Call to Order. A quorum being present, Faculty Council Chair Bailey called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m. in the Michael Board Room of the Albertson Building.

Minutes. The council accepted the minutes of meeting #6 of the 2004-2005 Faculty Council, held on October 19, as distributed.

Chair’s Report. In initiating the practice of recognizing faculty members for outstanding achievements Chair Bailey called on Linda Morris, Interim Vice-provost for Academic Affairs, to introduce Dave Thomas, Professor of Mathematics, who recently received a distinguished CASE teaching award for his contributions in the area of mathematical education. Thomas, who has been at the university for three years, was especially pleased to have been nominated by the university for this award, remarking that it shows the importance of teaching excellence at this institution.

Bailey reminded councilors of the upcoming council-sponsored forums intended to give faculty, staff, and students the opportunity to share their views with each other regarding the University Vision and Resources Task Force report. Councilors decided it would be important for the off-campus community to have the opportunity to participate in the forums as well. Phone lines will be set up for this purpose. The councilors were encouraged to attend one of the forums, especially in lieu of no Faculty Council meeting on November 2.

Provost’s Report. Provost Pitcher called the council’s attention to a Faculty Development Opportunity workshop that will be held November 9th from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. in the Clearwater room of the Commons. He encouraged department leadership, faculty and staff to take part in the workshop which will focus on assessment. Registration fee for the workshop is $75; some scholarships will be available for interested participants. The Provost also discussed briefly the freshman calling program that had been recently undertaken. Under the direction of Bruce Pitman, Dean of Students, many members of the faculty, staff, and administration, including the Provost himself, called university freshmen. The purpose is to check on how freshmen are adjusting to college life and to get their candid views on a variety of facets of campus life ranging from curriculum matters to living arrangements. He said students were generally pleased with the interactions they have had with faculty, though interestingly he noted that some felt their classes were insufficiently challenging. Pitcher said that final action was taken at the last meeting of the SBOE on the sale of the University of Idaho Foundation property in Idaho Falls to Idaho State University. The University of Idaho will now lease space in Idaho Falls. The Provost stressed that the university will continue to have a central role in the educational offerings in Idaho Falls as long as INEEL remains healthy.


Steve Meier, Department of Psychology and Communication Studies, said that the proposed minor was essentially a continuation of what has been done over the last several years. States are required to provide training for persons interested in being certified as prevention specialists. The state of Idaho has asked its universities to create programs that prepare students for certification, and the University of Idaho does this through the coursework indicated in the proposed minor. In addition to course work, students will need to log 4000-6000 hours in the field before they can sit for the certification exam. Meier said that funding for the minor comes from re-allocation within the department as well as state grants that have been received over the course of many years. The council gave unanimous approval to the proposed minor.
The council turned to an extended discussion on how to respond to the University Vision and Resources Task Force (UVRTF) report. Chair Bailey emphasized that the comments should focus on issues in the UVRTF report that dealt specifically with the Faculty Council. In referring to references in the report regarding committee redundancies, Vice-chair Zemetra noted that there have been repeated efforts to eliminate redundancies among the various Faculty Council and other university committees, but to date these efforts have yielded few results. The Provost suggested that a systematic evaluation of the committees be undertaken by perhaps requiring committees to prepare reports concerning their roles and effectiveness. It was also suggested that committees could be placed in categories based on the nature of the committees and/or the amount of time faculty would likely need to devote to committee work.

Councilor Gunter listed three areas he thought worthy of council comments to the President: post-tenure review, budget oversight, and the UVRTF suggested tool for establishing program priorities. The Provost pointed out that a new policy for post-tenure review had been developed three years ago. The policy is based on a three-year process that focuses on annual reviews and calls for intervention and possible termination after three years if sufficient progress has not been made by the faculty member in correcting deficiencies. Pitcher suggested that it would be best to wait to see how this policy is working before considering significant changes to it. Gunter observed that he, probably like many of his colleagues, was unaware of the current policy. Some councilors pointed out the need to make sure the policy was evenly applied across campus.

With regard to budget oversight it was noted that the Institutional Planning and Budget Committee is playing an active role in this area. The chair of that committee, Jeff Young, said that the committee had received excellent budget presentations from Mark Brainard and recommended that Brainard be invited to give a condensed version of those presentations to the council.

Chair Bailey called attention to the UVRTF recommendation that the Faculty Council become more involved in the area of intercollegiate athletics, and that a Faculty Council athletic oversight committee be formed. It was suggested that there may be a need for two committees: the Presidents Athletic Advisory Committee and the council oversight committee.

In the discussion dealing with ways to establish priorities, councilor McGuire said that the university has not yet created the proper mindset for interdisciplinary programs. Others noted the necessity of establishing metrics for evaluating programs. It was also suggested that it may take considerably more time and money than that envisioned by the UVRTF to determine and support high priority programs.

The council agreed to concentrate on the five areas listed below in its comments to the President. Council subgroups were asked to prepare drafts for this purpose. The drafts will be discussed at the next council meeting. The council will also review comments being developed by the Institutional Planning and Budget Committee

1. Committee redundancy (Zemetra)
2. Strengthening the role of the Faculty Council in university governance (including possible alternatives for selecting council members) (Bailey, Greever, McMurtry)
3. Post-tenure review (Gunter, McGuire)
4. Tools for establishing program priorities.
5. Intercollegiate athletics (Anderson, Beard, McMurtry, Rinker)

Next Faculty Council meeting scheduled for November 9th in the Michael Board Room of the Albertson Building.

The council adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Voxman
Interim Secretary of the Faculty Council