University of Idaho  
2007-2008  
FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA  
Meeting #23  
Tuesday, April 1, 2008, 3:30 p.m.  
Brink Hall Faculty Lounge  

Order of Business  

I. Call to Order.  

II. Minutes.  

III.  

• Minutes of the 2007-08 Faculty Council Meeting #22, March 25, 2008  

IV. Chair’s Report.  

V. Provost’s Report.  

V. Other Announcements and Communications.  

• Request two nominees for Campus Planning Advisory Committee (Guilfoyle)  
• Faculty Council Elections for 2008-11 (Adams)  
• FC-08-006: FSH 2700: Student Evaluation of Teaching (Christiansen)  

VI. Committee Reports.  

VII. Special Orders.  

• Executive Session: Faculty Secretary Candidate 4:45 p.m.  

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.  

• Resolution on FSH 5100 J – Indirect Cost Assessments (FC-08-003) (Oman/Schmeckpeper)  

IX. New Business.  

X. Adjournment.  

Professor Don Crowley, Chair 2007-2008, Faculty Council  

Attachments:  
Minutes of 2007-2008 FC Meeting #22, March 25, 2008  
Faculty Council Elections  
FC-08-006: FSH 2700: Student Evaluation of Teaching  
Resolution
University of Idaho  
FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES  
2007-2008 Meeting #22, Tuesday, March 25th, 2008

Present: Adams (w/o vote), Baker (w/o vote), Crowley (chair), Fritz, Griff, Hubbard, Machlis, McCollough, McDaniel, Mihelich, Miller, Murphy, Oman, Ripplinger, Rowland, Rush, Schmiege, Schmeckpeper, Sullivan, Ch. Williams, Wilson. Liaisons: Newcombe (Coeur d’Alene). Absent: Guilfoyle, McCaffrey, Ci. Williams, Crepeau (Idaho Falls), Stauffer (Boise)

Observers: 6

A quorum being present, the chair called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m. in the Brink Hall Faculty Lounge.

Minutes: It was moved and seconded (Rowland, Machlis) to accept the minutes of the March 4th meeting (Meeting #20, Meeting #21 having been canceled) as distributed. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair’s Report: The chair reported that last week’s meeting had been canceled because the two major agenda items slated for the meeting had had to be pulled for further work or because the necessary parties could not be present. We will be taking up those at next week’s meeting.

Vice Chair Guilfoyle could not be with us today owing to the death of her mother. Ann is collecting contributions for flowers.

The chair reminded council members that this Friday was Vandal Friday and thus the university’s single best recruiting event for new freshman students. He urged councilors and their constituents to do their best to “entice” these students by showing them and their parents both the high academic quality of the institution and the congenial nature of its faculty.

He also reported that salary distribution recommendations had been announced by the central administration. The legislature had appropriated 3% for CEC. The administration was reserving .4% for promotion increments. Various colleges were taking additional small portions to deal with equity and/or promotion issues. In CLASS, for instance ~2.5% was left to departments to be distributed, 1% of which was, by legislative mandate an across-the-board increase, and the rest (~1.5%) to be distributed as merit according to the merit protocols of the various colleges. He suspected, then, that most raises would fall between 2% and 3%.

He noted that most of this weeks President’s Cabinet meeting had been devoted to the hate incident widely, though vaguely, reported a few weeks ago and how the university might better respond to any future incidents of a similar nature.

More happily he reported on the MOU signing ceremony at Spalding the day before involving the university, WSU, LCSC, North Idaho College, the Northwest Indian College and the plateau tribes. The MOU is designed to provide better and more efficient educational opportunities to the tribes.

Finally, he relayed Professor Kathy Browder’s request for nominations of faculty members for possible membership on a task force that would make recommendations about a fiscally sustainable organizational structure to oversee and manage auxiliaries, auxiliary services, and physical activity facilities/spaces. After a brief discussion concerning the difficulty of getting faculty nominations on short notice for various task forces (e.g., the task force looking into the various proposals for outsourcing the bookstore), it was informally decided that anyone knowing of an interested faculty member should notify the chair and he would put any such names in a pool with the current faculty representation on the Facilities Scheduling Policy Committee to send to Professor Browder.

Provost’s Report: The provost reported on the selection of a new dean for the College of Science, Scott Wood, and the new vice president for research, Jack McIver. He also noted that promotion and tenure letters had gone out and that congratulations were in order for Professors Mihelich and Sullivan on council. The university’s budget for next year was still a process of putting together the pieces: enrollment, scholarships, infrastructure support, research activities, fundraising.
University Advancement: Chris Murray, Vice President of University Advancement, reported to Faculty Council on the status of university giving campaigns. He noted that he had now been here for some eighteen months. In that time the institution has greatly revised how it has organized the solicitation of gifts. Private giving is the area where the institution can reasonably anticipate the greatest growth in revenue; state appropriation, student fees, and grants and contracts will also grow, but at lesser rates. The university is building up to a major campaign, whose current goal is $300 million ( pared down from a wants/needs list of a billion dollars). The planned division of that $300 million is $45.85 million to students (largely in the form of scholarship endowments), $49.35 million to faculty, $48.15 million to programs, and $156.65 million to facilities. The goal has been tested by reviewing the university’s prospects and reviewing their wealth and interests. Major gifts programs are heavily dependent on staffing and the university is in the process of developing that staffing infrastructure. The advancement office has developed a measurable set of parameters to assess the university’s return on its investment in advancement. We are in the silent phase of the campaign now, and are planning to go public in fall 2011, and complete the campaign in 2014, in time for the university’s 125th anniversary. Beginning this May, there would be monthly progress reports issued concerning the campaign. In response to a question concerning how the campaign might be affected by what appears to be a swooning national economy, he noted that the campaign was seven years long, which should mean the economy is robust again before the campaign is over. He also noted that you had to cultivate potential donors in the “lean years” if you hoped to see those donations in the “fat years.”

Goal IV, Organizational Culture and Climate, Report: Co-chairs, Jeannie Harvey Interim Director of International Programs Office, and Mark Edwards, Director of Diversity and Community, reported on the activities of the Goal IV Team since their last meeting with the council. The Goal IV implementation team had worked in the past year on (1) advising (seeking greater support for faculty advising and provided partial funding for a fall 07 symposium on advising), (2) professional development (training for new department chairs, an on-going department chairs group, related developments for faculty, staff, and administrators more generally), (3) researching best practices to effect climate change and institutional transformation, (4) surveys related to campus climate (to do or not to do, given the large number of other surveys the university takes part in or otherwise administers), (5) provision of workshops on culture and climate (so as to create a campus-wide dialog about culture and climate).

Enrollment Management: Bruce Barnes, Assistant Vice President of Enrollment Management, reported on the growing process of enrollment management at the university. He laid particular emphasis on the revenue that accrued to enrollment gains and losses. The Board of Regents/State Board of Education has a workload adjustment formula which directs resources to institutions that have growing enrollments and away from those with declines. The University of Idaho’s growing enrollments in the first years of this decade built up credits (not actual money) with regard to this formula, but the enrollment declines of the last few years (about 10% from our peak) have “spent” all those credits and if we don’t start growing again, we will lose up to $2 million of state appropriated money. There was also a distribution formula at the board level which weighted students in different majors and at different levels.

Unlike other parts of the country, the Northwest still has increasing numbers of high school graduates. So our natural recruitment pool is getting larger. However, with declines of high school graduates in other parts of the country, we can expect increased recruiting of Idaho students by other institutions. We are part of a consortium of western states (WUE) which allow residents of one state to access the public institutions of another for a maximum of 150 percent of in-state tuition. Thus the students who will add most to our revenue coffers are from more distant states, as they will be paying the full non-resident tuition and fees. That is why we are currently, and experimentally, targeting students in the upper New England states and in upstate New York. He concluded by saying he thought our quality of faculty and academic programs was very high; we had a great story to tell prospective students, but, heretofore, we have not been telling it effectively.

Adjournment: The hour having grown late, it was moved and seconded (Murphy, Miller) to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 5:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Q. Adams,
Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Council
Faculty Council Elections 2008-2011

The members below are those that will need to be filled:

Hubbard, Dwaine (2008) Staff
Crowley, Don (2008) CLASS
McDaniel, Paul (2008) Ag/Life Sciences
Rowland, Paul (2008) Deans' Council (Provost Office is responsible)
Williams, Chris (2008) Science
(2009) CLASS (Sandra Haarsager spot was never filled – this is a one year appointment)
POLICY COVER SHEET
(See Faculty Staff Handbook 1460 for instructions.)
[1/08]

Faculty/Staff Handbook [FSH] ☐ Addition ☑ Revision* ☐ Deletion* ☐ Emergency
Minor Amendment ☐

Chapter & Title: FSH 2700 – Student Evaluation of Teaching

Minor Amendment ☐

Chapter & Title: Administrative Procedures Manual – FSH 2700 – Student Evaluation of Teaching

All policies must be reviewed, approved and returned by a policy sponsor, with a cover sheet attached to apm@uidaho.edu or fsh@uidaho.edu respectively.

*Note: If revision/deletion request original document from apm@uidaho.edu or fsh@uidaho.edu, all changes must be made using “track changes.”

Originator(s): Jeanne Christiansen 03/13/08

Telephone & Email: 885-7941 jeannec@uidaho.edu

Policy Sponsor: Bruce Pitman

Telephone & Email: 885-7657 bpitman@uidaho.edu

Reviewed by General Counsel Yes No Name & Date: ___________________________________

I. Policy/Procedure Statement: Briefly explain the purpose of proposed addition, revision, and/or deletion to the Faculty/Staff Handbook or the Administrative Procedures Manual.

FSH 2700 Student Evaluation of Teaching, Section C.5 Review included a provision for the policy to be reviewed after the fourth consecutive semester of implementation of the online process for student evaluations of teaching. The Teaching and Advising Committee reviewed the process for online evaluations of teaching and provided a report in 2007; the committee reviewed the report in fall 2007 and recommended revisions to the policy.

II. Reason/Rationale: Reason this addition, revision, and/or deletion is necessary, if different than above?
The recommended revisions to FSH 2700 were recommended to 1) up-date the policy with some changes in wording, timelines, and options and 2) remove Section C, a section that includes implementation procedures rather than policy statements.

III. Fiscal Impact: What fiscal impact, if any, will this addition, revision, or deletion have?
There is no fiscal impact as a result of the recommended revisions.

IV. Related Policies/Procedures: Describe other policies or procedures existing that are related or similar to this proposed change.
There are no related policies. Procedures for effective use of the system are available on the Office Institutional Research and Assessment web site (http://www.webs.uidaho.edu/studentevals/).

V. Effective Date: This policy shall be effective on July 1, or January 1, whichever arrives first after final approval (see FSH 1460 D) unless otherwise specified in the policy.

If not a minor amendment forward to: ___________________________________________
STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

PREAMBLE: This section discusses the purposes of student evaluation of teaching and the procedures by which that evaluation is carried out. It first appeared in the 1979 Handbook and was amended in July, 1992, to reflect the removal of student evaluations to the Office of Academic Affairs. Following a period of testing in 2001, a paperless web-based evaluation system was given formal approval in 2002. This made the original Handbook section obsolete, and thus it was completely revised. For further information, contact the Provost’s Office (208-885-6448). [rev. 7-01, 7-02]

CONTENTS:

A. Purpose
B. Policies and Procedures

C. Procedures for On-line Evaluations (Beginning Spring 2002 and Running for Four Consecutive Semesters)

A. PURPOSE. Student evaluation of teaching has two purposes. First, student evaluations assist individual instructors in improving their own teaching (“instructor,” as used in this section, refers to any teaching member of the faculty or staff). Second, they assist academic administrators in counseling instructors about their teaching and they are carefully weighed as a factor in judging the teaching component in tenure, promotion, and salary determinations. To achieve the first of these purposes instructors are urged to provide their students mechanisms for evaluation throughout the semester. To assist academic administrators in evaluation, the following policy and procedures have been adopted.

B. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.

B-1. All students will have the opportunity every full semester to evaluate each of their instructors in all sections of all courses during every academic term. Thus student evaluation of teaching is required in all sections of all courses during Fall and Spring semesters.

B-2. The standard university form, as approved by the faculty, will be used by all instructors in all of their classes, except in the College of Law which will use an evaluative device which it has tailored to its needs.

B-3. The Office of Academic Affairs has the responsibility of oversight in the administration of the evaluations, except those in the College of Law.

B-4. The evaluation shall take place during the last three weeks of instruction in each of Fall and Spring semesters, the semester (including final exam week) or the proportion thereof for courses of less than a semester duration.

B-5. Instructors will be able to view the student responses for their courses until after final grades have been submitted.

B-6. A system for mid-semester formative evaluation of instruction will be available to encourage student input for faculty seeking to improve teaching. The faculty member is the only one with access to the electronic data generated through the formative evaluation process shall be for evaluative use by the faculty member. The data are not considered part of the faculty member’s record, and are not to be used in an evaluation of the
faculty member by another, unless but may be included in the record at the discretion of the faculty member.

B-6. The Office of Academic Affairs shall see that a database of evaluation results for at least the last five academic years is maintained. These results shall be made available to colleges and academic units as needed, and the numerical summaries of an instructor’s evaluations shall be made available to students or other members of the university community upon request.

B-8. The Office of Academic Affairs, in conjunction with the Teaching and Advising Committee, will review the student evaluation of teaching forms and processes periodically, at least every five years.

C. PROCEDURES FOR ON-LINE EVALUATIONS (Beginning Spring 2002 and Running for Four Consecutive Semesters). At the university faculty meeting held on May 8, 2001, on the recommendation of Faculty Council, adopted the following set of temporary evaluation procedures so as to test the feasibility of on-line evaluation of teaching.

C-1. Students will the evaluation by logging on to the Student Information System any time during last three weeks of instruction for the semester.

C-2. The following measures can be used to encourage student participation:

C-2-a. Instructors will be encouraged to remind their students to complete the on-line form, and discuss the importance of the evaluation process.

C-2-b. A reminder will be sent to students via email. (This email might even contain a hyperlink to the appropriate web address for the evaluations.)

C-2-c. A drawing will be conducted from among the names of students completing the evaluations of all courses in which they are enrolled. Five gift certificates of $100 at the University of Idaho Bookstore will be awarded in this drawing. The drawing will be advertised in the email reminder to students, and publicity might also be sought through the student newspaper.

C-2-d. A program may be undertaken to educate students on the importance of the teaching evaluation.

C-2-e. Instructors may, at their discretion, include in their course syllabus the requirement that students complete the evaluation as a requirement to receive a grade for the course. (The system should be set up so as to allow instructors to obtain a list of those students from their course who have completed the evaluation.)

C-3. Results of the evaluation will be reported by the following process:

C-3-a. Instructors will be able to view the student responses for their courses after final grades have been submitted. They would access these responses through the Employee Information System.

C-3-b. Unit administrators responsible for annual evaluations of instructors will be given permission to view the responses for all courses taught within the unit.

C-4. Additional Possibilities:

C-4-a. The system should allow some degree of customization of the evaluation form to fit the needs of instructors. (Implementation of such customization is contingent on Faculty Council recommending a suitable form.)
C-4-b. The system should be available for instructors to use earlier in the semester for a formative evaluation.

C-4-c. Such an early evaluation would be optional; only the semester-end evaluation would be mandatory.

C-4-d. Instructors wishing to use the early semester evaluation would be able to customize several questions with essay responses.

C-4-e. Responses to the early semester evaluation would, as with the other evaluation, be available to instructors through the Employee Information System.

C-4-f. The system may be programmed to give improved student demographic data with the evaluation, such as breakdowns of results by class standing or GPA range.

C-5. Review. This online system for evaluations will be reviewed after its fourth consecutive semester of use. During this review it will be decided whether or not to make the online system permanent, or what if any adjustments should be made. (For instance, it may be determined that the random drawings for student incentive are no longer needed.)
Whereas, principal investigators are the lifeblood of external research funding at the University of Idaho; and

Whereas, external funding limitations often preclude the purchase of laboratory facilities and are insufficient for graduate student support and professional travel related to the principal investigators’ research; and

Whereas, principal investigators usually plan their research projects and endeavors several years in advance;

To encourage research and facilitate research related planning and expenditures, the UofI Faculty Council recommends the following changes to Chapter 5 (Part 5100), Section J, of the Faculty Staff Handbook:

J. INDIRECT-COST ASSESSMENTS.

J-1. UI does not waive indirect costs (i.e., facilities and administrative costs, F&A) on any grant or contract unless (a) the granting agency provides in writing its official policy stating that it does not allow indirect costs or allows only a specific percentage or (b) the vice president for research determines that the grant or contract is of such an unusual nature that a waiver, in part or in full, is unquestionably in UI’s interest.

J-2. The annual income generated through facilities and administrative costs (F&A) will be distributed between the university administration and the principal investigators and units that generated the income. This distribution will be reviewed by the Research Council as provided in section J-3.

a. The intended uses of these funds are to support and stimulate scholarly activities by providing financial resources to address administrative, personnel, infrastructure and other costs associated with productive research environments.

b. The unit/department/principal investigator to which the funds are allocated has control over use of these funds. A unit/department/principal investigator may, however, choose to make its funds available to a different unit.

c. In cases where revenues are generated by multiple units on a single project, the units will jointly develop a method to allocate the revenues. If the units cannot agree on a method for allocating the revenues, the Vice President for Research will arbitrate the differences and specify the final allocation.

J-3. A minimum of 5% of the annual F&A income will be distributed to the principal investigators receiving the external grant or contract, to be divided amongst the principal investigators according to the percent of work responsibility defined on the External Support Form (ESF). A minimum of 15% of the annual F&A income will be distributed to the departments of the principal investigators, again divided according to the percent of work responsibility defined on the ESF. A minimum of 30% of the annual F&A income will be distributed to the colleges and institutes involved in the research, with the division negotiated between the heads of those involved units. The remainder of the F&A annual income will be allocated as approved by the Research Council. The Research Council will review the sharing of indirect-cost income and advise the university administration on its use and distribution on an annual basis, provided that the minimum allocations specified herein are not abridged.