I. Call to Order.

II. Consent Agenda.

III. Minutes.
   - Minutes of the 2014-15 Faculty Senate Meeting #20, February 24, 2015 (vote)

IV. Chair’s Report.

V. Provost’s Report.

VI. Other Announcements and Communications.

VIII. Committee Reports.

   University Curriculum Committee
   - Curriculum process/timeline (Eveleth)

   Committee on Committees: (Teal)
   - FS-15-042rev: FSH 1640.95 - University Security and Compliance Committee (Dorschel)(vote)
   - FS-15-043: FSH 1640.89 - University for General Education (vote)
   - FS-15-044: FSH 1640.90 - General Education Assessment Committee (vote)
   - FS-15-045:
     - FSH 1640.36 - Dismissal Hearings Committee (vote)
     - FSH 1640.43 - Faculty Appeals Hearing Board (vote)

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. Special Orders.

X. New Business.

XI. Adjournment.

Professor Marty Ytreberg, Chair 2014-2015, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2014-2015 FS Meeting #19
FS-15-042 through 045
The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:32. While we briefly had adequate connections with all off-site members that soon dissipated. The minutes were amended to correct the meeting number and the date. A motion to approve the minutes as amended (Frey/Foster) passed with no objections and one abstention.

Chair’s Report: The Chair announced that next week Dan Eveleth will come to the Senate to discuss curriculum timelines. In two weeks Brant Miller will be present to discuss a proposed policy regarding allowing Emeritus Faculty and Honored Staff access to software. The Chair asked for volunteers to be Judge for the Student Achievement Award for Outstanding Faculty. Applications for the award are due Friday, March 6. Rodney Frey volunteered.

The Chair also asked for a Senate representative to the Campus Community Coalition on Alcohol and Drug Risk. Finally, the Chair requested that those who attended any of the meetings with the provost candidates to submit feedback to the website at http://www.uidaho.edu/president/search/provost-evp-search. The feedback will go directly to the President although he won’t be able to identify the identity of those providing the feedback.

The Chair recognized Senator Flores to make an announcement regarding the “grade-in” tomorrow as part of National Adjunct Day. The event is designed to raise awareness about the importance and working conditions of adjunct faculty.

Provost Report: Provost Aiken thanked all those who participated in the provost search. She also commented on the annual Jazz Festival starting this week. This is a signature event for the University and noted that the students visiting campus are potential UI students most of them in areas other than Music. The Jazz Festival provides a good opportunity to show off the campus and the work we do. It is also a great opportunity to hear great jazz artists perform during the evening performances and in the many workshops held during the day.

Enrollment Management: The Chair introduced Jean Kim, Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management. Vice Provost Kim briefly discussed the restructuring of administration leadership in the student affairs and enrollment management areas. Last month President Staben and Provost Aiken asked her to chair a new group, the Enrollment Management Council, whose task is to create a strategic enrollment management plan. They hope to have developed their plan by the end of the semester. The goal is to increase the enrollment at UI to 17,000 in the next ten years.

A senator, noting the decline of enrollment in his college over the last five years asked about the need to develop plans at the college and department level to address such declines. Ms. Kim noted that such declines were not unique to the senator’s area and acknowledged that different colleges would need to employ different strategies to address the problems of recruitment and retention.
Another question asked about “bottlenecks” like lab and dormitory space that might affect plans to increase enrollment. She suggested that they were looking at gateway courses and bottlenecks but that in the near term there is sufficient capacity to accommodate enrollment increases.

A senator asked if we had looked at what does and doesn’t work at other institutions seeking to increase enrollment. Vice Provost Kim said that they were looking at national best practices and they were specifically looking at peer institutions that have had similar challenges. Asked which peer institutions were being looked at, Ms. Kim responded they were looking at WSU, Utah State, Montana State and Colorado State among others. A senator suggested that we needed to “cast the net wider” to find those institutions that are being successful.

There were several questions related to the student climate and how we might retain students while also attracting new students. Ms. Kim agreed that we might do more in using “student ambassadors” as well as taking steps to insure an inviting campus environment. She suggested that she would like to return to the Senate as her task force develops its strategic plan.

Committee Reports: Graduate Council—FS-15-040: FSH 1700. Chair Ytreberg invited the Dean of the College of Graduate Studies Jie Chen to discuss a proposed change to the College of Graduate Studies Bylaws. The proposed change would remove the representative from “university-wide programs” on graduate council. The term “university-wide programs” applied to Bioinformatics & Computational Biology, Environmental Science, Neuroscience, Bioregional Planning and Community Design, and Waters of the West. Jie Chen stated that the reason for the proposed change was that these programs have now been moved into specific colleges and thus are represented through those colleges and no longer have a need for specific representation.

A couple of senators suggested that the nature of these programs suggests that they have interests that are not necessarily reflected by the colleges in which they are now located. This change would dilute the importance of these signature programs. Several of these programs have a large number of graduate students and involve many faculty members across several colleges.

The Chair pointed out that since this proposal did not come to us as a seconded motion that we needed a motion to proceed. The discussion that followed led to several senators suggesting that rather than removing the representation for “university-wide programs” that we should include a definition of university-wide programs.

A motion was made (Foster/Caplan) that the proposed change should be rejected and instead a sentence would be added to the graduate college bylaws that defines university-wide programs. The proposed definition stated that “a university-wide program is a program with graduate faculty from at least three colleges.” The motion passed 19-2-1. There was a concern raised about the fact that the FSH isn’t clear about the method of selecting a representative from a university-wide program. No further motions were made to address this concern.

Focus for the Future: The Chair turned the floor over to Provost Aiken to provide an update on the Focus for the Future process. The Provost emphasized that the FFF process was mandated by the Board of Regents and thus was different than the regular processes followed at the University. She stated that this was an ad hoc process that is now completed. Provost Aiken noted that FFF was transparent and had more input than any in which she had ever been involved. The President considered the results of the FFF process and sent his recommendations to the Board in August. The Board has now approved
the changes and it is a completed process. The Provost reiterated that FFF did not set a precedent for how we would proceed on curriculum issues in the future.

There were several questions about implementation of future changes. The Provost noted that actions to eliminate or restructure programs were completed but that programs that were on the watch list were still being watched. Any future proposed changes would go through regular shared governance processes. In response to a question about action plans, she stated that she has to report that action plans for programs are in place but that this was neither unusual nor particularly onerous.

**Adjournment:** A senator noted that he could detect a tone of relief in her voice that this process was completed and that many people on campus shared that sense of relief. On that note the Chair entertained a motion to adjourn (Wolf/Brewick) which passed unanimously at 4:46.

Don Crowley, Faculty Secretary and Secretary to the Faculty Senate
NEW OR EXPANDED ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

PREAMBLE: This section outlines the process by which new or expanded academic programs come to be offered. This section appeared in the 1979 Handbook. It was changed in November, 1991, to reflect the shift of responsibility for the catalog from the Faculty Secretary’s Office to the Provost or Registrar's Office. Unless otherwise noted, the text is as of July 1996. For more information, contact the Provost’s Office (208-885-6448). [ed. 7-00]

A. INTRODUCTION. The regents require the preparation and submission of a detailed analysis and evaluation of each new or expanded program that is proposed. A new or expanded program is one that will result in UI offering a new degree, certificate, major, or field of specialization within a major. The analysis and evaluation must include supporting information of many kinds, including but not limited to the following:

A-1. The need for the program should be clearly documented by requests, studies, employment opportunities, and other pertinent data. The national picture should be correlated with the state and local scenes in stating the need for a new program.

A-2. Feasibility studies should be done in most instances where new programs are requested. Desire and need do not necessarily mean that implementation is feasible.

A-3. Cost is a controlling factor in approval of a new program. The availability of funds for new programs constitutes a constraint in approving or disapproving program requests.

A-4. Potential student enrollment must be considered. A forecast of prospective enrollment is prerequisite to the approval of a new program. It should be recognized, of course, that the existence of a program tends to attract students. So, a projection of enrollment cannot be exact but it should be within reasonable limits.

A-5. UI's capabilities should be clearly set out. Supporting programs in courses that are necessary to the successful operation of a specific program cover a wide range of prerequisite programs that must be taken into consideration in locating a program at UI.

A-6. Priorities for new program development may vary among institutions in the state system. The specific interests of the faculty, the administration, and others in establishing priorities for new programs at UI must be supported by pertinent data.

A-7. Priorities should be established. At any time, a number of new programs may be needed and seem feasible. Fiscal constraints and other criteria against which new program adoption is measured mandate, therefore, an indication of the priority for the development of the proposed program.

A-8. Based on established programs, the designation of certain institutions for development of programs in specified disciplines must be considered. Geographical location, community factors, and existing related programs will have an important effect upon program development.

A-9. The capability of UI in the various areas of new program development must also be considered. Established capability probably weighs more heavily than potential for developing future capabilities. Moreover, the capability of UI is clearly conditioned by the historical development of programs that have been authorized in the past.

A-10. Unnecessary duplication should be avoided. In some instances, similar programs may be needed in the various areas of the state. In other instances, one well-developed program will not only suffice, but will be the only program that can meet the criteria referred to above.

A-11. The interrelationships of programs are important. The ladder and lattice concepts must be developed wherever possible. Two-year programs in one institution should be so structured that they are interchangeable parts of four-year programs at other institutions.

A-12. The curricula should be developed so that they fit certification and licensure requirements. They should also be eligible for approval by national accrediting agencies.

A-13. Criteria for determining the feasibility of new or expanded programs include: (1) demonstrated need based on documented requests, organized studies, enrollment predictions, personnel requirements, and/or accreditation standards; (2) relationships of new or expanded programs to the overall and specific educational programs of UI and the state system of higher education as approved by the regents; (3) current and future capabilities of UI to make available facilities, equipment, and personnel adequate to ensure a high quality program; and (4) estimates of income and expenditures, both direct and indirect, for the program for a minimum of three years.

B. FORMAT AND PROCEDURES. The Office of the State Board of Education has devised a set of forms (available from the Provost’s Office) for use in the presentation of the supporting information called for above. Concurrently with the submission of these forms, text for catalog entries pertaining to the new or expanded program should be submitted to the faculty secretary for editing and routing. Proposed certificate programs and proposed undergraduate programs are sent to the University Curriculum Committee; graduate programs are sent to the Graduate Council and then to the University Curriculum Committee. If recommended by the University Curriculum Committee, they are presented to the Faculty Senate and, if approved, to the university faculty for action. [See also 1540 C and 4110.][ed. 7-00, 7-01, 7-09, rev. 8-07]

C. TIME TABLE FOR APPROVAL AND IMPLEMENTATION. Customarily the president presents proposals for new or expanded programs to the regents at their June meeting. For the regents to act at that time, the proposal must be presented at the April meeting (the agenda is prepared early in March). To be included on the April agenda, final action by the university faculty must be completed in February. Thus, to provide time for consideration by the University Curriculum Committee (and the Graduate Council in the case of graduate programs) and by the Faculty Senate, proposals for new or expanded programs must be in the Office of the Faculty Secretary no later than October. Experience has shown that proposals reported out of the colleges after October have had to wait about two years for implementation.

CATALOG CHANGE PROCEDURES

PREAMBLE: This section outlines the process by which the catalog is changed. This section remains unchanged since its appearance in the 1979 Handbook. For further information, contact the Registrar's Office (208-885-6731). [ed. 7-00]

A. Students have, as a matter of principle, a right to find in the catalog the courses they are taking and a current statement of their curricular requirements; departmental administrators and college deans should make every effort to ensure that proposed changes are submitted in time to be included in the catalog.

B. Changes that are proposed to take effect in the interval between publication of catalog issues may be considered by the University Curriculum Committee for good and substantial reasons. Because of various requirements for routing of and action on such changes, they must reach the committee no later than four months before the beginning of the academic session in which the changes are expected to be effective. [See also 1540 C and 4110.][ed. 7-01]
Curricular Approval Workflow Presentation
Faculty Senate, March 3, 2015

Department Approval

College Approval

Group A*  e.g. Add or Drop Courses; Change Courses; Curriculum Changes, USAC Approvals

Due December 15th***

Office of the Registrar

Graduate Council

University Curriculum Committee (UCC)

General Curriculum Report

Group B*  e.g. Add or Drop options/emphases; Add or Drop minors; Name Changes; Regulation Changes**

Due December 15th***

Office of the Provost

Office of the Registrar

Graduate Council

University Curriculum Committee (UCC)

Faculty Senate

General Policy Report or General Faculty Meeting

Office of the President

State Board of Education (SBOE) Notification

Group C*  e.g. Add or Drop Degree/Major; Offer Program Online; Add or Drop Department/College

Due October 15th***

Office of the Provost

Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) Review

Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU)

Please note:
* If you have any questions or concerns about the appropriate group your proposal will fall into, please contact the Academic Publications Editor in the Office of the Registrar at (208) 885-6731 for assistance.

** Group B Regulation Changes can be sent directly to the Academic Publications Editor in the Office of the Registrar and do not need to be routed to the Office of the Provost.

*** Changes in Group A that are received after the deadline may be considered for good and substantial reasons (see FSH 4120). Changes in Group B and C may be considered under similar circumstances however, substantial fees will be assessed by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU).

**** For questions regarding adding items to the Five Year Plan, please contact the Office of the Provost at (208) 644-8 for assistance.
CURRICULUM APPROVAL PROCESS: REVIEW CURRENT POLICIES AND TIMELINE, ADJUST, & COMMUNICATE

Daniel M. Eveleth
University Curriculum Committee, Chair

Dwaine Hubbard
Senior Associate Registrar
Reasons for review

- Past State Board actions…. (e.g., Program Prioritization Process)
- Confusion among faculty about the process
- Confusion among faculty about deadlines
- Questions about the Post-Printed-Catalog Era
- New Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities requirements
- Recent State Board actions…. (e.g., Focus for the Future)
Existing Policy

- **FSH 4110**: New or Expanded Academic Programs
  “…must be in the Office of the Faculty Secretary no later than October. Experience has shown that proposals reported out of the colleges after October have had to wait about two years for implementation.”

- **FSH 4120**: Catalog Change Procedures
  “Changes that are proposed to take effect in the interval between publication of catalog issues may be considered by the University Curriculum Committee for good and substantial reasons.”
Types of Curriculum Proposals

A. Those that need approval from the faculty ending with the General Curriculum Report.
   e.g., course addition/change

B. Those that need approval from the faculty and SBOE.
   e.g., new minor, option, emphasis

C. Those that need approval from the faculty, SBOE and NWCCU.
   e.g., new degree
Proposed Changes

- Clearly communicate:
  - Approval process associated with each proposal type.
  - Deadlines
    - Benefits
    - Risks
  - Exceptions & Other Options
    - “good & substantial reasons”
    - 404 course number
    - Petitions
Proposed Changes

- **Traditional proposals:**
  - Faculty-originated
  - Result in changes to the General Catalog

- **PPP/FFF proposals:**
  - Faculty input during program review
  - SBOE mandates change
  - Result in changes to the General Catalog

Therefore, all changes (whether faculty-originated or SBOE-mandated) need appropriate review and approval from faculty.
Proposed Changes

Benefits:

- Transparency
- Communication
- Provides evidence of support or non-support
- Opportunity for creative solutions and to identify unintended consequences

One Exception:

- Treat “discontinues” as we treated PPP proposals - i.e., a negative vote or a choice not to hold a vote would not prevent a proposal from moving forward.
Summary

- Institutionalize processes for three types of proposals.
- Allow different deadlines for each type of proposal.
- Treat PPP/FFF proposals as we would any proposals, with two exceptions:
  - Decisions not to hold a vote or a negative vote would not prevent a proposal from moving forward.
  - Votes or non-votes travel with a proposal.
- Communicate!!! With more knowledge comes more control.
UNIVERSITY SECURITY AND COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE - Proposal

Background

The Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (20 USC § 1092(f)) is the landmark federal law, originally known as the Campus Security Act that requires colleges and universities across the United States to disclose information about crime on and around their campuses. The law is tied to an institution's participation in federal student financial aid programs and it applies to most institutions of higher education both public and private. The Act is enforced by the United States Department of Education. Possible consequences for an institution’s non-compliance with the Clery Act include:

- A suspension or limiting of the institutions Title IV funding
- The Department of Education may issue a civil fine up to $38,500 per violation
- The institution may suffer reputational loss due to negative media attention
- Failure to comply with the Clery Act can be used in various litigation matters

Justification/Rationale for establishment of the University Security and Compliance Committee

The Clery Center for Security on Campus recommends that institutions formally charter Clery Compliance committees to ensure full compliance with the Clery Act. The formation of such a committee at University of Idaho would both ensure Clery Act compliance and aid the University Office of Public Safety’s commitment to creating and maintaining a safe environment for the UI Community and those who visit. Establishing the Security and Compliance Committee would also help broaden awareness of security issues facing the University of Idaho and help enhance policies and programs that support a secure campus environment.

Proposed Charter - FSH 1640.95

The University Security and Compliance Committee (USCC) is charged with ensuring the University’s compliance with the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Clery Act), and planning and facilitating activities that support a safe and secure living, learning and working experience. USCC will focus on accurate disclosure (reporting of Clery crime statistics) and implementation of best practices regarding safety policies and procedures. The USCC will conduct an annual review of all reportable crimes prior to submitting crime statistics to the U.S. Department of Education. The committee will also perform a thorough review of the Annual Security and Fire Safety Report (ASFR) prior to its publication.

The USCC shall meet a minimum of three times each year. Topics will include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Review updates to the law, policies and procedures related to security and Clery Act compliance
- Ensure timely collection of Clery crime statistics from applicable jurisdictions
- Recommend enhancements to security policies

1 The Clery Center for Security on Campus a nonprofit dedicated to preventing violence, substance abuse and other crimes on college and university campuses across the United States
• Identify programming efforts and recommend improvements.
• Review crime and disciplinary data to avoid report duplication.
• Conduct a final review of the data elements for the ASFR and recommend policy changes.
• Confirm procedures for distributing the ASFR.

**Proposed Membership**

Executive Director, Office of Public Safety & Security, Chair – Voting  
Human Resource Services – Voting  
Athletic Department – Voting  
Staff Affairs – Voting  
General Counsel – Non-Voting  
Dean of Students Office – Voting  
Moscow Police Department – Voting  
Two faculty members {X-2} – Voting  
One non-Moscow representative (faculty/staff) – Voting  
Title IX Coordinator – Voting  
Admissions – Voting  
EHS Fire Safety Specialist – Voting  
Women’s Center – Voting  
Information Technology Services – Voting  
Two undergraduate students – voting  
Graduate Student – voting
A. FUNCTION.

A-1. University Committee for General Education serves as the curriculum body for general education by soliciting and approving proposals and courses to be included in the University's general education and general education courses eligible for transfer to other state institutions (SBOE general education matriculation "GEM" courses). The UCGE committee also engages in program review and makes recommendations for the continuous refinement of general education in conjunction with the Director of General Education and the Assistant Director of Institutional Research and Assessment (see General Education Assessment Committee, FSH 1640.90). Recommendations for change will be forwarded to UCC, Faculty Senate, and the university faculty. [rev. 4-11, rev. 11-12, rev. 12-14].

A-2. The committee reports periodically (at least once a year) to the Faculty Senate on the status of general education. [ed. 7-06, 7-09, ren. 4-11, ren. & rev. 11-12].

A-3. This committee traditionally meets on Thursdays at 3:30 p.m. [add. 7-08, ren. 4-11, 11-12]

[Information on University General Education can be accessed at the general education website: http://www.uidaho.edu/class/general-education] [ed. 11-11, 11-12]

B. STRUCTURE AND MEMBERSHIP. Director of General Education (w/o vote), College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences Dean, or designee (w/o vote), College of Science Dean, or designee (w/o vote), Registrar, or designee (w/o vote), Assistant Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, or designee (w/o vote), Director of Academic Advising, or designee (w/o vote), and 11 faculty members selected by the Committee on Committees, one of whom serves as chair, and two undergraduate students, appointed by ASUI. The faculty members shall include one member from the Colleges of Agricultural and Life Sciences, Art and Architecture, Business and Economics, Education, Engineering, and Natural Resources and from the Library, and two members from the Colleges of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences and Science. The student members shall also be chosen to represent two different colleges. [rev. 7-06, 7-08, 7-10, 11-12, 10-14, ed. 8-12]
A. FUNCTION.

A-1. General Education Assessment Committee (GEAC) serves as the body for oversight of general education assessment. The Director of General Education and the Assistant Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, or designee, will provide coordination and leadership.

A-2. The GEAC meets to norm and score assessment artifacts, and to review assessment findings and make recommendations based on its findings to UCGE.

[Information on general education assessment can be accessed at the general education website: http://www.uidaho.edu/class/general-education]

B. STRUCTURE AND MEMBERSHIP. The committee is composed of nine members as follows: Director of General Education as Chair, Assistant Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, or designee, one UCGE member, two undergraduate students, and four members (faculty/staff) to include one with interdisciplinary experience and the remaining three selected to ensure a broad representation across the eight colleges that offer baccalaureate programs. All members, except students, serve on three year staggered terms. The Director of General Education is responsible for the selection of committee members.
Judicial Committees: Dismissal & Faculty Appeals: FSH 1640.36 & 43

- review function/structure/process e.g. no alternates, have all as large panel to draw upon
- ensure/add neutral party to provide guidance to chair as ex officio non-voting member who serves the purpose of providing advice to the chair(s) on process of hearings i.e. Ombuds
- ensure chair understands he/she schedules and runs the meetings
- training at Senate Retreat/Chair Workshop -- include Ombuds with General Counsel
- Faculty Secretary will also meet at beginning of year to ensure chair understands their role
- Faculty Secretary will also meet with any chair who seems to be struggling understanding their role
- Don will meet with Ellen to discuss these suggestions for Ombuds involvement

1640.36
DISMISSAL HEARINGS COMMITTEES
[This section was removed from FSH 3910 D-3.b. and placed here in July 2008]

A. FUNCTION. This committee will conduct a hearing at the request of a faculty member who has been terminated to determine whether their termination was properly based on the grounds stated (see FSH 3910 D-3 and 3920 D.)

B. STRUCTURE AND MEMBERSHIP: The DHC is composed of four faculty members and one administrator at the departmental level or above, six faculty members and three administrators as alternates. Committee members, including alternates, are chosen on the basis of their objectivity and competence and the high regard in which they are held in the UI community. In appointing members the Committee on Committees should attempt to reflect the diversity of the UI faculty. Due to the possibility a case may be appealed to the Faculty Appeals Hearing Board care should be taken in appointing members to both Faculty Appeals Hearing Board and Dismissal Hearings Committee. The term of membership is three years. [rev. 1-09, 4-11]

C. SELECTION: The faculty member requesting a hearing has the right to substitute up to two members appointed with two others from the alternate list. The provost also has the right to substitute two members appointed with two others from the alternate list. If as a result of substitutions and conflicts of interest there are an insufficient number of faculty members or administrators on the alternate list, the Committee on Committees will be asked to appoint more members to the alternate list as needed. Once the panel for an individual hearing has been determined, it will meet at the direction of the chair of the Dismissal Hearings Committee and elect its own panel chair. [rev. 1-09]

C-1. Panel Chair’s Role: Once a panel chair has been selected, he/she will request a meeting with the Faculty Secretary at their earliest opportunity to discuss and review process. The Faculty Secretary and Ombuds offices will be available at any time for advice throughout the hearing. The panel chair may also request assistance from the Faculty Secretary, Ombuds or General Counsel’s office throughout the hearing.

C-2. Observers: Both parties may have an advisor, or neutral party, present at the hearing.

1640.43
FACULTY APPEALS HEARING BOARD
[This section was removed from FSH 3840 C & D and placed here in July 2008]

A. FUNCTION. This board will conduct a hearing at the request of a faculty member who wishes to appeal an institutional decision under FSH 3840 A. In each case referred to it, the board has the following responsibilities: [ed. 4-12]

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. Since a case for dismissal is appealable to the Faculty Appeals Hearing Board, care should be taken in appointing members to both Faculty Appeals Hearing Board and Dismissal Hearings Committee. 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 hearing has been determined, it will meet at the direction of the chair of the Faculty Appeals Hearing Board and elect its own panel chair. [rev. 7-99, 1-09, 4-11]

B-1. Panel Chair’s Role: Once a panel chair has been selected, he/she will request a meeting with the Faculty Secretary at their earliest opportunity to discuss and review process. The Faculty Secretary and Ombuds offices will be available at any time for advice throughout the hearing. The panel chair may also request assistance from the Faculty Secretary, Ombuds, or General Counsel’s office throughout the hearing.

B-2. Observers: Both parties may have an advisor, or neutral party, present at the hearing.

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,
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, and