receipt of the administration’s response, submit a written reply.
       - Content is limited to new matters raised by the administration’s response. Must submit original to the FAHB chair.

   The chair’s letter should further inform the parties of the existence of the FAHB Procedures and include a copy, and should provide an estimated date range for hearing and indicate that the chair will follow up regarding scheduling.

2. Prior to the hearing:
   - After the deadline has passed for the appellant’s reply to the administration’s response, the FAHB meets to consider the case and select potential hearing dates.
     - FAHB chair sends letter to parties informing them of the hearing date and process and any decisions made under FSH 3840 D-2.
     - FAHB chair may elect to first call/email parties to identify a hearing date, then provide exact date in letter (note policy – this is a summons under FSH 3840 D-3).
   - FAHB chair confers in advance of the hearing with both parties to determine which witnesses, if any need to be formally summoned to ensure they are available at the hearing, and to decide any preliminary matters that the parties bring to the chair’s attention.
• FAHB identifies any other witnesses it wishes to call and sends a summons to these individuals as well.

3. During the hearing:
• All hearings of the Board are closed. However, a hearing may be open, at the request of either of the parties involved, with concurrence of the other party and a majority of the Board.
• FAHB chair provides introduction, reminds parties of process, tracks and notifies parties of time limits.
• Each party has ½ hour to present its case – not including time spent on questions by FAHB (if warranted, FAHB may extend time limits). Parties may present their case in whatever manner they desire: e.g., through the testimony of witnesses, submission of documents, or oral statements. The appellant presents first.
• Each party has 10 minutes to summarize its case.

4. After the hearing:
• FAHB “promptly” reports its findings and recommendations in writing to the appellant, departmental administrator, dean, provost and president.
• President has 45 days following receipt of the report to respond in writing to the appellant and FAHB, stating his or her decision and the rationale for it.
• Appellant may appeal an adverse decision to the Board of Regents.
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BYLAWS OF THE FACULTY OF THE COLLEGE OF GRADUATE STUDIES

PREAMBLE: This section contains the bylaws of the faculty of the College of Graduate Studies, including the criteria and application process for membership in the graduate faculty. This current version of the bylaws of the College of Graduate Studies was adopted by the graduate faculty as of July, 1995 (replacing a version that had remained substantially unchanged from the 1979 Handbook). Further information may be obtained from the College of Graduate Studies (208-885-6243).

CONTENTS:
Article I. Name, Object, and Authority
Article II. Membership
Article III. Membership Review
Article IV. Officers
Article V. Meetings of the Graduate Faculty
Article VI. Graduate Council
Article VII. Committees
Article VIII. Rules of Order
Article IX. Amendments

ARTICLE I--NAME, OBJECT, AND AUTHORITY.

Section 1. Name. The faculty of the College of Graduate Studies, a constituent faculty, is designated hereinafter as the "graduate faculty."

Section 2. Object and Function. The object of the graduate faculty is to give emphasis to graduate instruction and related research and to function as follows: to maintain an overview of the program and procedures of graduate instruction and of the environment created by the university for research, to establish academic regulations for graduate study, and to review proposed graduate curricula.

Section 3. Authority. As provided in the constitution of the university faculty [see 1520 I-4-A], this constituent faculty is authorized to establish and effect its educational objectives, including matters of student admission and curriculum, and to participate in the selection of its dean, other executive officers, and faculty members, subject only to the general rules and regulations of the university faculty and the authority of the president and the regents.

ARTICLE II--MEMBERSHIP.

Section 1. Graduate Faculty. The graduate faculty is constituted of those who meet the criteria for graduate faculty membership. To be eligible for membership on the graduate faculty, a UI faculty member must 1) hold a terminal degree, or commensurate professional experience, in the field of his/her research specialty; 2) have the recommendation of the administrator of the unit in which the faculty member has his/her primary appointment; and 3) be approved by the dean of the College of Graduate Studies. Eligible faculty must hold one of the following academic ranks as defined in the Faculty-Staff Handbook, Section 1565 D-2 Faculty, D-3 Research Faculty, D-4 Extension Faculty, D-8 Distinguished Professor, and D-9 Clinical Faculty. The rank of D-5 Librarian, D-6 Psychologists or Licensed Psychologists, and D-7 Officer Education, are not eligible for Graduate Faculty Membership but may be eligible to serve on a graduate committee. Instructors and Senior Instructors, D-1, are not eligible for graduate faculty or to serve on a graduate student committee. These criteria may be waived at the discretion of the dean of College of Graduate Studies. [rev. 7-13]
Section 2. Member Privileges. A member of the graduate faculty has the privilege of: serving as a representative to Graduate Council, participating in the election of a representative from his or her college graduate faculty to serve on the Graduate Council (according to each college’s bylaws), voting on matters concerning the programs and regulations of the College of Graduate Studies, and serving as major professor of a graduate committee. No graduate faculty member shall chair a graduate program committee for a degree higher than the earned degree held by that faculty member. [rev. 7-13]

ARTICLE III. MEMBERSHIP REVIEW. [add. 7-13]

Section 1. To maintain membership on the graduate faculty, a member must continue to meet the membership criteria. The Graduate Council will determine continued membership of a faculty member who does not meet the expectations described in his/her position description for three consecutive years (overall evaluation score of 2 or lower) or if there is other evidence that a member is not meeting the membership criteria, or if a member has been found to have committed an ethical violation or research misconduct (see Section 2 below). A review may be initiated by the administrator of the member’s unit, by the college dean of the college in which the primary appointment is held, by the dean of the College of Graduate Studies, or by the Graduate Council.

Section 2. Any violation of professional ethics or finding of research misconduct, as defined by the Faculty-Staff Handbook, will be cause for review or may be cause for revocation of graduate faculty membership, as the Graduate Council may determine.

Section 3. When reviewing graduate faculty membership, the Graduate Council should consider the faculty member’s position description and the following: 1) publication of a scholarly book published by a refereed press, or a quality refereed (juryed) scholarly work; 2) successful direction of graduate students to completion of their degrees; 3) contribution to or invitation to make presentations at international/national/regional/professional conferences; 4) teaching of formal graduate courses, exclusive of independent study/research; 5) receipt of research funding; and 6) other scholarly, creative, or community contribution activities verified by the administrator of the unit to be of equal standing to any of the above.

Section 4. Any appeal of a Graduate Council decision regarding graduate faculty membership will be forwarded to the Faculty Appeals Hearing Board (FSH 1640.43).

ARTICLE IV -- OFFICERS. The dean of the College of Graduate Studies serves as the chair of the graduate faculty and of the Graduate Council; the assistant or associate dean serves as vice chair of these bodies. The secretary is appointed by the dean with the concurrence of the Graduate Council. [ren. 7-13]

ARTICLE V -- MEETINGS OF THE GRADUATE FACULTY. [ren. & ed. 7-13]

Section 1. Call of Meetings. A meeting of the graduate faculty may be called at the discretion of the dean or, in his or her absence, by the assistant or associate dean. Meetings must be called at the earliest convenient time on the request of the Graduate Council or on the written petition of 10 members of the graduate faculty. [ed. 7-13]

Section 2. Quorum. Those members of the graduate faculty present at a meeting properly called in accordance with this article constitute a quorum.

Section 3. Agenda. The dean is responsible for the agenda and causes it to be issued at least one week before each meeting of the graduate faculty. The agenda lists all subjects, other than routine matters, to be voted on by the graduate faculty.

ARTICLE VI -- GRADUATE COUNCIL. [ren. 7-13]

Section 1. Function. The Graduate Council is the representative body of and is empowered to act for the graduate faculty, to which the constitution of the university faculty delegates those responsibilities stated in these bylaws, article 1, section 3, as a constituent faculty of the university. The council is responsible to and reports to the graduate
faculty, which retains the authority to review actions of the council. The Graduate Council and faculties of other colleges of the university have the authority to originate actions affecting the College of Graduate Studies. Actions affecting that college originating outside the college are considered and acted on by the council when they are forwarded to it by the appropriate college faculties. Policy actions concerning standards for admission, academic standards, courses of instruction, curricula, graduation requirements, and graduate degrees to be granted require routine approval by the university faculty.

Section 2. Membership. The council consists of one member elected by and from the constituent graduate faculty of each college that offers programs leading to graduate degrees (except the J.D. degree), three at-large members of the graduate faculty recommended by the dean of the College of Graduate Studies and approved by the provost of the university, two members representing university-wide academic programs, two graduate students, and the dean and assistant or associate dean of the College of Graduate Studies. [rev. 7-13]

a. College Representatives to Graduate Council. The constituent graduate faculty of each college that offers programs leading to graduate degrees (except the J.D. degree) establishes procedures in the unit's by-laws for electing its representative to the council. [add. 7-13]

b. University-Wide Academic Program Representative to Graduate Council. The university-wide academic programs will select one representative for the Graduate Council. [add. 7-13]

c. At-Large Members of Graduate Council. In appointing the at-large faculty members to serve on the council, the provost of the university considers the number of members of the graduate faculty in each college and also considers the need for breadth of representation of disciplines. Representation of the non-Moscow campuses should also be considered. [add. 7-13]

d. Graduate Student Representatives to Graduate Council. The appointment of the graduate student members is on recommendation from the Graduate and Professional Student Association. [add. 7-13]

Section 3. Terms of Office. The college, university-wide academic programs, and at-large members serve for three years, taking office on the first day of the fall semester of the year for which they are elected or appointed. The student members serve for one year. Except for the dean and assistant or associate dean, no member of the council may serve more than two consecutive terms. A faculty member who has served two consecutive terms may again serve after a lapse of three years. [rev. 7-13]

Section 4. Eligibility. Every voting member of the graduate faculty is eligible to serve on the council.

Section 5. Vacancies. If a college or university-wide academic program representative is unable to complete his or her term, the constituency they represent will elect a graduate faculty member to complete the term. If any of the at-large members are unable to complete their term, the provost of the university will appoint another member to complete the term. [rev. & ren. 7-13]

Section 6. Quorum. A quorum consists of a majority of the members of the council, excluding the dean and associate or assistant dean of the College of Graduate Studies. [ren. 7-13]

ARTICLE VII--COMMITTEES. Standing committees of the graduate faculty or of the Graduate Council are appointed by the Graduate Council. Special or ad hoc committees are appointed by the dean in consultation with the Graduate Council. [ren. 7-13]

ARTICLE VIII--RULES OF ORDER. [See 1520 VI.] [ren. 7-13]

ARTICLE X--AMENDMENTS. These bylaws may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the voting members of the graduate faculty, as defined in article II, section 1, above, in attendance at a properly called meeting. Amendments that conflict with any provision of the constitution of the university faculty or with regents' policies are without effect. Proposed amendments must have been published in full in the agenda at least one week before the meeting of the graduate faculty or presented in writing at the meeting previous to the one in which the vote is to be taken. No provision of this article may be suspended. [ren. 7-13]
DATE: 10/16/14

TO: Dr. Katherine G. Aiken
    Interim Provost and Executive Vice President

FROM: Liz Bryant, Pre-Health Advisor; Andrew Brewick, Director, Academic Advising

SUBJECT: Minor Change Notification Request

Attached to this letter please find the NWCCU Change Application Form(s) for the below listed program(s)/change(s). The University of Idaho is writing to notify both the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) per the Substantive Change Policy (revised 2013) and the Idaho State Board of Education per Board Policy Section III.G.3.c.ii of the change(s) which we believe is minor.

- Pre-Health Professions Studies, creation of an academic minor

The following information is being provided to ensure both agencies have the necessary information to ensure the minor, non-substantive change(s) is in align with our institutional responsibilities and accreditation.

Mission and Core Themes:
Development of a Pre-Health Professions Minor will enable the University of Idaho to better support the academic and professional development of our pre-health students through more accurate and efficient identification and outreach. Furthermore, it will help us to focus our teaching and learning in a pre-professional context for our pre-health professions students.

Authorization:
The change(s) was approved through the College of Science Curriculum Committee, and University Curriculum Committee, Faculty Senate, and by the University Faculty during the 2014-15 academic year. The University of Idaho is providing notification to NWCCU and OSBE as required by the policy of each agency prior to making the change(s). The change(s) will be made effective beginning Summer 2015.

Educational Offerings:
The proposed Pre-Health Professions minor will be academically housed in the College of Science. Most health professions schools do not require a specific degree for admission. Instead, students are encouraged to select a major in an area that reflects their interests and aptitude, and then simultaneously complete prerequisite coursework for admission to their school(s) of choice. The proposed Pre-Health Professions minor includes curriculum that most health professions schools will expect applicants to have completed prior to admission, and involves no change to current course offerings at the University of Idaho.

Planning:
The current system is not sufficient for accurately and efficiently identifying the population of pre-health students enrolled at the University of Idaho. Development of a Pre-Health Professions academic minor will enable students to formally self-identify as a pre-health professions student, regardless of their chosen major. This process will allow the pre-health advisor to perform a higher level of outreach to these students, and will provide them with a
more structured pathway to satisfy their professional school prerequisites. This solution was
developed, in consultation with the Registrar's office and pertinent academic departments,
following a review of the current processes used and challenges faced at both the University of
Idaho and other institutions.
Development of this program would entail removal of Pre-Health Studies language (Pre-Med,
Pre-Dental, Pre-Physical Therapy) from within Biological Sciences in the University Catalog,
and placement of the proposed academic minor within Colleges and Other Units.

**Budget:**
No projected change.

**Student Services:**
Development of the proposed Pre-Health Professions minor has negligible potential for negative
impact, and high potential for positive impact. Students will be able to self-identify through the
declaration of the proposed minor. The proposed minor incorporates multiple options, allowing
students to customize their course of study to meet the needs of their specific programs of
choice. The declaration of the proposed Pre-Health Minor will enable the Pre-Health Advisor
and other Academic Advisors to accurately identify students' pre-health intentions, regardless of
academic major.

**Physical Facilities:**
None.

**Library and Information Resources:**
No additional resources required.

**Faculty:**
No additional faculty or staff required for the development of the Pre-Health Professions
academic minor.

Attachments: NWCCU Change Form (#)
Appendix A: Pre-Health Professions Minor Curriculum
University of Idaho: Pre-Health Professions Minor

Most health professions schools do not require a specific degree for admission. Instead, students are encouraged to select a major in an area that reflects their interests and aptitude, and then simultaneously complete prerequisite coursework for admission to their school(s) of choice. The Pre-Health Professions minor includes coursework that most health professions schools will expect applicants to have completed prior to admission. Requirements do vary between programs; therefore, students should be certain to check specific requirements at their schools of most interest.

Required Courses:
- Chem 101, Introduction to Chemistry 4 cr
- Chem 111*, Principles of Chemistry I 4 cr
- Psych 101, Intro to Psychology 3 cr
- Stat 251, Statistical Methods 3 cr

Choose at least 10 credits from the following:
- Biol 115, Cells and the Evolution of Life 4 cr
- Biol 116, Organisms and Environments 4 cr
- Biol 120, Human Anatomy 4 cr
- Biol 121, Human Physiology 4 cr
- Chem 112, Principles of Chemistry II 4 cr
- Chem 277, Organic Chemistry I 3 cr
- Chem 278, Organic Chemistry I Lab 1 cr
- Engl 317, Technical Writing 3 cr
- Physics 111, General Physics I 3 cr
- Physics 111L, General Physics I Lab 1 cr
- Physics 211*, Engineering Physics I 3 cr
- Physics 211L, Engineering Physics I Lab 1 cr

*Chem 111 strongly encouraged as most health professions schools require general chemistry for science majors

Courses to total 20 credits for this minor