Call to Order: A quorum being present, Faculty Council Chair Robert Zemetra called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

Minutes: The last minutes of the 2004-2005 Faculty Council, those of May 10th, 2005, and the first minutes of the 2005-2006 Faculty Council, those of May 3rd, 2005, were approved unanimously as distributed.

Introductions: The members of the council re-introduced themselves to one another and, of course, the new provost, Doug Baker, was also introduced.

Chair’s Report: The chair welcomed members of the 2005-2006 council, hoping that they had had productive summers and were ready for a productive year on council. In his view this coming year was one of great promise in terms of opening a new era of faculty governance at the university. The president was in the second year of his presidency and was not faced with the day-to-day crises of his first year. We have a new provost who’s beginning his second month. Both president and provost are interested in having active interaction with faculty. In the reinvention and restructuring of the university that they see in the future they are anxious for faculty participation.

The chair reviewed a number of significant items in the state of the university. The first was that for the first time in about eight years there were no major building projects on campus. Secondly, the university’s budget for this fiscal year was balanced. Student numbers remain very stable and the football team is scoring. Outside of the university, the state’s coffers are full and the City of Moscow was also lobbying on behalf of increased compensation for faculty and staff. It would, however, remain something of a challenge to educate the legislature in the importance of higher education to the economic well-being of the state. If education is shortchanged, so is the state. He was hopeful that there was growing recognition of this connection on the part of legislators. Another area where educating the legislature was necessary was in the area of institutional equity: the state’s various institutions of higher education were different and had different missions.

On campus he saw a need for more education of university administrators on the importance of faculty participation. Faculty Council would be part of the debate on retiree health insurance. It would also be part of the discussion on addressing deficiencies noted in last year’s institutional accreditation report; specifically pointed out was the need to develop methods of assessment of learning outcomes. And, while we are not gatekeepers in this area, we will be asked to give our input into any departmental and college restructuring: we will want to make sure that whatever happens is in the best interests of the university as a whole. Finally, there are more particular areas of interest, such as plus/minus grading and proposed changes to the tenure and promotion policy that the president did not approve last spring that Faculty Council may wish to revisit.

Provost’s Report: In his first report to Faculty Council the provost said that he felt that he had come at the perfect time. His first four weeks have been busy and exciting and included his first board meeting, a meeting he characterized as both interesting and “great theater.” The rest of his report was divided into a number of major themes.

- State Support for Higher Education: The provost reported his understanding that the state’s fiscal position was good for the immediate future. A review of budget changes over the past two decades or so reveals that state appropriations for Medicaid were up 15-17%, appropriations for corrections were up 7%, appropriations for K-12 education were up about 4%, and appropriations for higher education were essentially flat. There seems to be a general understanding that this is not a sustainable pattern and that higher education is due for an infusion of resources. The president has requested of the board an increase of 8% for faculty and staff compensation, as well as money for deferred maintenance and technology infrastructure needs. It appeared to him that these were common themes across state institutions of higher education. All state schools are seriously underfunded. The most effective strategy for remedying this situation is for the institutions to work together and not squabble over small amounts.
- Strategic Planning Issues: The provost has reviewed the work of the last two years’ that forms the underpinning of current strategic planning: the report of the University Vision and Resource Task Force, the institutional
accreditation self-study, the Pappas Report, and the president’s February 11th document. He also pointed out that we were now statutorily required to do strategic planning. He hopes to have some sort of draft document ready in a month for people’s comments and once fine tuned that report would be the underpinning of the Blue Ribbon Committee the president would appoint to review preproposals and proposals for university reinvestment.

- **Accreditation:** The institutional accreditation report had left the university with a big “to do” list. Particularly urgent was the creation of written learning outcomes for all programs and certificates. In this area there is considerable variation across campus. He felt that we as a faculty should be able to define what it is we want our students to be able to do as a result of their education in our programs and to be able to assess those results. We will need to create sustainable, meaningful, models of learning outcomes and assessment.

- **Art and Architecture:** The provost briefly discussed the issue of the proposal that Art and Architecture be made into a separate college again. He had met with the chairs of the affected departments and with the Art and Architecture Foundation.

**Confirmation of the Secretary to Faculty Council:** It was moved and seconded (Beard-Williams) to confirm Faculty Secretary Douglas Adams as secretary to Faculty Council. The motion carried unanimously.

**Elections:**

- University Budget and Finance Committee: Professor Young, currently chair of this committee, provided council with some background information and history of this committee. Professor McCullough volunteered to be the “freshman” member of this committee from Faculty Council. His nomination was seconded by Professor McMurtry. It was moved and seconded (Beard-Reid) to close nominations and have the secretary cast a unanimous ballot for Professor McCullough. The motion carried unanimously.

- Campus Planning Advisory Committee: In a similar fashion Professor Woolston provided some background information on the Campus Planning Advisory Committee, a quiet committee the past couple of years, but one which may be poised for greater activity as the university begins another cycle of planning form the future. Professor Munson volunteered and he was seconded by Professor McLaughlin. It was moved and seconded (Beard-Reid) to close nominations and have the secretary cast a unanimous ballot for Professor McCullough. The motion carried unanimously.

**Confirmation of Sabbatical Leaves for 2006-2007 and one for 2005-2006:** After brief clarifying discussion of the status of the sabbatical proposed for fall 2005, it was moved and seconded (Young-Bechinski) to approve all of the sabbaticals forwarded at this time to Faculty Council by the provost. The motion carried unanimously.

**Introduction of Potential Faculty Council Agenda Items:** Various members suggested the following items, some old, some new, that Faculty Council might pursue over the course of this academic year.

- Maternity/Paternity Leave
- Intellectual Property
- Codifying Teaching Loads and other changes to FSH 1565
- New Core (both from the standpoint of advising, and from the standpoint of its content)
- Plus/Minus Grading
- Academic Standards/Grade Inflation
- Academic Advising
- Relationship of Job Descriptions and Tenure and Promotion Decisions
- Academic “Citizenship” (service, advising, etc.)
- Salary Issues (equity and merit; how many years should be considered when considering merit)
- Motivation of Faculty to Greater Participation
- Student Evaluation of Teaching
- Increasing Faculty and Student Diversity

[Council members are urged to be in touch with their constituents on a regular basis concerning items that should come before Faculty Council.]

**Adjournment:** There being no further business, Professor Beard made his customary motion to adjourn. In this he was ably seconded by Professor Munson. The motion to adjourn carried unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Q. Adams
Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Council