University of Idaho
2008-2009 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA
Meeting #18

Tuesday, February 3, 2009, 3:30 p.m.
BRINK HALL FACULTY LOUNGE

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2008-09 Faculty Council Meeting #17, January 27, 2009

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.
   • Preliminary Discussion of Athletics

VI. Committee Reports.

   University Curriculum Committee:
   • FC-09-031: UCC-09-065 – Regulation M-3-b

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.
   • FC-09-028: NOI CLASS: BS/BA Organizational Sciences (postponed to February 3, 2009)
   • FC-09-030: Collective Bargaining (Gier/Dickow)
   • Program Prioritization Process/NOI

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Karen Guilfoyle, Chair 2008-2009, Faculty Council

Attachments: Minutes of 2008-2009 FC Meeting #17
FC-09-028: NOI Organizational Sciences (distributed earlier)
FC-09-030: CB Resolution & Supporting Material (distributed earlier)
FC-09-031: Regulation M-3-b
University of Idaho  
Faculty Council Meeting Minutes  
2008-09 Meeting #17 Tuesday January 27, 2009  

Present: Baird, Baker (w/o vote, on compressed video link, Boise and with Christiansen sitting in Moscow), Battaglia, Crowley, Eveleth, Fairley, Fritz, Graden, Guilfoyle (chair), Holthaus, Hill (w/o vote), Huber, Johnson (GPSA), Limbaugh (ASUI), Machlis, Mihelich, Miller, Murphy, Oman, Stoner (ASUI), Sullivan, Watson (w/o vote for Makus), Williams, Wilson. Liaisons: Budwig (Boise), Newcombe (Coeur d’Alene). Absent: Makus, Schmeckpeper, Crepeau (Idaho Falls). Visitors/Guests: 8  

A quorum being present, the chair called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. in the Brink Hall Faculty Lounge.  

Minutes: It was moved and seconded (Murphy/Miller) to accept the minutes of the January 20 meeting (Meeting #16) of the 2008-2009 Faculty Council as distributed. The motion carried unanimously.  

Chair’s Report: The Chair noted that her report would be brief to maximize the time available to discuss process and procedures following the announcement of proposed program closures under the PPP, and other business scheduled for the meeting. In addition, the President search had progressed to a stage at which short-listed candidates would be announced and they would soon be visiting campus.  

Provost’s Report (from Boise): Yesterday President Daley-Laursen presented to JFAC. He outlined the strategic goals and the processes for change at UI: The PPP, RFI and Re-Engineering. He received a very positive response and UI was commended for its strategic action and providing a model for the rest of the state. The President will also present tomorrow to the house and senate higher education committees. He had already met with the co-chairs and they were supportive and encouraging of the process of change at UI.  

The SBOE met yesterday and the good news to report is that an increase in the WWAMI program doubling the number of approved seats from 20 to 40 was supported. Unfortunately, in the present fiscal climate, it was unlikely that additional funds would be approved to support the expanded program.  

As part of the PPP, for programs that were recommended for closure, talks were beginning with affected students. Appropriate contact people were providing information to parents. A “frequently asked questions” document was being drafted to assist with academic advising across the university. Vice-Provost Christiansen added that there were active conversations across several university committees with respect to process of the PPP.  

FC-09-030 Collective Bargaining: The Chair noted that 20 minutes would be allocated for this topic to allow time for full discussion of PPP process and procedure.  

Professor Dickow spoke to the resolution, as distributed. The call was for support of the up-coming collective bargaining bill in the 2009 Idaho Legislature. The bill had the support of representatives Trail and Ringo.  

Ultimately, the bill would allow for arbitration/mediation of issues that affected faculty via a group such as the American Federation of Teachers or other collective group.  

One council member spoke in support of the resolution. His points were 1) A strong belief in faculty governance, and 2) we may be approaching an era in which conflicts between faculty and administration
will arise and a mechanism to arbitrate will be necessary. Another member opposed the resolution noting that this bill would constrain faculty to representation as a single unit. In higher education there is an array of labor markets with salaries that vary from discipline to discipline. Collective bargaining would be inconsistent with this structure.

There are many issues that could arise from consideration of support for the bill including salary negotiation, health benefits or employee concerns about how personnel matters are handled. Further clarification indicates that this resolution does not enact any union representative arrangement. It is in support of enacting legislation that would support, in principle, a collective bargaining process on behalf of faculty.

It was proposed that FC could take one week to reflect with constituents on the issue before a motion in support or against was determined. It was moved to table discussion with a vote being taken at FC meeting next week (Machlis/Miller), approved.

**UCC Report:** UCC Chair, Professor Dacey spoke to discussion at UCC of the process for handling of NOIs generated as part of the PPP. The UCC Chair noted that at the Monday meeting General Counsel Kent Nelson joined to provide legal interpretation of the PPP. The UCC Chair noted the guidelines provided on the Provost’s webpage, referencing SBOE criteria for example, Section III.G.9. and the *Faculty Staff Handbook* – FSH 1520, Constitution of the University Faculty, Article IV and FSH 1540, Standing Rules of the University Faculty. The UCC members had some concerns about the process. It appeared that UCC would have only three days prior to their meeting of February 9 to review the 41 proposed program closure NOIs. The usual NOI process for non-contentious issues allows a period of 15 days for review by the general policy report mechanism however the proposed time-line appears to be rushed. In addition under the present proposal, the UCC would not receive input or data used at the prior college/department level curriculum committee meetings. The UCC Chair suggested that this information and data should be provided prior to the meeting of February 9 to facilitate more complete review.

FC Chair Guilfoyle added that the faculty leadership had met with Chair Dacey and proposed to provide a resolution as proposed by Vice-Chair Miller (as distributed):

**RESOLUTION OF FACULTY COUNCIL WITH RESPECT TO PROPOSALS FOR PROGRAM CONSOLIDATION AND DISCONTINUANCE**

*Whereas,* the President and the Provost have presented to Faculty Council and to the University Community proposals for consolidation or discontinuance of 41 degree programs.

*Whereas,* pursuant to the Faculty Staff Handbook (FSH) Notices of Intent (NOIs) with respect to those proposals are now being prepared for consideration by the appropriate University bodies.

*Whereas,* The Regents of the University have conferred on the Faculty particular responsibility for oversight of the University curriculum.

**NOW THEREFORE,** it is resolved by Faculty Council that the appropriate Department, College and University Committees are requested and, as appropriate, directed to observe the following guidelines in addressing these proposals:
1. The initial committee to consider each proposal shall develop a written record of the data and information supporting the proposal. This data shall accompany the NOI to the further levels of review.

2. If there is opposition to the NOI, those persons wishing to speak against the NOI shall be given reasonable opportunity to be heard (taking into account the number of persons wishing to be heard) and to present written statements and data in opposition. The written information in opposition to the NOI shall accompany the NOI to the further levels of review.

3. The Chair of the Committee reviewing each NOI shall record the vote with respect to the NOI and include that vote in the minutes of the meeting at which the vote occurred. The minutes of the meeting shall accompany the NOI to any further levels of review.

4. The Chair of the Committee that last reviewed the NOI shall appear at the meeting of the next higher body to consider the NOI in order to be available to answer questions of that next body concerning that prior review.

5. After the initial committee review of the NOI, the chairs of the subsequent reviewing bodies may allow reasonable opportunity for those persons supporting and opposed to the NOI to be heard during the course of those subsequent reviews (taking into account the number of persons wishing to be heard and the number of NOIs subject to review by that body). It is intended, however, that the initial review committee shall serve as the primary body for gathering evidence with respect to the NOI and that the record developed at that initial review shall serve as the primary record for any further review.

The Chair added clarification, noting that the intention was that both minority and majority opinion and supporting data from each would accompany the NOI through each review level, such that committee members at all levels could be readily informed of the level of support for each NOI through the process. This would also avoid the repetition of depositions from contributing faculty.

_Does this proposed resolution imply that we will deviate from the normal procedure of NOIs, or is this just clarifying?_  
This isn't deviating from process but it is ensuring that a record of process (votes and opposition numbers) as well as supporting data and information is added.

_At each committee level would this provide an opportunity for people against the NOI to come forward?_  
Yes, and the intention of the resolution in supporting the provision of a written record is to provide continuity of information through the process. For example some committees in the process are under the auspices of FC but others are not FC committees, such as the Graduate Council. Thus the resolution states that all committees are requested and as appropriate directed to observe the guidelines.

The Chair noted that each college had different internal procedures and that the proposed measure would ensure that under any process, subsequent committees along the process would have data and information to help them make informed decisions.

_Do we envision that the supporting documents become part of the NOI and are forwarded along to the state board level or do they terminate here at FC?_  
This question asks does FC have the authority to control what the president sends to the SBOE? This is constrained to the degree of the board's rules. It is recommended that if an NOI is controversial, it
would be prudent to have all views sent forward with the NOI. This would allow the President to provide both sides of the argument and he would have his opportunity to defend his position to the SBOE.

_It is very important that we do this right and slowly. Discontinuing a program gives the SBOE the right to dismiss tenured faculty in the program._
The General Counsel responded that this is correct.

Another view noted that the President made it very clear that there will be no tenured faculty lay-offs resulting from the present proposed program closures. This is the President’s commitment and statement of principle.

In opposition to the above view another noted the example of a previous administration that committed to providing an on-going level of health care insurance for retirees. This was now before the courts. It is very important to have something written protecting faculty from changed views as the result of, for example, a change in leadership. A new president may have a different view from this president.

The Chair requested comment from General Counsel.

General Counsel Nelson noted that board policy contemplates that tenured faculty can be dismissed as a result of program closure. He suggested that if a level of assurance that board approval could result in program closure but not in dismissal of faculty was desired; a possible mechanism might be that when an NOI goes forward, it could, specifically state that it will not serve as authorization for dismissal of tenured faculty.

It was further noted that faculty were not just associated with one program. Likely without exception, faculty were associated with multiple programs and interpretation of faculty association with a program that was closed, was ambiguous and thus the implication of SBOE policy was not clear.

Discussion followed about the use of terminology in the process – with reference to “programs” and how this related to “curriculum” and as referenced in SBOE policy and the FSH.

_It was noted that FSH 1520 Article IV Section 3 as cited is relevant to faculty responsibilities for “Courses of instruction, curricula and degrees ….. are subject to approval by the university faculty”, whereas Section 12 is relevant to structure: “faculty advises and assists the president and the regents in establishing, reorganizing, or discontinuing major academic and administrative units of the university…..”_

There was consensus that the faculty has a greater role in matters of curriculum in contrast to the advisory role in matters of university structure.

A further comment was offered: the resolution had only been distributed at the meeting. It was requested to try to provide such resolutions two to three days in advance.

The Chair then called for the question in consideration of the resolution. Moved (Crowley/Fairley), approved unanimously.

**RFI Report:** Professor O’Rourke provided a Power-Point presentation and notes were distributed.

A diverse group from the UI community comprised the RFI review committee. The committee had conducted many long meetings during the past few weeks in the process.
The committee’s charge was to forward full proposals to the President and Provost in March that are innovative and that meet the published RFI criteria.

- There are no funds to be divided, and no hard cap on the numbers of proposals to be forwarded.
- The committee’s work involves:
  - Proposal evaluation
  - Proposal synthesis and creation
  - Proposal development

- The committee is operating under the assumption that this time next year, the UI will be different. Perhaps very different.
- While the financials are central, this is not a budget-balancing exercise.
- This is a vision process, and visions conflict. The process cannot act in a protectionist way and be successful.
- The process must proceed with the university as the context, insofar as this is possible.

**The Input: Pre-Proposals vs. Ideas**
- **Pre-Proposals:**
  - 77 submitted.
  - They demonstrate real energy and excitement about change, and an engagement with the institution’s future.
  - Most are focused on issues “close to home”.
  - The committee’s goal has been to evaluate them with the university in mind and expand them when necessary.

**The Range of Coverage**
- Majority – academics, but also outreach, process and administration are well represented.

**Demographic Profile of Contact People**
- Majority faculty but administrators, exempt and staff employees well represented, but few students.
- Many proposals have teams from a range of demographics.

Units broadly represented, but by site, a large majority from Moscow.

**Review of Pre-Proposals (January 2009):**
- Each pre-proposal has been evaluated by the committee.
- Proposal ideas have emerged directly from pre-proposals, from syntheses of pre-proposals, and from identification of ideas that are “in the air”.
- The final review will identify the strongest proposals. (January 29)
- Report with our recommendations is due to the President and Provost by February 2, with decisions and evaluations to the authors out shortly thereafter.

**Development of Proposals (February 2009):**
- A few proposals will emerge directly from individual pre-proposals.
- Several proposals will likely involve the synthesis of multiple pre-proposals.
- Several proposals could arise out of committee deliberations and not be related in any obvious way to any pre-proposals.
- In the latter two cases, the nature of the proposals must be articulated by the committee and authors recruited to draft them.
Review of Phase 2 (full) Proposals (March 2009):
- Will begin March 12 when proposals are submitted.
- A subset of the proposals will be identified and forwarded to the President and Provost for final selection decisions in late March.

Publicity:
- Titles, descriptions, and contact authors for all pre-proposals now appear on the RFI website.
- When decisions are made concerning proposals to be solicited, extended descriptions of these will be published on the RFI website and public commentary requested. When proposals are submitted in March, they will be published on the site in their entirety.

What if there are “yellow card” programs involved in an RFI?
All RFI proposals are being evaluated on their merits. If an RFI is forwarded and implemented that involved one of these programs, this could provide a new life to that program.

What is the mechanism for broader input to the final versions of RFI proposals?
The committee would be pleased to receive suggestions for ways to incorporate broader input to the process. The guidelines at present are not greatly detailed and will be augmented. For example, there are presently no time-lines. The committee is suggesting inclusion of phased development structures. Proposals should not only be inspirational but it is hoped that results can be seen within 3 to 6 months.

Many of the proposals shown on the website appear to be research-related. How many proposals deal with curriculum?
Providing an estimate only, about two fifths focus on teaching or a combination of teaching and research.

Having a few minutes remaining, the Chair called for further comment on the PPP.

General Counsel Nelson noted that in interpreting documents relevant to the PPP, care is needed and single documents read in isolation are misleading. He noted that original authority on processes at UI were initiated in the Territorial Act. The final decision on program closures rests with the Regents. He also suggested that there appear to be several programs proposed for closure that may be considered in the category of “attic cleaning”. He suggested that these should be identified and dealt with quickly to allow further time to deal with more controversial proposed program closures.

Adjournment: It was moved and seconded (Murphy/Miller) to adjourn at 4:56 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Rodney A. Hill
Faculty Secretary and
Secretary to Faculty Council
I am seeking a change to the field trip section of the catalog. At this time, field trips that are not in the catalog require the signature of the departmental administrator, dean, and provost. The dean has oversight of curricular and co-curricular learning opportunities for degree and certificate programs, fiscal resources, personnel, risk, and so forth. For these reasons, I suggest that the dean be the final signature for these field trips.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

M – Attendance, Repeated Absences, Field Trips, and Official Student Travel

M-1. Attendance. Students are responsible for class attendance; in all cases of absence, students are accountable for the work missed. In the case of officially approved absence and on the request of the student, the instructor is obligated to provide an opportunity for the student to make up for missed work. In general, an absence is considered "official" when the student is: (a) participating in an approved field trip or other official UI activity (e.g., athletics, debate, music, or theatre arts); (b) confined under doctor's orders; (c) called to active military duty during emergency situations; or (d) granted a leave of absence from UI for reasonable cause by his or her academic dean.

M-2. Repeated Absences. In courses where a substantial amount of the content can be mastered only or primarily through class participation, regular and punctual attendance is essential and may, therefore, be reflected in grading. Instructors will make clear at the beginning of each course the extent to which grades are dependent on attendance. Instructors may report to the registrar students who are repeatedly absent from classes (a form is available from departmental and college officials). Absences may be considered excessive when their number equals or exceeds the number of credits in a particular course.

M-3. Field Trips and Official Student Travel. "Field trip" is defined as any required, course-related student travel that exceeds 25 air miles from the campus or conflicts with other classes that the students involved are taking. (A trip taken within 25 air miles during the class scheduled for the particular class or at a time that does not conflict with other classes the students involved are taking is a "local trip," not a "field trip.")

M-3-a. Missed Class Work. Students participating in field trips, as defined above, or other official UI activities are responsible for conferring in advance with the instructors of any classes that will be missed in order to be eligible for making up missed class work. (See M-1.)

M-3-b. Approval of Course-Related Field Trips. Administrative approval for course-related field trips will be obtained by the person in charge of the trip as follows:

(1) Each field trip as identified in the catalog course description requires prior approval by the department in accordance with divisional procedures (application for approval should be made at least one week before the expected departure).

(2) Each field trip NOT identified in the catalog course description requires prior approval by the departmental administrator and the dean of the college, and the provost (application for approval should be made at least two weeks before the expected departure).

M-3-c. Approval of Other Official Student Travel. Administrative approval for official student travel that is NOT course related is obtained from the vice president for student affairs (application for approval should be made at least two weeks before the expected departure).

M-3-d. Costs. When a college can cover all or part of the cost of a course-related field trip from allocated funds, the college should do so. If the college cannot cover the cost, or a portion thereof, the cost (or remaining portion) must be borne in proportionate share by the students in the course. Students missing required field trips identified in the catalog course description must pay their proportionate shares.

M-3-e. Field-Trip Completion Deadline. All field trips and other UI-approved student travel must be completed before 7:30 a.m. on the fifth day of classes before the start of final examinations.
M-3-f. Unofficial Student Travel. UI student accident insurance does not cover injuries sustained in the course of travel unless the travel has been officially authorized by the appropriate UI agent.

M-3-g. Vehicle Information. Information concerning privately owned vehicles (registration, insurance, driver's license, etc.) to be used for field trips or other official student travel must be filed in the Risk Management Office (Rm. 209, Admin. Bldg.). Administrators of departments and divisions are responsible for ensuring that the required information is filed before the initial use of each privately owned vehicle in a given academic year.

M-4. Accommodation of Religious Observances in the Administration of Examinations. When tests or examinations fall on days objectionable to a student because of religious beliefs, the student should contact the instructor as soon as possible. The instructor may require the student to submit a concise, written statement of the reasons for the request. If the request appears to be made in good faith, the instructor should make alternative arrangements for the administration of the examination or test. If the instructor believes the request not to be in good faith, or if the instructor and the student are unable to agree on arrangements, the student or the instructor should seek the assistance of the departmental administrator, dean, or provost, in that order.

M-5. Drop for Non-attendance. Students are responsible for notifying their instructors through the Registrar when extenuating circumstances not covered as an officially approved absence as defined in M-1 prevent their attendance during the first week of the semester. Instructors may drop students who have not attended class or laboratory meetings nor notified the instructor through the Registrar by the end of the sixth business day following the start of the class. Valid reasons for missing classes do not relieve the student of making up the work missed.