University of Idaho
2008-2009 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA
Meeting #19

Tuesday, February 10, 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 #18, February 3, 2009

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.
   • Athletics (Rob Spear/Jana Stotler)

VI. Committee Reports.

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.
   • Program Prioritization Process/NOI

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Karen Guilfoyle, Chair 2008-2009, Faculty Council

Attachments: Minutes of 2008-2009 FC Meeting #18
University of Idaho  
Faculty Council Meeting Minutes  
2008-09 Meeting #18 Tuesday February 3, 2009

Present: Baird, Baker (w/o vote), Battaglia, Crowley, Eveleth, Fairley, Fritz, Graden, Guilfoyle (chair), Hill (w/o vote), Huber, Johnson (GPSCA), Limbaugh (ASUI), Machlis, Makus, Mihelich, Miller, Murphy, Noble (for Holthaus, w/o vote), Oman, Schmeckpeper, Stoner (ASUI), Sullivan, Williams, Wilson. Liaisons: Budwig (Boise), Dakins (Idaho Falls), Newcombe (Coeur d’Alene).

Absent: Holthaus.
Visitors/Guests: 5

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 27 meeting (Meeting #17) of the 2008-2009 Faculty Council as distributed. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair’s Report: The Chair reported that many faculty had shared concerns about the short notice and rushed nature of the two President candidate visits, this week and next. The State Board was in charge of scheduling and there was little opportunity for faculty input to be heard on this point. The Chair further pressed her contact (Regent Thilo) for information about when faculty input on the President candidates could be received by the State Board. Vice-Chair Miller noted that a form to provide input was recently made available on the President’s web-page at http://www.uidaho.edu/presidentialsearch.aspx.

The Vice-Chair added that on questioning one of the Regents at today’s Presidential candidate address, he discovered that the decision process would be fast-tracked and the window for comment would be perhaps a week following the second candidate visit early next week. The Vice-Chair urged everyone to provide input quickly.

Will the remaining three candidates on the president search short-list be invited to campus? Not at this time. Only if issues arise that lead to outcomes such as announcement of non-availability of the top two candidates, or for example, if their suitability becomes doubtful through the present process.

The Chair then briefly outlined the items for today’s agenda, noting that it was important for everyone to engage in the PPP/NOI process. High priorities would be to continue with the interactive nature and transparency of the process. The Chair also urged that faculty continue the involvement of students in the process and keep them thinking about where the changes in the university will take us.

Provost’s Report: The Provost noted that leadership had met with the student leaders and student press representatives from “The Argonaut” to discuss the coming changes through the PPP/NOI processes. “The Argonaut” has agreed to run stories on changes in each college. The Provost then noted his enthusiastic support of the RFI review committee in advancing the RFIs. He noted that the committee had worked very long hours and had combined tasks of synthesis and suggested amalgamation of some RFIs. He and the President would meet later this evening to review the committee recommendations. The RFI leaders would be contacted and then soon after the successful RFIs would be announced.

He thanked the faculty for the strong turn-out to interact with presidential candidate Nellis and noted that candidate Dooley would be on the Moscow campus next Monday, February 9.
Preliminary Discussion of Athletics: The Chair called for discussion points and questions that would be passed along to Athletics Director, Rob Spear, to provide him time to prepare answers to present to FC next week.

A concern was that there appeared to be a drift of athletics students away from specialist majors into General Studies. Discussion around this point suggested that scheduling was an issue. Training sessions may clash with specialist class hours in some cases. Thus, students were left with few options other than to change major to General Studies in order to remain compliant with guidelines for degree completion. Another view was that students might have been influenced to change to General Studies by athletics staff. Another council member noted that during his past service on the Athletics Advisory Board, he had vehemently argued against moving training times to earlier in the day as this practice does interfere a great deal with scheduled academic class hours and that later practice times should be advocated.

The Chair noted that a question would be: how does UI Athletics expenditures compare with peer institutions in the same athletics conference?

Another point was advocated: to engage in a full UI community discussion about the pros and cons of the most expensive sport in the UI program, football. It was noted giving examples of Stanford and Ohio State universities, that both of these had large, high-visibility football programs and both ran at net losses. In addition universities such as UC Irvine or UC Santa Barbara are competitive in division one sports but do not have a football team.

What are the Athletics Director’s five and ten year plans for the program?

Is it possible for the head football coach to be invited next week?

With academic programs at UI contracting due to the present fiscal situation; what is the athletics program doing to refocus and contract?

Another FC member noted three international academic performance indices that ranked universities throughout the world. 1. The London College of Economics only enter the top 50 universities and we are not in that pool. The Shanghai index lists UI in the top 500 in a list of 8000 in the world, i.e. in the top 5%. The Spanish Council ranked the top 4000 universities and UI is #265. The point made was that UI’s academic programs are world class, but the athletics program is not.

What is the increase in seating capacity with current Kibbie Dome renovations?
The Provost replied that the current renovations addressed life safety issues. Future planned changes were part of a prioritized list and depended upon the availability of funding.

Are current renovations compatible with on-going use of the facilities?
The Provost noted that heavy equipment would be working and the majority of activities would be relocated during the renovation period.

FC-09-031 Change of Regulation M-3-b: Discussion noted that this change essentially moved the authorization process away from the Provost’s office to the college level. Risk and budgetary authority for these activities resided in the colleges and the authorization should be consistent with this. Approved unanimously.
A related issue was raised with respect to rule M1 – Attendance. The issue of acceptability for students to be absent for the purposes of caring for their children or other family members was discussed.

It was moved (Fritz/Crowley) to instruct the University Curriculum Committee to investigate and report to FC a recommendation for changes in the appropriate sections of the Catalog that either support or deny students excused absences for the purposes of caring for children or other family members due to (short term) illness. Approved unanimously. It was noted that the Registrar’s involvement in UCC meetings would as a routine matter include the Dean of Students Office in considering the salient points in determining required documentation of the illness.

**FC-09-028 NOI CLASS: BS/BA Organizational Sciences.** Professor Reardon noted that this NOI had arisen from demand of non-traditional students in Northern Idaho. In providing new information that had arisen - there had also been discussion with Lewis-Clark State College about opportunities to collaborate in delivering the proposed classes. The notion was to make the offering with minimal fiscal impact. Many of the classes were designed to be self-supporting. They were cross-disciplinary and might become cross-college. Discussion with CNR and CALS indicated potential synergy. It was noted that it was unfortunate that Communication Studies was to be eliminated. However, some courses from this degree could be supported by the proposed program. There was demand from both non-traditional students in the Coeur d’Alene-Spokane area and from Moscow students, especially students interested in organizational psychology in the non-profit sector. The program would not reside in a department but rather at the college level in CLASS.

*The cross-cutting interdisciplinary nature of the degrees was noted. Another comment related that several staff at the Moscow campus would be interested in enrolling.*

**Was there any overlap with CBE?**
Dean Morris had participated in original development of the degree. Another view was that the present form of the NOI differed from the original concept development, i.e. originally the course was to be offered only in Coeur d’Alene but the NOI appeared to indicate that the main client group was Moscow students.

**Could this program be offered on the Coeur d’Alene campus and not the Moscow campus?**
Yes, but there would be no reason to restrict it to Coeur d’Alene if there is demand in Moscow?

**Was there any overlap with the closing of the Communication Studies program? Are Communications faculty and students interested in the program and is there a way for this to be a transition rather than a program closure?**
Yes, there is overlap and this evolved due to the timing of the introduction of the proposed program. It is not known if there is interest from Communications students and faculty.

**Another view was that the motion would not be supported by the FC member because we are in the midst of closing 41 other programs and it is inconsistent to be opening a new program at this time.**
Professor Reardon responded that many of the Northern Idaho Center students requesting this course were non-traditional students aged 40 to 50 and the two year delay in implementing the course would be a particularly serious blow to this client group.

Member Limbaugh introduced a student guest (Huddleston) who spoke in favor of the program noting that students interested in organizational psychology in the non-profit sector were enthusiastic about the introduction of this course, also noting its innovative nature being cross-disciplinary.
The Chair called for the question. Approved, nine in favor, eight opposed.

**FC-09-030 Collective Bargaining:** Professor Dickow spoke to the resolution. The call was for support of the up-coming collective bargaining bill in the 2009 Idaho Legislature.

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.

There was considerable discussion related to the complexity of the resolution as presented. The current version of the draft bill was also discussed. It was noted that the final draft of the supported bill was not in the hands of FC, but that it was essentially as currently proposed.

Another view was presented as representing many constituent faculty who found contention with both the resolution and the bill. It was noted that if the bill was to go forward, market driven forces would not dictate wages so there is serious concern from faculty that we will not be able to compete to get faculty in some disciplines. A second point was with the resolution which is very symbolic, containing many clauses beginning “whereas .... etc”. These elements were highly empirical and differentially interpretable.

A counter point was made that the issue was that the resolution supporting the bill was about our ability to organize and have representation. It was noted that there are about 35 states that have such collective bargaining legislation and the remaining states that don’t have it. It was suggested that there was no information that this has caused any problems. Universities in Oregon are quite happy with the kinds of arrangements they have come to. The competitive salaries issue is not convincing and it would be too far ahead to align specific salary issues with the proposed resolution.

It was suggested that a reasonable position might be to support the final statement of the draft resolution, disencumbering that component from many of the complexities of the draft.

It was moved (Crowley/Murphy) as follows: Be it resolved that the University of Idaho Faculty Council supports the higher education collective bargaining bill in the 2009 Idaho legislature. Approved, 13 for and two against.

**PPP/NOIs:** The Chair requested input and suggestions from FC constituencies.

It was suggested that the so called “yellow carded” programs were identified on the Provost’s web-page although they were not specifically identified by that term. It was noted that no advice or supporting data had been provided to departments and that this information would empower faculty to begin to address deficiencies and consider strategies such as program amalgamation.

The Provost noted that activities around the presidential candidate visits had temporarily disrupted the process and Provost’s Council would be meeting this week to look in greater detail at the data and that timely responses would be provided. Thus, it was expected that faculty would be given time to propose improvements and beneficial structural changes.

The Chair suggested that the first NOIs would reach UCC for next Monday’s meeting, February 9. The following Monday is President’s Day and UCC plans to meet that week on Feb 19. Thus, FC would see a
group of NOIs most likely on Feb 24th. This may require a longer meeting that day, an issue we will discuss next week.

GPSA representative Johnson urged faculty to engage graduate students in the discussion and noted that there had been extensive discussion of the issues within GPSA. The Chair requested FC member Johnson to prepare a report to FC from GPSA and present within the next few weeks.

Another question addressed the time-frame considering that there would be no layoffs, where was the cost saving? The Provost replied that by working the process toward the April SBOE meeting, reductions in teaching loads would be realized sooner and this was a true cost-saving. The critical timing element was such that the program cuts would be approved in time to be entered in the 2009-10 catalog.

It was suggested that additional public relations exercises conducted by administration might do more to alleviate perceived tensions of some faculty. The Provost acknowledged that more communication is needed to clarify that there will be no layoffs due to the present round of program closures but he also noted some feedback has indicated that the communication was already overdone and it is difficult to get a good balance.

The Provost added that the recent additional cuts imposed by the legislature were not addressed with the PPP. Options to address short-falls were being considered.

Adjournment: It was moved and seconded (Machlis/Fritz) to adjourn at 5:12 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Rodney A. Hill
Faculty Secretary and
Secretary to Faculty Council