University of Idaho
2008-2009 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA
Meeting #23

Tuesday, March 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 #22, March 3, 2009

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.

VI. Committee Reports.
    University Curriculum Committee:
    FC-09-033: UCC-09-068 – Drop M.S. Geological Engineering (deferred twice - Denied by UCC)
    FC-09-065: UCC-09-102 – Consolidate M.S. majors in CNR to One
    FC-09-066: UCC-09-104 – Discontinue MAT Art Education (Denied by UCC)
    Faculty Affairs:
    FC-09-067: FSH 3050 – Position Description
    FC-09-068: FSH 3140 – Performance Expectations
    FC-09-069: FSH 3320 – Annual Evaluation
    FC-09-070: FSH 3420 – Faculty Salaries

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.
    FC-09-071: FSH 1520 – University Constitution
                (Initial discussion of multi-site participation at general faculty meetings)

X. Adjournment.

Professor Karen Guilfoyle, Chair 2008-2009, Faculty Council

Attachments: Minutes of 2008-2009 FC Meeting #22
               FC-09-033 (distributed earlier)
               FC-09-065 through FC-09-071
Present: Rowland for Baird, Baillargeon, Baker, (w/o vote), Battaglia, Crowley, Eveleth, Fairley, Fritz, Graden, Hill (w/o vote), Huber, Machlis, Makus, Mihelich, Miller, Murphy, Stohner, Sullivan, Williams, Wilson. Liaisons: Budwig (Boise), Newcombe (Coeur d’Alene), Dakins (Idaho Falls)

Absent: Baird, Guilfoyle (chair), Johnson, Limbaugh, Oman, Schmeckpeper.

Visitors/Guests: >20

A quorum being present, the vice chair, Professor Jack Miller, in the absence of the chair, opened the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

Minutes: It was moved and seconded (Murphy, Eveleth) to approve the minutes of the meeting of February 24th, 2009 as distributed.

Chair’s Report: Professor Miller noted that he was again chairing this meeting as Professor Guilfoyle was recovering slowly but we anticipated her welcome return next week. The Vice-Chair noted that FC members would need to initiate the new FC member nominations by encouraging their colleges and faculty to engage more actively in faculty governance. Ballots needed to be conducted and members nominated by the deadline of April 15, see FSH 1520 Article V and FSH 1580.

Provost’s Report: The Provost noted that the PPP had begun last fall, based upon a three year process of strategic planning. Thus the University of Idaho was better prepared than many institutions for the national fiscal crisis that hit last September. He further noted that UI (and most of our peers) had suffered a steady decline in state funding for 30 years and this trend will continue. Our strategic PPP has positioned us well to make the difficult decisions that are before us. We did not have the resources to continue the current scope of programs and focus upon excellence was the mantra for the realities of today. The Provost spoke to two metaphors to illustrate the challenges facing the university. The Idaho water resource issue – i.e. like water in Idaho, our resources have been over-extended for some time. The north-west mountain snow-pack: its reduction will lead to permanent change.

He noted that the Graduate Council and the University Curriculum Committee had been working through difficult issues in considering the NOI’s that were now before FC today. Indeed, we would face additional difficult decisions ahead. The Provost complimented FC and the hard-working committees who had been working through the PPP. He also noted that the RFIs were evolving and would be presented to FC later in the spring. The process re-engineering piece of the ppp would be conducted over the summer.

The Provost noted that we have before us the opportunity to reshape the university, at this turning point in our history.

Committee Reports: The Vice-Chair summarized and reviewed the procedure for dealing with the NOI’s. The resolution passed by FC supporting the process requested minutes, documents and votes from the various committees involved in program review to accompany the NOI. He also noted that we had scheduled to meet until 6:00 p.m. this evening. Under the resolution passed by FC with regard to the NOI process in the interests of fair treatment to all NOI’s under discussion, visitors would be limited to 3 min each to comment on NOI’s.
**FC-09-033.** It was again moved to defer discussion of FC-09-033 – Drop MS in Geological Engineering (Crowley / Huber) as neither of the FC representatives from the College of Engineering could be present today. Approved, unanimously.

**FC-09-053.** Drop MS in Physical Education. The FC Vice-Chair asked UCC Chair Dacey to join the discussion at the FC tables. The UCC chair noted that this NOI had come to UCC twice. On the first occasion the NOI did not have departmental support and on the second occasion with the department in agreement. Agreement came about following advice that a solution be found in defining a fall-back position for students.

Questions: *Would the department come forward with a non-thesis program proposal?*
Yes, this would come forward in time for approval at UCC before the October 15 deadline. Dean Rowland added that there had been broader discussion of department objectives and there was also an intent to move to a bachelor’s program that progressed into a PhD program following a model at Arizona State University. There being no further discussion, the vote was unanimously in favor of the NOI going forward.

**FC-09-054.** Drop BA in foreign language, German option. The UCC vote was 10:2 in favor. There was no further discussion and the vote was unanimously in favor of the NOI going forward.

**FC-09-055.** Drop BS/BA in Communications Studies. Professor Dacey noted that there was considerable discussion about this NOI at UCC. With the exception of freshmen, it would be possible for the large number of students enrolled to complete their programs. Due to two faculty retirements and unavailable funds to replace these positions, it would no longer be possible to teach the required classes for this major. There were only two faculty left with 14 courses to teach – this was clearly impossible.

Students from the ASUI senate were invited to speak. There was a request for the FC discussion to be postponed. It was stated that ASUI wished to retain the Communication Studies Major. A further request was made for all freshmen majors in Communications Studies to be allowed to complete their major.

Dean Aiken noted that this degree was initiated in 2003, and that it had not been well resourced. The dean noted that she had met with ASUI leadership to discuss issues around proposed closure of the degree. Professor Folwell (Communications Studies) noted that there were between 22 and 30 students in freshmen or sophomore classes. Initially, the department was against the closure of the program but understood the issue of a lack of resources and the reality that this brought.

Dean Aiken further noted that multiple criteria developed, reviewed and adopted by various university bodies, including FC were used in the PPP. She noted that the program was weak across many of the metrics developed and that this is a reflection of the metric of an under-resourced program (throughout its history, since 2003).

There was further discussion of the possibility of teaching out all students including freshmen. Professor Folwell indicated that she has spent considerable time to find a solution for all students and it was possible that every required course could be offered for all students to complete. The Provost agreed that in this case it appeared possible that the course could be taught out to all students currently enrolled in the major.
Dean Aiken noted that there were various majors and options for students to allow full teach out of all students in the major. The dean gave kudos to Professor Folwell for her dedication and tenacity in working through many complex issues in an effort to provide students with the best possible options in this restricted budgetary environment. She also commended the department for fighting for a program that although is important the reality of a lack in funding made it impossible to retain.

There being no further discussion, the vote was in favor of the NOI going forward, 11 for, 3 opposed.

**FC-09-056.** Drop BA/BS Justice Studies and new emphasis in Sociology. It was noted that the vote in UCC was 11 for and 0 against. It was noted by a faculty member from the department that there were no problems with this transition and the department wished to actively move to the newly structured program. There being no further discussion, the vote was unanimously in favor of the NOI going forward.

The Vice-Chair noted that the next NOI’s for consideration were denied by UCC. The UCC chair noted that **FC-09-057, 09-058, 09-059, 09-060 and 09-064** (four discontinued programs replaced by a single degree), were considered by UCC as a group. The overall UCC vote was 0 for, and 10 against. The plan to replace the programs was not well articulated.

CALS Associate Dean Foltz spoke to these NOIs. He noted that the college faculty and administration felt they had insufficient time to craft a better consolidated course structure. He noted that three departments were represented in working towards the program consolidation. The votes from the three departments were mixed, PSES being against the consolidation.

It was suggested that FC could approve the NOI’s and that in the interim between the present and the next intake of students, the college would have time to work on improving the course structure as it presently stood. It was noted that students incoming in fall of 2009 could be given the option of selecting a later version of the catalog as their reference program content. One improvement under consideration was to add capstone courses to the program.

Professor Johnson, Department Head of PSES, noted that an issue needing resolution was bringing the three departments into agreement on the new program, as it was difficult to identify core courses that suited the needs of all three.

Potential negative impacts of the consolidation were discussed. Foltz noted that with the change to the consolidated degree there would likely be additional problems with student recruitment as the proposed program title was not as readily recognizable as the individual program names.

It was also noted that the program consolidation would lead to real savings in administrative and accreditation costs.

The Provost added that these were all small programs and there were additional benefits to consolidate for greater efficiency.

An amendment to the motion from UCC was proposed. The listed start date for FC-09-057 was incorrect. It was moved (Crowley/Mihelich) to change the program start date to the fall of 2009, approved unanimously.

There being no further discussion, the vote was proposed in support of the five NOI’s, 16 for, 0 against. Thus FC approved these NOI’s to go forward.
**FC-09-062.** Drop BSFCS in Child, Family and Consumer Studies. The UCC chair noted that the long-term goal of this program closure was to work toward a program blend with Agricultural Education. The UCC vote was 4 in favor and 7 against the NOI.

Associate Dean Foltz noted that this degree provided training for teachers in Family and Consumer Sciences and there were approximately 100 teachers around the state who held this degree. However, demand was small with only a few students enrolled.

The dean of the College of Education also provided some clarification about the special allocation of state support that was tied to this program (about $35,000). It was noted that with a redesigned course offered in Agricultural Education, that the state support would still be provided.

Professor Evenson, Interim Department Chair of FCS noted a need to repackage this program. When asked whether she supported the NOI, Professor Evenson was ambivalent because of dedication to a long-time association with this program in her department. Professor Evenson also noted that the remaining programs in the department had large enrollment (376 students) and the reality was that the department is somewhat forced in favor of the NOI.

There being no further discussion, the vote was unanimously in favor of the NOI going forward.

**FC-09-061 and 09-063.** CALS / CNR – Drop BS Range Livestock Management. There was discussion about the parallel nature of the two degrees. CNR was in favor of the NOI, but if CALS wished to retain the degree, CNR would informally support its retention in CALS.

The CNR dean McLaughlin noted that the degree had been offered for several years and was developed in a spirit of cross-college cooperation. It had turned out to be an unsuccessful investment for CNR with few students attracted.

Associate Dean Foltz noted that there were no CALS administrators present at the UCC meeting to provide clarification and this may have led to some issues not being fully elucidated.

There being no further discussion, the vote was unanimously in favor of the NOI going forward.

UCC chair Dacey noted the importance of how these NOI’s go through different committees, each with their own perspective allowing for a thorough review. UCC focused on curriculum issues, while FC took a broader view and each of these steps were important for complete review of the programs and forwarding of NOI’s.

The Vice-Chair thanked UCC chair for her hard work on the NOI’s. He also thanked all of the guests for helpful input.

**Adjournment:** It was moved and seconded (Murphy/Crowley) to adjourn at 5:30 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Rodney A. Hill, Faculty Secretary and
Secretary to Faculty Council
**IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**  
**ACADEMIC/PROFESSIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION**  
**NOTICE OF INTENT**

To initiate a  
New, Expanded, Cooperative, Discontinued, program component or Off-Campus Instructional Program or Instructional/Research Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Submitting Proposal:</th>
<th>University of Idaho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of College, School, or Division:</td>
<td>College of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Department(s) or Area(s):</td>
<td>Forest Resources, Rangeland Ecology and Management, Conservation Social Sciences, Forest Products, Fish &amp; Wildlife Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicate if this Notice of Intent (NOI) is for an Academic or Professional Technical Program  
Academic X Professional - Technical _______

This is a New, Expanded, Cooperative, Contract, or Off-Campus Instructional Program, or Administrative/Research Unit (circle one) leading to:  
**Discontinue Master of Science majors in Conservation Social Science; Fishery Resources; Forest Resources; Forest Products; Rangeland Ecology and Management; and Wildlife Resources. Create Master of Science major in Natural Resources**

(Degree or Certificate)

Proposed Starting Date: August 2009

**For New Programs:**

Master's of Science in Natural Resources (CIP=03)  
Program (i.e., degree) Title & CIP 2000

**For Other Activity:**

- Program Component (major/minor/option/emphasis)
- Off-Campus Activity/Resident Center
- Instructional/Research Unit
- Addition/Expansion
- **X** Discontinuance/consolidation
- Contract Program
- Other

Dean’s signature on file 2/6/09  
College Dean (Institution) Date  
Chief Fiscal Officer (Institution) Date  
Chief Academic Officer (Institution) Date

VP Research & Graduate Studies Date  
State Administrator, SDPTE Date  
Chief Academic Officer, OSBE Date  
SBOE/OSBE Approval Date
Before completing this form, refer to Board Policy Section III.G., Program Approval and Discontinuance.

1. Briefly describe the nature of the request e.g., is this a new program (degree, program, or certificate) or program component (e.g., new, discontinued, modified, addition to an existing program or option).

This is a consolidation of six individual Masters of Science Programs, Conservation Social Sciences, Fisheries Resources, Forest Resources, Forest Products, Rangeland Ecology and Management, and Wildlife Resources into one integrated and jointly managed program. The purpose is to increase program management effectiveness, including meeting the recommended minimum standard of graduating at least 10 students per year; create a higher quality and potentially more interdisciplinary educational environment for the graduate students; align our program with the US Department of Education’s Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP 2000); and continue to position the University of Idaho natural resources educational mission for a successful future.

2. Provide a statement of need for program or a program modification. Include student and state need, demand, and employment potential. Attach a Scope and Sequence, SDPTE Form Attachment B, for professional-technical education requests. (Use additional sheets if necessary.).

This consolidated Master’s of Science Degree in Natural Resources builds upon the recommendations of the recently completed Yardley Report concerning University of Idaho graduate programs and addresses the metrics identified during the program prioritization process for maintaining sustainable and viable graduate programs as well as the university adopted Program Prioritization Criteria. This proposed graduate program is clearly central to our mission. Cost effectiveness gains would occur in the areas of program assessment, credit hour production, and program administration. Internal and external demands exist and are likely to grow over the next decade. This change should allow additional faculty time to be redirected toward our professional and doctoral programs or increasing the number of students enrolled in this program. We expect our program size to remain stable with room for modest growth and the quality of the student experience has the potential to be improved via increased interdisciplinary aspects of the proposed program and increased dialogue among and between faculty and graduate students. The proposed change is designed to continue to promote synergies between the College of Natural Resources (CNR) and Law as well as between CNR’s graduate academic program and other related social and biophysical science and land resource/management programs at the University of Idaho. Furthermore, the proposed consolidated degree continues to reflect the state’s changing natural resource needs and demands, and it will provide Idaho graduates for the state, national, and international workforce in the area of natural resource and conservation sciences.

3. Briefly describe how the institution will ensure the quality of the program (e.g., accreditation, professional societies, licensing boards, etc.).

The quality of this consolidated program will be insured by continued annual assessment and regular multi-year external reviews of the program and its options. Additionally, an Advisory Committee of practicing scientists and professionals will be engaged in regular curriculum reviews and processes to further develop CNR’s long standing nationally known natural resource and conservation programs.

4. Identify similar programs offered within the state of Idaho or in the region by other colleges/universities. If the proposed request is similar to another program, provide a rationale for the duplication. This may not apply to PTE programs if workforce needs within the respective region have been established.
This graduate programming will continue to build upon and evolve cooperative efforts with Washington State University, the University of Montana and other outstanding natural resource graduate programs throughout the nation, especially as we enhance our sharing of virtual graduate courses and programming. Inside Idaho we will continue to cooperate with related programs and scientists at Idaho’s state and private institutions of higher education. Our recent efforts to update our memorandums of understanding with federal and state land management, natural resource, and environmental agencies as well as collaboratives with private and non-profit organizations will also add to the strength of this program.

Because graduate natural resources and forestry education programming is central to the University of Idaho’s mission and we have always had responsibility for delivery of these programs throughout the state, there are no other graduate programs in this specific area at our other state public institutions.

Recent composite enrollments for the six Master’s Programs at the University of Idaho being consolidated into one are shown in the table below. The decline in the number of MS graduates is offset in part CNR’s increasing number of graduates in our PhD Natural Resources Program, and our Master’s of Natural Resources Professional Degree Program. This is a planned strategy with the long term goal of having three outstanding graduate natural resource and conservation programs all targeting different student markets and fulfilling different needs in the workforce (natural resource practicing professionals, scientists, and researchers).

Last three years beginning with the current year and the 2 previous years. Note enrollment data includes both full and part time graduate students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Relevant Enrollment Data</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Previous Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI (Full &amp; Part-time)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Only</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>(68)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees offered by school/college or program(s) within disciplinary area under review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution and Degree name</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Specializations within the discipline (to reflect a national perspective)</th>
<th>Specializations offered within the degree at the institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSU</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Within the larger discipline classification area (CIP 2000) of Natural Resources and Conservation we will continue to offer the following specializations: Conservation Social Sciences, Ecology and Conservation Biology, Fisheries Resources, Forest Products, Forest Resources, Range Ecology and Management, Resource Recreation and Tourism, Wildlife Resources.

All of these specializations are offered at the BS level at UI as independent academic programs and the opportunity to pursue doing a science (MS) or more practice oriented degree (MNR) will be maintained at the Master’s level and the consolidated PhD will be retained. Additionally, emerging topic areas such as policy sciences and law, land use planning and management, ecosystem services, human ecology, fire ecology, and conservation biology are likely to evolve as elements of our graduate program.

5. Describe how this request is consistent with the State Board of Education’s policy or role and mission of the institution. (i.e., centrality).

The proposed change retains an area central to the University of Idaho’s mission—natural resources and forestry education. It will do it more effectively, while continuing to promote individualized programming for MS students and position the program to be flexible to react to a changing future. It does not duplicate existing graduate programs elsewhere in the state. It also provides an opportunity to meet an existing demand and positions the graduate programming in Natural Resources to expand into directions of identified interest and where existing faculty expertise can be further capitalized upon.

6. Is the proposed program in the 8-year Plan? Indicate below.

   Yes _____  No  X _____

If not on 8-year plan, provide a justification for adding the program.

These changes are motivated by CNR’s need to continue to transform its graduate level academic programming to reflect changes in natural resources and associated sub-fields, and the faculty’s desire to strengthen its science-based programs. Clearly, the existing economic situation has caused us to immediately address the need to be more cost effective and recent changes in the college’s strategic plan provide guidance to re-evaluate our graduate programming in terms of quality, productivity, relevance to workforce demands and emerging directions in natural resources.
8. Resources--Faculty/Staff/Space Needs/Capital Outlay. (Use additional sheets if necessary.):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Fiscal Impact</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Operating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Capital Outlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Source of Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Appropriated-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reallocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appropriated – New</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Nature of Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Recurring *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Non-recurring **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Recurring is defined as ongoing operating budget for the program, which will become of the base.
** Non-recurring is defined as one-time funding in a fiscal year and not part of the base.

**Less Tangible Benefits:**
The enhanced consolidated graduate degree program at the Master’s of Science level will result in the production of new synergy among existing Departments and Program Areas by continuing processes of dialogue among faculties. It is likely to that will result in course redevelopment, increased credit hour production per FTE, and a reduction in total time allocated to MS assessment activities. This released time will become available to invest in our professional and PhD programs as recommended by Yardley. This effort also continues the movement within the College of Natural Resources to become more interdisciplinary and reflects the need of our graduates to address complex natural resource problems that involve biophysical and human systems.
Notice of Intent (NOI) Approval Tracking Form

Committee Chairs please append this document to the relevant NOI and send it forward to the next committee for review.

Committees: College standing groups defined by by-laws as being normally involved in such processes:

CNR Leadership Council (Consensus agreement): Pam Bell, Jo Ellen Force, Tom Gorman, Jim Gosz, Troy Hall, Steve Hollenhorst, Karen Launchbaugh, Nancy Matthews, Bill McLaughlin, Kerry Reese, and Larry Young to support the idea of a single MS degree program and having the Dean develop the initial draft for department review. (January 21, 2009)

CNR Dean drafts the Initial NOI: After holding a series of sessions with each departmental faculty an NOI was drafted attempting to reflect ideas and concerns brought forward in the Departmental sessions. (January 27, 2009)

CNR Departmental Faculty: Faculty In the Departments of Fish and Wildlife Resources, Forest Products, Forest Resources, Rangeland Ecology and Management and Conservation Social Sciences discussed the issues and empowered their representative to the CNR Curriculum Committee to present ideas on their behalf. (Week of January 26th)

CNR Curriculum Committee: Janet Rachlow, chair, Karen Launchbaugh (substitute for Lee Vierling), David Roon, Larry Young (substitute for Troy Hall), Fran Wagner, Mike Whiteman, Anthony Davis (substitute for Penny Morgan). Also present were Charles Tibbals, academic publications editor, Registrar’s Office, and Valarie Roberts, Assistant to the Dean, College of Graduate Studies. (January 31, 2009) The Committee voted to take an amended version back to their Departmental faculties for further discussion and report back to the Committee Chair by February 4, have an e-mail vote on a final version, and report to the Dean by February 6. Committee Members reported back and conducted their vote on a final version of the NOI. Monday, February 9 the Dean was sent an e-mail from the Committee Chair reporting a unanimous vote by the committee on the revised NOI. On February 9 the NOI was placed on the website and an email sent to all CNR faculty members as required.

CNR By-Laws Waiting Period (2/09 – 2/13): The proposed change was posed on the CNR website and all faculty sent an e-mail on February 9. After five working days only a single faculty member called for additional discussion and according to our by-laws in absence of five faculty members’ dissent within five days of notice the recommendations of the CNR Curriculum are forwarded to the UI Curriculum Committee and on February 17 it was forwarded to the Graduate School and the Provost Office.

Program/Degree: Master of Science in Natural Resources.

Discussion: Other discussion opportunities provided.

CNR Leadership: On January 21, 2009, Dean Bill McLaughlin led the college leadership in a discussion about the possible consolidation of six individual Masters of Science Programs majors into one Master of Science in Natural Resources. The consensus was that the dean meet with department
faculty, obtain input from masters students and draft a NOI for the CNR Curriculum Committee to consider.

CNR Department Faculty Discussion with Dean: Between January 21 and 23, 2009, the dean met and obtained input from department faculty. There was general agreement with the proposed consolidation. The Dean used these inputs to draft a NOI and move it forward to Department Heads the CNR Curriculum Committee Chairperson.

CNR Masters’ Students: On January 29, Mike Whiteman met with masters’ students to obtain their input. They expressed mild concern that a single master’s program may be less attractive to potential students, and there might be possible confusion between the Master of Natural Resources and a Master of Science in Natural Resources. Additionally, e-mail input was sought and several students responded. Some were supportive and felt it would have positive impacts and others were concerned about the loss of program identity.

Alumni Board of Trustees: On January 29, we distributed an e-mail to our Alumni Board of Trustees where we explained the changes and solicited any concerns that they might have. We also provided them with a copy of Presidents Update and Progress Report.

From: Rachlow, Janet
Sent: Monday, February 09, 2009 4:26 PM
To: McLaughlin, William
Cc: Matthews, Nancy
Subject: result of vote on NOI

Bill,
The Curriculum Committee voted unanimously to pass the NOI for consolidation of the 6 MS degrees in CNR.

Committee Members representing each Department or Program are:

Troy Hall (Conservation Social Sciences) Penny Morgan (Forest Resources) Janet Rachlow (Fish and Wildlife Resources), Chair David Roon (Ecology and Conservation Biology) Lee Vierling (Rangeland Ecology and Management) Fran Wagner (Forest Products)

Thanks, Janet
Dr. Janet Rachlow
Department of Fish & Wildlife Resources
P.O. Box 441136
Moscow, ID 83844-1136
phone: 208-885-9328
fax: 208-885-9080
CNR Curriculum Committee  
January 31, 2009

Present: Janet Rachlow, chair, Karen Launchbaugh (sub. for Lee Vierling), David Roon, Larry Young (sub. for Troy Hall), Fran Wagner, Mike Whiteman, Anthony Davis (sub. for Penny Morgan).

Also present: Charles Tibbals, academic publications editor, Registrar’s Office, and Valarie Roberts, Assistant to the Dean, College of Graduate Studies

Masters - NOI Discussion

The draft NOI proposal prepared by Bill McLaughlin to combine the college’s seven masters into one was discussed.

Objections voiced by department faculties included: Options not already included in the college should not be added without further deliberations. A Master of Science in Natural Resources is somewhat confusing compared to MNR, which is more of a professional degree. A Master of Science without options would provide more flexibility and would provide more flexibility and would be a strong program across the college. Programs with fewer than ten students are protected from elimination. There is a danger in moving to a common program but, it was noted, that has not happened with the college’s PhD. Most prefer to have the program listed or included in the title; with the exception of fisheries and wildlife, that would not discourage students from coming.

The college’s PhD is a Dr. of Philosophy with a major in natural resources. The proposed change to the CNR masters would create a Master of Science with a major in natural resources.

Valerie noted that it is not uncommon to have a college-wide doctoral program, e.g. a sports physiologist with a College of Education degree; they describe their background with their list of publications and letters of reference. It was noted that a master degree is different and for many is a terminal degree.

A question was raised about what specialization term could be used without SBOE approval. Charles said “concentration” is used most commonly and Karen indicated REM has used “Career Track” to describe a focus area. Neither will show up on an official transcript.

Next Steps

MSP (Larry Young; Fran Wagner): Put forward these two approaches that do the following:
- MS degree with a major in natural resources with no specified options
- MS degree with major in natural resources with six specified options that are being consolidated
- A clear explanation of the reasoning behind those two approaches be provided and departments have an opportunity to react to those and this or another NOI as modified.

Anthony agreed to write the rational for master with no options and Janet agreed to write the master with options.

MSP (Rachlow, Wagner): After discussion with respective departments that we forward the recommended modifications to the dean.
The process was discussed:

1) Return to dean for revision with recommendations
2) Dean returns to committee
3) Committee discusses and circulates to faculty for 5 days
4) If no dissenting vote from 5 faculty, then it will forward to UCC

Charles explained the university’s stand. According to legal counsel there is no veto in this process. Items may be forwarded to SBOE in two ways:

- The president can send something to SBOE. Even if there is no support in the college, with UCC and Faculty Council, the proposal may be forwarded anyway.
- The faculty can circumvent the president and forward items to SBOE

It is possible that retaining options may not appear to the SBOE as enough of a change. And, if the process in the college doesn’t move swiftly it is possible changes will be made for us. Representatives from the departments were asked to caucus and get a consensus or email vote from their faculty. The default position needs to be clarified to the faculty.

A vote of the committee was taken:

1. Master of Science, no options (4 in favor; Larry unknown)
2. Master of Science with 6 existing majors as options (1 in favor; Larry unknown)

**MSP(Launchbaugh, Wagner): The recommendation of these two options from the Curriculum Committee favors a single Master of Natural Resources degree without options. A footnote and rationale will be included.**

Janet and Anthony will redraft the NOI today, forward the proposal to faculty today, meet Tuesday, February 3, or Wednesday, February 4, and forward the committee’s recommendations to the dean by the end of the week.

There was a consensus that “sustainable” and other options that were added should be removed.

**Bachelor of Science for Range Livestock**

MSP (Launchbaugh): That the NOI with amendments that drops the Bachelors of Science for range livestock.

To approve the NOI with amendments that drops the Bachelors of Science I range livestock.

Vote: unanimous vote
Notice of Intent (NOI) Approval Tracking Form

Committee Chairs please append this document to the relevant NOI and send it forward to the next committee for review.

Committee: Graduate Council

Program/Degree: Consolidation of Forest Resources, Rangeland Ecology and Management, Conservation Social Sciences, Forest Products, and Fish and Wildlife Resources
To Master of Science in Natural Resources

Discussion:

Janet Rachlow presented on behalf of the CNR College Curriculum Committee. Dean McLaughlin was also present to address questions.

Dr. Rachlow indicated that all the majors within the college would be collapsed into the M.S. Natural Resources. No options or emphasis areas are included in the name of the degree. This concept parallels the college-wide PH.D. degree in Natural Resources.

In CNR, the department faculty voices their opinions to their representative to the College Curriculum Committee and then committee acts on their behalf so there are no specific department votes reported. The issue is then posted on the college website and asks faculty to indicate any concerns. In the absence of five faculty members dissenting within five days of the note, the NOI is considered approved. It was reported that there was no overwhelming opposition to the NOI from the department faculty.

With this NOI approved, the College degrees would be the Master of Natural Science, Master of Science, Ph.D. all in Natural Resources.

Dean McLaughlin indicated that the degree can all be the same and the coursework can reflect the areas of specialty or interdisciplinary. Because the Study Plan indicates the student’s direction, the direction of the program can be determined there.

The college has 58 faculty.

With consolidation, is there a common core? Dean McLaughlin indicated that this is the long-term discussion and goal. Instead of six sets of learning outcomes, there will be one set to be discussed.

Question was asked if the need to consolidate was based on low numbers in each program and if combining them would produce stronger numbers. Master of Science degrees in the six areas have declined from 40 in 2004 to 25 in 2008. The following chart shows a more detailed breakdown:
Consolidation of CNR programs

Page 2
2-25-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNR MS Majors</th>
<th>FY04</th>
<th>FY05</th>
<th>FY06</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Social Sciences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Products</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Resources</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangeland Ecology and Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Resources</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Master of Natural Resource degree is an expanding on-line program for professionals.

Question was asked if students will be less likely to come here if the program isn’t individually identified. The response was that the Fish and Wildlife students and department may miss the name recognition, especially in Idaho, but do not oppose the consolidation.

Vote: __13__ In Favor

      __0__ Opposed
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Committee: University Curriculum Committee  Date: 3/02/09

Absent: Nancy Krogh, Garrett Holbrook.
Others Present: Margrit Von Braun, John Foltz, Bill Woolston, Mark Hoversten, Dwaine Hubbard

Program/Degree: Consolidate the following Master of Science major into a combined major in Natural Resources: Conservation Social Sciences; Fishery Resources; Forest Resources; Forest Products; Rangeland Ecology and Management; and Wildlife Resources.

Discussion:

UCC-09-102  College of Natural Resources
The committee reviewed the proposed Notice of Intent (NOI) from the College of Natural Resources to discontinue the Master of Science (M.S.) majors in Conservation Social Sciences; Fishery Resources; Forest Resources; Forest Products; Rangeland Ecology and Management; and Wildlife Resources. The proposed NOI also seeks to create a consolidated Master of Science major in Natural Resources. Committee chair Dacey asked what the difference is between the M.N.R. program and the M.S. program. Committee member Marshall indicated that the M.N.R. program is intended mostly for off-campus students and does not contain a research requirement. Committee member Machleidt voiced concern over the varying subjects all being housed under one major. Marshall noted that proposed consolidated M.S. program would then be in line with the existing Ph.D. program and would hopefully encourage more cross-department work within the college. Machleidt noted that there would be very little cost savings from this reorganization. Committee member Wells remarked that this NOI made sense to him from an administrative and academic perspective. The committee Approved the proposed NOI 11 for and 0 against, and will forward the proposed NOI to Faculty Council for review.

Vote: Approved – 11 For, 0 Against
IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
ACADEMIC/PROFESSIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION
NOTICE OF INTENT
To initiate a
New, Expanded, Cooperative, Discontinued, program component or Off-Campus Instructional Program or Instructional/Research Unit

Institution Submitting Proposal: University of Idaho
Name of College, School, or Division: College of Art & Architecture
Name of Department(s) or Area(s): Art & Design

Indicate if this Notice of Intent (NOI) is for an Academic or Professional Technical Program
Academic X Professional - Technical 

This is a New, Expanded, Cooperative, Contract, or Off-Campus Instructional Program, or Administrative/Research Unit (circle one) leading to:

Discontinuance of MAT Art

(Degree or Certificate)

Proposed Starting Date: July 1, 2009

For New Programs:

Program (i.e., degree) Title & CIP 2000

For Other Activity:

☐ Program Component (major/minor/option/emphasis)
☐ Off-Campus Activity/Resident Center
☐ Instructional/Research Unit
☐ Addition/Expansion
☐ Discontinuance/consolidation
☐ Contract Program
☐ Other

Dean’s signature on file 2/2/2009
College Dean (Institution) Date
Chief Fiscal Officer (Institution) Date
Chief Academic Officer (Institution) Date
President Date

VP Research & Graduate Studies Date
State Administrator, SDPTE Date
Chief Academic Officer, OSBE Date
SBOE/OSBE Approval Date
Before completing this form, refer to Board Policy Section III.G., Program Approval and Discontinuance.

1. Briefly describe the nature of the request e.g., is this a new program (degree, program, or certificate) or program component (e.g., new, discontinued, modified, addition to an existing program or option).

   The request is to be allowed to discontinue the Master of Arts in Teaching art, an online degree. This program draws resources from other existing professional programs.

2. Provide a statement of need for program or a program modification. Include student and state need, demand, and employment potential. Attach a Scope and Sequence, SDPTE Form Attachment B, for professional-technical education requests. (Use additional sheets if necessary.).

   The request to cancel this degree program is based on a number of factors including the following:

   Following are the program descriptors leading to and supporting this recommendation:

   **Summary:**

   The Yardley Report questioned the viability of this program based on low enrollments. Currently there are 1.8 student FTE's in the program. Closure of this on-line degree allows the department to focus its limited faculty resources on the traditional, studio-based undergraduate and graduate degrees offered by the department.

   **Quality:** Graduates of the program are generally of high quality who find jobs in private practice.

   **Duplication:** The program does not duplicate other programs or degrees at the university.

   **Centrality:** Art is part of the liberal arts mandate documents for the University of Idaho. It is central to the mission.

   **Demand:** This is the only on-line MAT in Art in the state of Idaho. Approximately two to six students are admitted per year. There has been steady growth in enrollments. Nevertheless, this is a small program. Nearly all courses are less that 4 student enrollment.

   **Resources:** Courses currently are taught as an “overload” to normal teaching assignments. Since teaching loads in this department are very high, removal of this degree would result in more manageable workloads.

3. Briefly describe how the institution will ensure the quality of the program (e.g., accreditation, professional societies, licensing boards, etc.).

   The professional art degrees are maintained.

4. Identify similar programs offered within the state of Idaho or in the region by other colleges/universities. If the proposed request is similar to another program, provide a rationale for the duplication. This may not apply to PTE programs if workforce needs within the respective region have been established.
This does not apply. The University of Idaho offers the only online MAT in Art program in the State of Idaho.

Enrollment and Graduates (i.e., number of majors or other relevant data)
By Institution for the Proposed Program
Last three years beginning with the current year and the 2 previous years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Relevant Enrollment Data</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Previous Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees offered by school/college or program(s) within disciplinary area under review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution and Degree name</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Specializations within the discipline (to reflect a national perspective)</th>
<th>Specializations offered within the degree at the institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Describe how this request is consistent with the State Board of Education's policy or role and mission of the institution. (i.e., centrality).

The primary focus remains on the Master of Fine Arts degree (MFA) which is aligned with the liberal arts mission of the University.

6. Is the proposed program in the 8-year Plan? Indicate below.

   Yes X   No ______

If not on 8-year plan, provide a justification for adding the program.

8. Resources—Faculty/Staff/Space Needs/Capital Outlay. (Use additional sheets if necessary.):

   Estimated Fiscal Impact   FY      FY      FY      FY      Total

   A. Expenditures
   1. Personnel
   2. Operating
   3. Capital Outlay
   4. Facilities
   TOTAL: 0          0        0        0        0

   B. Source of Funds
   1. Appropriated-
      reallocation
   2. Appropriated – New
   3. Federal
   4. Other:
   TOTAL: 0          0        0        0        0

   B. Nature of Funds
   1. Recurring *
   2. Non-recurring **
   TOTAL: 0          0        0        0        0

* Recurring is defined as ongoing operating budget for the program, which will become of the base.
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Committee: College of Art and Architecture Curriculum Committee
    Jill Dacey (chair), Brian Sumption, Anne Marshall, Diane Armpriest, Shauna Corry, Elizabeth Graff.

Program/Degree: Discontinue the MAT Art degree

Discussion:

It should be noted that this NOI was not initiated by the Department of Art and Design, but by Mark Hoversten, Dean of the College of Art and Architecture.

Good revenue stream; University should look at other MAT on-line degree programs. It does take faculty time to accomplish the program.

Came through as 2 votes to support the NOI; 5 to not support; 2 abstained from voting at the Department of Art & Design level of voting.

It is labor intensive. Skypes is used and work is shown on line. There is direct feedback to students by faculty members.

Is an opportunity for teachers; one of the department’s major forms of outreach.

Students don’t pay out-of-state tuition; pay $35.00 per credit (on-line fee).

Students in the program have reported that it costs about $20,000.00 to complete the MAT online in one year at other universities.

More discussion about specific courses and what they offer the student. Classes taken by both MFA on campus students and MAT online students are taught at night using both actual and virtual attendance, using Skype.

Other MATs are being dismantled across campus. Math has one that is viable. It should be noted that the MAT in Art accepts approximately 3/year of the 12 to 15 that apply. They have to submit a portfolio and go through a strong review process.

Undergraduate emphasis areas in ceramics and photography are already dismantled.

Would the department decide to freeze the program rather than dismantle it? No decision or discussion on this possibility.

Vote: Unanimous in not supporting the NOI for the discontinuation of the MAT Art degree.
Notice of Intent (NOI) Approval Tracking Form
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Committee: Department of Art, Committee of the whole.
Cronk, Dacey, Ferguson, Giese, Haagensen, Keim-Campbell, Machlis, Turner-Rahman, Woolston

Program/Degree: MAT Art

Discussion:

The Dean’s NOI was presented and discussed line by line for accuracy and comment. A discussion of pro’s and con’s followed, in turn followed by the vote.

Title page: Missing degree or certificate designation. (MAT Art –online)

Page 1 Question 1: Additional words needed to second sentence, “This program draws resources from other professional programs in the department.”

Page 1 Question 2: Yardley Report summary: incorrectly states the student FTE’s. The student FTE’s have steadily grown since the report was issued to a high this Spring 09 with 10 students enrolled in the MAT. The Yardley Report recommended either to grow the program or to discontinue it. We have chosen to grow the program by 2 times. Since the Yardley Report the MAT has been awarded a ten-year reaccreditation by NASAD.

Quality: The MAT leads to a degree in education not private practice. The degree also leads to a doctorate in Education, teacher pay increases, professional teacher standing in their district and higher quality teacher standards in elementary and secondary art programs.

Demand: The following should be added and/or noted: Since the Yardley Report was issued the enrollments have doubled with a total of 10 MAT students enrolled. The potential for growth of this unique national online offering is limited mostly by the size of the faculty. It currently is a positive revenue stream for the department and the University. Current enrollment for Art 520 and 521 is 6 students each and Art 508, which is jointly taken by MFA students, has 3 MAT students.

Discussion followed:

Concerns were expressed that the elimination of the MAT was a political move that if not approved might increase the likelihood of other future program cuts.

We should acknowledge that the University in the PPP needs to make cuts in order to renew the University’s focus of resources and we should be sensitive to the University’s recommendations.

Concern was expressed that if there is agreement on this closure that a statement should be registered that no faculty will lose their positions over this and any resources available from the closure will be redirected to the MFA program.
The MFA and MAT programs are both lumped together in all matrix tables for PPP review. If the MAT is discontinued this will directly effect the total graduate numbers and may bring unwarranted scrutiny to the MFA program.

The MAT program is unique, innovative and growing program and could further increase revenue to the department and University. It will increase total graduate masters FTE numbers. Dissolving the program will reduce the departments outreach, a stated goal of the UI Strategic Plan.

Concerns were expressed about the UI Administrations vision since it was observed that so many MAT programs were listed for dissolution. Was this an unexpressed policy that needed airing? It was also noted that the Math MAT was retained with “good” numbers, why then was the Art MAT with solid numbers and growing slated for dissolution?

There were concerns expressed about the limits of the online delivery format. Discussion ensued about Skype in audio, video and text as well as the ability to tap into the new Artstor library resource to expand the MAT students’ visual knowledge base.

It was acknowledged that the recent UI Presidential candidate envisioned a more robust commitment to on line delivery. The graduate school is projecting that the new wave for future delivery of training for experienced workers in the growing pool of middle management is through online delivery such as our MAT on line program.

**Vote:** For approval of the NOI (2); Against approval of the NOI (5); Abstaining (2)
Notice of Intent (NOI) Approval Tracking Form
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Committee: Graduate Council

Program/Degree: MAT Art

Discussion:

Jill Dacey, Chair of the College of Art and Architecture Curriculum Committee was present to answer questions regarding the NOI.

The MAT program is a totally on-line program designed to serve mainly high school teachers who enroll for one class per semester.

MAT program just received a 10 year accreditation last semester.

The final department vote on the NOI was 1(Y)-7(N)-1(AB). The final College Curriculum Committee vote on the NOI was 0(Y)-6(N).

Dacey indicated that while this program is time intensive it also generates revenue. They only take the students that can be accommodated.

Councilor asked how this program was selected for discontinuance. Response was that this NOI was initiated at the Dean’s level. There are 18 students in the Master of Fine Arts program, a 3 year program which is the heart of the Art department.

Dean Hoversten was asked why this program was on the list. He began by praising the program and the efforts of the faculty to support it. He indicated that this is a good degree and serves a function that we don’t have elsewhere. This is a good program for people who are place bound. The reason this program is on the radar screen, is because the faculty are stretched too thin. This may be a place where the teaching loads can be reduced to focus on the remaining programs. The MFA is the heart of the professional program and is the strongest. He continued to say that he is looking for strong programs in all our majors. The major issue here is focus and teaching loads and needing to look at the big picture of the entire college.

Dacey indicated that his NOI was initiated by the Dean’s Office and the department faculty does not support it. This is one of the few programs of its kind nationally. If you GOOGLE for such a program, the UI is the first choice. The opinion of the department faculty was that with good funding this program can have an even higher national profile. The department has indicated that they would
step up and do more in order to keep the program. After a long discussion, the department wishes to keep the program. Department feels the program has a strong future.

Dacey indicated that students in the MAT and MFA attend several of the same courses with the MAT students connected electronically. The MFA is a 60 credit degree; MAT is 30 credits and is for teachers. The MAT could be used by those who wish to do doctoral programs in Education.

Dean Hoversten indicated the challenge at the college level is that he isn’t sure how to teach all the courses need for all the degrees without continuing to overload the faculty.

One Councilor stated firmly that we need to either find the resources or we will lose students from a growing program.

A statement was made that it isn’t always bad to have small program which is done well.

Another thought was expressed that by ending this program for teachers, we also may end the exposure of their students to art. Thus we would lose these potential students and thus continue the downward spiral.

This was acknowledged by department faculty along with the comment that once a program is eliminated, it is very difficult to get it back.

Question was asked if this NOI was connected with the current budget situation. Dean von Braun reminded Council that the PPP is separate from the budget issues and one is not the cause of the other. We are being asked to make difficult academic decisions. It is difficult to separate the two but the fact is that there isn’t enough money to go around.

Dean Hoversten indicated the faculty in the college is stretched, stressed, and strained and that difficult decisions need to be made.

Vote: __2__ In Favor

__11__ Opposed
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Committee: University Curriculum Committee  Date: 3/02/09

Absent: Nancy Krogh, Garrett Holbrook.
Others Present: Margrit Von Braun, John Foltz, Bill Woolston, Mark Hoversten, Dwaine Hubbard

Program/Degree: Discontinue the Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) major in Art Education

Discussion:

UCC-09-104 College of Art and Architecture
Committee chair Dacey introduced the proposed Notice of Intent (NOI) from the College of Art and Architecture to discontinue the Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) major in Art Education. Dacey noted that this is one of the very few online M.A.T. in Art programs. Dacey indicated that enrollment is normally limited to 3 new students per year until last year. Committee member Eckwright clarified that if the department had the resources they would admit greater numbers of students into the program. Dacey noted that two faculty teach the majority of the classes for these students. Bill Woolston indicated that other faculty in the department have agreed to help teach courses for this program. Dean Hoversten vouched for the quality of this program and indicated that the biggest concern is a lack of resources in the college to support this program. Committee member Stone asked how many students this program could handle with help from the other departmental faculty. Dacey indicated that the department could likely handle up to 12 at a time. Woolston noted that that the entire graduate program is taken as a teaching overload. Additionally stipends that are used for M.F.A. students to assist in teaching up to 72 art courses have been reduced by 60%. Stone asked if teaching the program as an overload would have any impact on accreditation. Woolston indicated that all the programs were accredited with this knowledge. Committee member Henscheid noted that with all of the NOIs coming through, the committee focuses on the curricular impact to the program, but not to the university. Dacey noted that some of that discussion did occur with undergraduate programs such as Communication Studies. The committee Denied the proposed NOI 0 for and 11 against, and will forward the proposed NOI to Faculty Council for review.

Vote: Denied – 0 For, 11 Against
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Faculty/Staff Handbook [FSH] ☐ Addition ☑ Revision* ☐ Deletion* ☐ Emergency
Minor Amendment ☐
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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.

Changes to this policy began in 2006 with the formation of a sub-committee of Faculty Affairs to review and clarify current P&T processes. See http://www.webs.uidaho.edu/facultycouncil/CommitteeWebPages/Agenda_Minutes_Faculty_Affairs_P&T_Subcommittee.htm for all records of this sub-committee. Then in 2007-08 a second sub-committee was formed at the recommendation of the first sub-committee to review policy and a request to simplify the forms by the Provost, to also include interdisciplinary activities, tie AE to PD, connect to Strategic Action Plan goals. See http://www.webs.uidaho.edu/facultycouncil/CommitteeWebPages/Agenda_Minutes_Fac_Affairs_Subcommittee_PDAE.htm for records of this sub-committee’s work.

FSH 3140 Performance Expectations is closely related to one’ s position description as such 3140 was incorporated into FSH 3050 – Position Description.

II. Reason/Rationale: Reason this addition, revision, and/or deletion is necessary, if different than above?

Many discrepancies were found in policy, forms and policy were inconsistent, unclear processes, process changes.

III. Fiscal Impact: What fiscal impact, if any, will this addition, revision, or deletion have?

none

IV. Related Policies/Procedures: Describe other policies or procedures existing that are related or similar to this proposed change.

FSH 1565, 3320, 3520, 3560, 3570, 3420 & 3140

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.
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3050

POSITION DESCRIPTIONS

PREAMBLE: This section describes the creation and use of position descriptions that define responsibilities for faculty and staff positions. See also section 3140, “Performance Expectations of Faculty.” This section was original to the 1979 Handbook; it has been editorially revised at intervals. In July 1998 the year covered by a position description was changed from an academic year to a calendar year. In July 2001 section B underwent some clarifying changes while the form itself underwent extensive revisions. In July 2007 the form underwent substantial revisions to address enforcement and accountability issues in the UI promotion and tenure process as well as to align the form with the Strategic Action Plan. In 2008 the form was revised to better integrate faculty interdisciplinary activities (including ensuring communication among all parties and eliminating the need to obtain multiple signatures) and FSH 3140 was incorporated into this policy section. Further information may be obtained from the Provost’s Office (208-885-6448), the Office of the Faculty Secretary (208-885-6151), or Human Resources (208-885-3600). [rev. 7-98, 7-01, 7-07, ed. 12-06]

A. GENERAL. The position description establishes each faculty member’s specific responsibilities of each faculty member are established in position descriptions. These position descriptions serve a variety of important functions; in particular, they constitute the essential frame of reference in annual performance evaluation of faculty members [see 3320], and consideration of faculty members for tenure and promotion [see 3520 and 3560]. [rev. 7-98, ed. 7-00, 7-02]

B. PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS. Expectations designated for individual faculty members to achieve tenure or promotion in rank or satisfactory performance evaluation must be compatible with the criteria of the department or other unit concerned. Each faculty member is to be advised of these expectations in writing by the departmental or unit administrator at the time of appointment.

B-1. Each department or unit shall determine the faculty roles and how much value or weight is to be assigned to each of these roles. These determinations shall be documented in the department’s or unit’s by-laws. Each document shall be reviewed and approved by the college faculty, or a committee of the college faculty. Expectations are specified in the current faculty position description and are the basis for the annual performance evaluation. Expectations must not be greater than those that can be reasonably supported in the department or unit by providing sufficient time and resources. Expectations are specified in the current faculty position description and are the basis for the annual performance evaluation.

B-2. Except by written agreement between the faculty member and the appropriate administrator, expectations for individual faculty members are in effect for a period of one calendar year.

C. CBP. PROCEDURE.

C-1. During the fall semester, (a) The calendar year position description is recorded on the form appended to this section with a due date announced established by the provost. ) Each faculty member’s calendar year position description is recorded on a form that provides for the classification of responsibilities in conformity with the statewide reporting system. A copy of this form is appended to this section. [rev. 7-98, 1-08, ed. 7-01]

C-2. The form should be filled out in collaboration with the unit administrator. Faculty members involved in interdisciplinary activities should check the box on the position description form and attach a narrative explaining their activities and listing units and members involved. For faculty involved in interdisciplinary activities or with centers, the unit administrator is to solicit comments regarding the content of the form, position description, and discuss this with, all interdisciplinary/center administrator(s) listed on the faculty member’s narrative attached to the form. The form is then to be signed by the faculty member, approved by the unit administrator, approved by the dean, and sent to the Provost’s Office. [rev. 7-01, 7-02, 1-08]

C-3. Any change in duties or responsibilities that represents a significant departure from the position description is permitted only with the written consent of the faculty member and administrator involved. A revised position description should be filed in this event.

Comment [a1]: This was A of 3140

Comment [a2]: Was B-1, 4 & 5 of 3140.

Comment [a3]: Was B-2 of 3140.

Comment [a4]: Was B-3 in 3140.
When the faculty audit-personnel activity report form (PAR) (see APM 45.09) is completed in the spring, the unit administrator should compare the data obtained for each faculty member with the corresponding position description. Perfect agreement between the position description and the record of actual performance is not necessarily expected, but it is desirable that any discrepancy between them be as small as is feasible. [ed. 7-01] (Form follows on the next pages.)
PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS FOR FACULTY

PREAMBLE: This section outlines performance expectations of faculty with respect to tenure and promotion. This section was new to the Handbook in July, 1982, and remained unchanged until July 1998 and again in July 2003 when it was revised to give greater prominence to annual position descriptions as the embodiment, so to speak, of performance expectations for faculty and to bring it in line with other Handbook revisions. For further information, contact the Provost's Office (208-885-6448). [rev. 7-98, 7-03]

A. POLICY. Expectations designated for individual faculty members to achieve tenure or promotion in rank or satisfactory performance evaluation must be compatible with the criteria of the department or other unit concerned. Each faculty member is advised of these expectations in writing [see 3320] by the departmental or unit administrator at the time of appointment. [rev. 7-02, 03]

B. PROCEDURES.

B-1. Each department or unit shall determine the faculty roles and how much value or weight is to be assigned to each of these roles. These determinations shall be documented in the department’s or unit’s by-laws. Each document shall be reviewed and approved by the college faculty or a committee of the college faculty. [add. 7-03].

B-2. Except by written agreement between the faculty member and the appropriate administrator, expectations for individual faculty members are in effect for a period of one year. [ed. 7-02, 03, renumbered 03]

B-3. Any change in duties or responsibilities that represents a significant departure from the position description is permitted only with the written consent of the faculty member and administrator involved. A revised position description should be filed in this event. [rev. 7-98, 7-03]

B-4. Expectations must not be greater than those that can be reasonably supported in the department or unit by providing sufficient time and resources. [renumbered 7-03]

B-5. Expectations are specified in the current faculty position description and are the basis for the annual performance evaluation. [rev. 7-98, 7-03, renumbered 7-03]
POLICY COVER SHEET
(See Faculty Staff Handbook 1460 for instructions.

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

Chapter & Title: FSH 3320 – Annual Performance Evaluation

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): Subcommittees of Faculty Affairs formed to review P&T Process since 2006

(Please see FSH 1460 C)

Name Date
Charles Morrison Chair, charlesm@uidaho.edu

Policy Sponsor: (If different than originator.)

Faculty Affairs - Don Crowley 12/5/08

Telephone & Email: Crowley@uidaho.edu

Reviewed by General Counsel x Yes No Name & Date: Hoey Graham 12/5/08

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.

Changes to this policy began in 2006 with the formation of a sub-committee of Faculty Affairs to review and clarify current P&T processes. See http://www.webs.uidaho.edu/facultycouncil/CommitteeWebPages/Agenda_Minutes_Faculty_Affairs_P&T_Subcommittee.htm for all records of this sub-committee. Then in 2007-08 a second sub-committee was formed at the recommendation of the first sub-committee to review policy and a request to simplify the forms by the Provost, to also include interdisciplinary activities, tie AE to PD, connect to Strategic Action Plan goals. See http://www.webs.uidaho.edu/facultycouncil/CommitteeWebPages/Agenda_Minutes_Fac_Affairs_Subcommittee_PDAE.htm for records of this sub-committee’s work.

II. Reason/Rationale: Reason this addition, revision, and/or deletion is necessary, if different than above?

Many discrepancies were found in policy, forms and policy were inconsistent, unclear processes, process changes.

III. Fiscal Impact: What fiscal impact, if any, will this addition, revision, or deletion have?

none

IV. Related Policies/Procedures: Describe other policies or procedures existing that are related or similar to this proposed change.

FSH 1565, 3050, 3520, 3560, 3570, 3420, 3140.

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: ________________________________

Policy Coordinator Appr. & Date: ______________________________________

[Office Use Only]

APM F&A Appr.: __________________________________________

[Office Use Only]

FSH Appr. FCL 12/12/08

FC _FC-09-069___

GFM ____________

Pres./Prov. __________

[Office Use Only]

Track # __UP-09-024__

Date Rec.: 12/5/08

Posted: t-sheet 12/16/08 h/c ____________

web ____________

Register: ________________

(Office Use Only)
ANNUAL AND PERIODIC PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS AND SALARY DETERMINATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS AND PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS

PREAMBLE: This section contains those policies and their attendant procedures for those periodic reviews of performance that affect faculty members and academic administrators. Policies concerning performance evaluation were part of the original 1979 Handbook, but were completely rewritten in July 2002 and further refined in 2003. In July 2007 Form 1 underwent substantial revisions to address enforcement and accountability issues in the UI promotion and tenure process as well as align the form with the Strategic Action Plan. In 2008 this section was again revised to reflect recent changes to the faculty position description and evaluation forms were revised to better integrate faculty interdisciplinary activities. Further information may be obtained from the Provost’s Office (208-885-6448) and the Office of the Faculty Secretary (208-885-6151). [ed. 7-03, rev. 7-07]

CONTENTS:

A. Annual Performance Evaluation and Salary Determination for Faculty Members
B. Performance Below Expectations of Tenured Faculty Members
C. Performance Evaluation of Academic Administrators
D. Sequence of Evaluation of Faculty Members and Administrators.

A. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND SALARY DETERMINATION FOR FACULTY MEMBERS.

A-1. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION. Annual evaluation of the appropriate performance of each member of the faculty is, primarily, the responsibility of the faculty member and the her/his unit administrator concerned. The provost is responsible for preparing supplementary instructions each year, including the schedule for completion of the successive steps. The form to be used, “Annual Performance Evaluation Form 1: Evaluation of Faculty,” is appended to this section. Personnel on international assignment see [See also FSH 3380 C.] [rev. 7-03]

a. Forms Distributed. Supplies of the form to be used in the evaluation process are procured by deans and unit administrators. The immediate administrative officer is responsible for ensuring that each faculty member receives the proper form together with a copy of the supplementary instructions. [rev. 7-01]

b. Performance levels in each criterion evaluated are described as follows:

i. Exceptional Performance (5) is extraordinary performance well beyond that required relative to the position description including full consideration of the unit’s priorities [rev. 7-02]

ii. Above Expectations (4) represents performance which is better than that expected relative to the position description including full consideration of the unit’s priorities [rev. 7-02]

iii. Meets Expectations (3) is the performance expected of a faculty member relative to the position description including full consideration of the unit’s priorities that can be defined as normative. [rev. 7-02]

iv. Below Expectations (2) denotes performance that is less than that expected of a faculty member relative to the position description (including full consideration of the unit’s priorities) and means improvement is necessary. A rating of this type triggers procedures outlined in 3320 B. [rev. 7-02]

v. Unacceptable Performance (1) is performance that is not acceptable relative to the position description (including full consideration of the unit’s priorities) and/or is inconsistent with the conditions for continued employment with the institution. Failure to meet these standards in any of the following ways will result in a rating of unacceptable performance. [rev. 7-02]

a) received a “1” rating the previous period but did not make the improvements required;

b) consistently violated one or more of the institution’s standards for meeting the expectations of the position; or
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c. Annual Report of Efforts and Accomplishments by Faculty Member. Each faculty member shall provide his or her unit administrator with the following materials for use in the annual performance evaluation:

1. Current Curriculum Vitae
2. UI Faculty Position Description for Annual Performance Review
3. Written Detailed summary report of Faculty Activity Summary for the period of the Annual Performance Review that compares accomplishments to expectations in the Position Description for the period under review
4. Other materials deemed necessary to document efforts and accomplishments for the period under review. [add. 7-01]

d. Evaluation of Faculty by Unit Administrators. Unit administrators evaluate their faculty members; the performance of each faculty member during the review period covered by the evaluation is judged on the basis of the position description(s) in effect during that period. In the case of faculty members holding joint appointments and/or involved in interdisciplinary activities, as noted in the position description, in two or more academic or administrative units, it is the responsibility of the administrator in the faculty member’s primary academic discipline to solicit and consider relevant information on job performance from other administrators with responsibility for the faculty member’s work. [See also 3080 E-3-2]

Ratings are determined by comparing the faculty member’s performance to the position description and the weightings set forth in the departmental by-laws approved by the unit members [effective Fall 2003]. The results of the student evaluation of teaching are carefully weighed and used as a factor in this evaluation. For each area of responsibility—evaluated, the unit administrator shall describe the basis for conclusion judgmenthis evaluation in assessing the faculty member’s performance, of the faculty member. The ratings and additional comments or narrative, as the evaluator deems appropriate, are entered as indicated on the form. The annual evaluation score for an individual faculty member in Form 1 relates to the individual faculty member’s performance evaluation relative to his/her position description. The overall unit average is provided to the faculty member upon request so that each faculty member can gauge his/her performance relative to other faculty members within the unit. After the unit administrator has completed ratings and narratives of for all individual written evaluations and ratings of faculty for the annual review period, he or she shall provide these the following items to the each reviewed individual, as they become available: [rev. 7-03]

1. a copy of the individual’s annual evaluation form and narrative written evaluation and ratings to the faculty member,
2. if requested, comparative information to help assess their performance evaluation and numerical ratings, including, but not limited to:
   a) Frequency distribution for overall ratings for the unit
   b) Frequency distribution for overall ratings for the college [rev. 7-97, renumbered and rev. 7-01]

e. Self-Evaluation and Conference. Each faculty member is given an opportunity to use the evaluation form [FSH 3320 Form 1] and procedure described in A-2 and to make an evaluation of his or her own performance. The unit administrator shall provide each faculty member with the opportunity to meet to discuss the unit administrator’s annual evaluation. (Suitable alternate arrangements are made for off-campus personnel.) The purpose of this meeting is to review and discuss the administrator’s evaluation and the self-evaluation, if any. The unit administrator explains his or her ratings and comments narrative providing a formative assessment on progress towards tenure, promotion, and/or continued satisfactory performance related to the faculty member’s performance during the year and any revisions in professional goals and objectives for the coming year. The faculty member and the unit administrator work to identify strategies that would help the individual improve his or her performance. The ratings may be modified as a result of the discussion. At the
Conclusion of the review process, for the annual evaluation, each faculty member shall sign the evaluation form indicating that they have had the opportunity to read the evaluation report and to discuss it with the unit administrator. If the faculty member disagrees with the contents of the review, the faculty member shall be permitted to append a report to the unit administrators’ evaluation, detailing the nature of the dissent. A copy of the administrator’s final evaluation is given to the faculty member. [renumbered and rev. 7-01]

f. College-Level Action. Copies of the performance evaluation materials forwarded by the unit administrator to the appropriate dean(s), for evaluation at the college(s) level, shall include:

- the narrative evaluation on progress towards tenure, promotion, and/or continued satisfactory performance,
- by the unit administrator and any evaluative comments provided by interdisciplinary/center administrators or from those administrators of faculty holding joint appointments, a dissent report (if any) by the faculty member, and
- the evaluation form, are forwarded to the appropriate dean for evaluation at the college level.

If the narrative evaluation and evaluative comments are not attached, the forms will be returned to the department by the college.

If a report of a dissent is filed by the faculty member, it shall be provided to the dean. The dean shall arrange a meeting with the unit administrator and the faculty member to attempt to resolve the relevant issues. The dean enters an evaluation in the space provided on the evaluation form. A copy of that form is given to the faculty member and to the Provost’s Office for permanent filing. [see FSH 1470 and APM 65.02] A copy of the original evaluation form is retained in the college office. If the dean concurs with the overall evaluation and rating of the faculty member by the unit administrator, no additional signature is required from the faculty member.

If there are any differences in any rating between the unit administrator and college dean, a narrative prepared by the dean shall be attached stating the reasons for these differences and the final evaluation and rating. However, if the dean’s evaluation and rating is different from that of the unit administrator, a second and subsequent signature by the faculty member, acknowledging receipt of the dean’s evaluation and rating, is required. The original evaluation form and narrative are forwarded to the Provost’s Office for permanent filing. If the narrative is not attached the form will be returned to the college by the provost. A copy of the evaluation form is retained in the college office. If the faculty member disagrees with the Dean’s evaluation and the difference cannot be resolved at the college level, either party may choose to refer the matter to the University Ombuds (FSH 3820). If the matter remains unresolved at the college level, the Provost shall be notified of the dissent. [renumbered and rev. 7-01, 12/06]

A-2. SALARY DETERMINATION. This process is carried out at the departmental and higher levels of academic administration. Each year the provost specifies the definitions of the salary increment categories to be used and prescribes their proportionate distribution. A “Salary Recommendation” form is completed for each faculty member according to the schedule established by the provost. [See also 3380 E and FSH 3420.]

a. Departmental Action. The unit administrator enters a recommended salary increment category in the space provided on each salary form. This recommendation will reflect the performance evaluation described in A, relative salary position, and other relevant factors. Special considerations should be noted in the “Comments” section at the bottom of the form or by an accompanying written statement. The unit administrator will submit written justification if his or her assignment of specified salary increment categories departs substantially from the prescribed distribution. Such justifications are taken into consideration by the dean in arriving at an equitable college-wide distribution among the categories. The unit administrator forwards the Salary Form for each faculty member to the dean, together with a listing of all members of the unit. [fed 7-01]
b. **College Action.** Deans, at their discretion, may require administrative officers under their jurisdiction to supplement their salary-increment recommendations by such means as copies of the evaluation form, written statements, or personal conference. The dean enters a recommended salary-increment category in the space provided on each Salary Form. The dean’s distribution of faculty members among the salary categories is guided by the recommended proportions and takes into account possible differences in qualifications and merit among departments, e.g., it may be that the average members of an outstanding department are given consideration equal to that accorded the top members of an average department. When this stage has been completed, the dean meets individually with each unit administrator for review of the dean’s recommendations. The dean forwards the Salary Form for each faculty member to the provost. [ed. 7-01]

c. **Presidential Action.** Review and action by the provost consists primarily of making adjustments necessary to arrive at an equitable distribution of faculty members among salary-increment categories for UI as a whole. After a recommended salary-increment category has been established at the departmental, college, and presidential levels, a copy is sent to the faculty member. The president determines, on the basis of funds available, the salary increment range applicable to each category.

d. **Budget Office Action.** The Budget Office provides computer printouts showing current salary and tentative salary for the coming year and sends the appropriate list to each dean.

e. **Review and Adjustment.** The dean, in consultation with each unit administrator in the college, makes corrections and minor adjustments as necessary to place each faculty member on the proper salary basis within the department. The aggregate of final salary recommendations must fall within the total salary-increase budget established for the college. [ed. 7-01]

f. **Final Approval.** The provost, after consultation with the deans, approves the corrected lists. When they have been approved by the president and the regents, faculty members are officially notified of their salaries for the coming year and “Salary Agreement” forms [see 3080] are sent to them for completion. [ed. 7-01]

g. **Merit-based Salary Increases Not Funded.** If, in any year or consecutive preceding years, funding is not provided for merit-based salary increases or funding is only provided for cost-of-living increases, the annual review reports will be retained at the unit level. At such time that as merit-based salary increases are available, the recommendation for merit increases shall be based upon the average scores of the current period and any preceding consecutive periods for which merit-based funding was not provided. [add. 7-01]

B. **PERFORMANCE BELOW EXPECTATIONS OF TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS** (See also FSH 3190)

B-1. If the unit administrator determines that a faculty member is performing below expectations, the unit administrator should consider the variety of possible causes, other than mere application of inadequate effort on the faculty member’s part, that might be responsible for the change.

It is not the unit administrator’s role to diagnose the cause of the problem but to suggest sources of appropriate professional help and to encourage the employee to seek such help [http://www.hr.uidaho.edu/default.aspx?pid=70192 www.uidaho.edu/hr/ Benefits/ health/ eap.html]. Faculty members and unit administrators may obtain referral information and advice from the University Ombuds and Human Resources. [ed. 12-06]

B-2. **FIRST ANNUAL OCCURRENCE.**

a. In the event that a faculty member receives an annual evaluation concluding that the faculty member has performed below expectations (2 or lower) within one area of responsibility, the unit administrator will offer to meet with the faculty member to identify the reasons for evaluating the performance as below expectations.*
(1) The faculty member and the unit administrator will review the current Position Description and examine strategies that would permit the faculty member to improve his or her performance and revise it as necessary to address the issues identified during the discussion.

(2) The faculty member and the unit administrator will write a development plan that will assist the faculty member in improving his or her performance to meet expectations.

b. In the event that a faculty member receives an annual evaluation concluding that the faculty member has performed below expectations (2 or below) in the overall score, the unit administrator will offer to meet with the faculty member to identify the reasons for evaluating the performance as below expectations.*

(3) The unit administrator will appoint a mentoring committee by selecting three individuals from a list of five faculty members nominated by the faculty member, or if the faculty member makes no nominations, will appoint three faculty members of her/his choosing. The mentoring committee’s purpose is to help the faculty member improve performance. The members of the committee need not be drawn from the same unit as the faculty member. The faculty member or unit administrator may request that the University Ombuds attend the meetings of the mentoring committee and faculty member. [ed. 12-06]

b. In the event that a faculty member receives an overall score of 1, the provost can determine that further review of a faculty member’s performance is required. This review will be conducted in accordance with the procedures prescribed in 3320 B-4.

*These steps will be taken within sixty days of the annual evaluation.

B-3. TWO CONSECUTIVE ANNUAL ASSESSMENTS OF BELOW EXPECTATIONS. In the event of two consecutive annual evaluations concluding that the faculty member has performed below expectations (an overall or within one or more areas of responsibility (an overall summary score of 2 or lower)) the unit administrator will arrange a meeting of the faculty member, the unit administrator and the Dean of the College. The faculty member or the unit administrator may request that the University Ombuds attend the meeting. [ed. 12-06]

The intent of the meeting is to review:

a. the current position description and revise it as-if necessary to address the issues identified during the discussion.

b. the development plan-strategies implemented in the previous year and to identify why the plan-strategies did not result in the faculty member meeting expectations. The parties should re-examine strategies that would permit the faculty member to improve his or her performance.

*These steps will be taken within sixty days of the annual evaluation.

B-4. THREE CONSECUTIVE ANNUAL EVALUATION ASSESSMENTS OF BELOW EXPECTATIONS. In the event of three consecutive annual evaluations below expectations overall or within one or more areas of responsibility, or a pattern of below expectations evaluations over five years (an overall summary score of less than 2 or lower), the Dean shall initiate a formal peer review.

a. Composition of the Review Committee. The Review Committee will consist of six (6) members, appointed as follows:

i. The Faculty member will submit to the unit administrator a list of the names of three faculty members from within the unit and three tenured faculty members from outside of the unit. The unit administrator will submit a similar list to the faculty member. From the list given to the faculty member, he/she will
select one person from inside of the unit and one from outside the unit. From the list given to the unit administrator, he/she will select one person from inside of the unit and one from outside the unit.

ii. The committee members will select as chair another faculty member from within the unit.

iii. The Ombuds or his/her designee shall be an ex-officio member of the committee. [ed. 12-06]

b. Timing of the Review. The review and recommendation(s) will be completed within sixty days of the annual evaluation.

c. The Review. The purpose of the review is to assess the level of performance of the faculty member and the unit administrator’s evaluation of that performance. To that end, the committee shall assess the reasonableness of the previous evaluations and the appropriateness of the development plans, as well as any material submitted by the faculty member and the unit.

The faculty member and chair will provide the following materials to the committee:

- Updated Curriculum Vitae of the faculty member
- Position Descriptions for the past four years
- Annual evaluation materials submitted by the faculty member for the past three years
- Annual Evaluations of the faculty member by the unit head and the Dean for the past three years
- Student and peer evaluations (if any) of teaching for the past four years
- A self-evaluation of teaching
- A self-assessment summary of what the faculty member has learned and achieved during the past four (4) years, including contributions to the department, university, state, nation, and field (about 2 pages).

The faculty member may submit any additional information he or she desires, and the committee may request additional materials as it deems necessary.

d. Responses to Committee Report. The faculty member, chair, and dean will receive the report and will have fifteen days from the report’s date to submit written responses to the review committee. The review committee will send the report and all responses to the provost.

e. Provost. The Provost will be responsible for determining the appropriate resolution, which may include:

1) continuing the status quo;
2) mentoring to address area(s) of concern;
3) termination for cause;
4) consideration of other recommended resolution(s).

C. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS.

C-1. EVALUATION BY FACULTY MEMBERS. Opportunity is provided for an annual performance evaluation of college deans, assistant and associate deans, and administrators of academic departments and other intracollege units by the faculty members of the respective units. The provost sends each faculty member an appropriate number of copies of the form, “Annual Faculty Evaluation of Academic Administrators” [form is appended to this section] to be used for evaluation of the departmental or intracollege-unit administrator, one to be used for evaluation of the dean, and one to be used for evaluation of each assistant or associate dean in the college.

C-2. EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENTAL OR INTRACOLLEGE-UNIT ADMINISTRATORS AND ASSISTANT AND ASSOCIATE DEANS. Completed copies of the form are sent directly to the dean. The dean furnishes the administrator evaluated a summary of the evaluations in such a way that the confidentiality of individual evaluations is preserved. The dean may arrange conferences with the administrator to discuss the
evaluation. After these steps have been completed, individual faculty members’ evaluations are destroyed by the dean and the written summary is filed in the dean’s office.

C-3. EVALUATIONS OF DEANS. Completed copies of the evaluation form are sent directly to the provost. The provost furnishes each dean evaluated a summary of the evaluations in such a way that the confidentiality of individual evaluations is preserved and confers with the dean about the evaluation. After these steps have been completed, individual faculty members’ evaluations are destroyed by the provost and the written summary is filed in the Office of Academic Affairs.

D. SEQUENCE OF EVALUATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS AND ADMINISTRATORS. The provost prepares the schedule for completion of steps in the performance evaluation and salary determination process each year. It will provide that faculty members’ evaluations of departmental or intracollege-unit administrators and assistant and associate deans are in the hands of the dean before the administrators’ recommendations on salary, promotion, and tenure are made known to the faculty and, similarly, that faculty members’ evaluations of deans are in the hands of the provost before the deans’ recommendations on salary, promotion, and tenure are made known to the faculty. Conversely, the summaries of faculty evaluations of departmental or intracollege-unit administrators, assistant and associate deans, and deans will be communicated to the persons evaluated after their recommendations on salary, promotion, and tenure have been transmitted to the provost.

(Forms on next five pages)
POLICY COVER SHEET
(See Faculty Staff Handbook 1460 for instructions.)

FC-09-070

Faculty/Staff Handbook [FSH] □ Addition □ Revision* □ Deletion* □ Emergency
Minor Amendment □
Chapter & Title: FSH 3420 – Faculty Salaries
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): Subcommittees of Faculty Affairs formed to review P&T Process since 2006
(Please see FSH 1460 C)
Telephone & Email:
Charles Morrison Chair, charlesm@uidaho.edu
Policy Sponsor: (If different than originator.) Faculty Affairs - Dan Crowley 12/5/08
Telephone & Email: Crowley@uidaho.edu
Reviewed by General Counsel □ Yes □ No Name & Date: Hoey Graham 12/5/08

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.
Changes to this policy came about when FSH 3320 was revised to address the findings of the sub-committee of Faculty Affairs review of current P&T processes. See http://www.webs.uidaho.edu/facultycouncil/CommitteeWebPages/Agenda Minutes Faculty Affairs P&T Subcommittee.htm for all records of this sub-committee. Then in 2007-08 a second sub-committee was formed at the recommendation of the first sub-committee to review policy and a request to simplify the forms by the Provost, to also include interdisciplinary activities, tie AE to PD, connect to Strategic Action Plan goals. See http://www.webs.uidaho.edu/facultycouncil/CommitteeWebPages/Agenda Minutes FAc Affairs Subcommittee PDAE.htm for records of this sub-committee’s work.

II. Reason/Rationale: Reason this addition, revision, and/or deletion is necessary, if different than above?
It was discovered that FSH 3320 A-2 a-f was a duplicate of FSH 3420 B-1 through B-6. It is recommended that FSH 3320 A-2 a-g be deleted but add “g” to 3420 as B-7.

III. Fiscal Impact: What fiscal impact, if any, will this addition, revision, or deletion have?
none

IV. Related Policies/Procedures: Describe other policies or procedures existing that are related or similar to this proposed change.
FSH 1565, 3320, 3520, 3560, 3570, 3050, 3140.

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: ___________________________________________
Track # __UP-09-026___
Date Rec.: __12/5/08____
Posted: t-sheet __12/16/08__
/web___________
Register: ______________
(Office Use Only)

Policy Coordinator Appr. & Date: ____________________________ [Office Use Only]
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PREAMBLE: This section describes the procedures used to determine faculty salaries, including salaries for summer session, salaries for other teaching activities not covered by the basic appointment, and additional compensation for administrative appointments. Cf. RGP II.G.

NOTE: It is the Regents' policy to define "faculty" for purposes of salary and other reporting purposes as follows: "Faculty" includes all persons whose specific assignments are made for the purpose of conducting instruction, research, or public service as a principal activity (or activities), and who hold the academic rank/titles of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, lecturer, or the equivalent of any of these academic ranks. This category also includes deans, assistant deans, and executive officers of academic departments (chairpersons, heads, or the equivalent) if their principal activity is instructional. Not included are teaching or research assistants or medical interns or residents. The material in this section was all an original part of the 1979 Handbook. Revisions since that time have varied from major (2002) to minor (1988); with regard to subsection B-2 it is worth noting that the caveat that UI's salary-adjustment guidelines are constrained by legislative and regents' actions was added in June 1988, while F-1 was modified slightly at the same time so as to clarify the regents' intentions concerning payments for work done above and beyond regular duties. Unless otherwise noted, the text is as of July 1996. Further information may be obtained from the Provost's Office (208-885-6448) or the Office of the Faculty Secretary (208-885-6151). [ed. 7-00, 7-02]

CONTENTS:
A. Salary Adjustment Guidelines
B. Salary Determination

A. FACULTY SALARY-ADJUSTMENT GUIDELINES.

NOTE: When the faculty established these guidelines in the late 1960s, it intended that the salary-adjustment process (see 3420) be implemented using these principles as guidelines within constraints that may be imposed by the legislature or the regents. [ed. 7-02]

A-1. SALARY ADJUSTMENTS. Factors to be considered in recommending salary adjustments are:

a. Cost of Living. First consideration is given to cost-of-living adjustments for all faculty members. This adjustment should be a uniform percentage of the salary of each faculty member at a given salary level, but need not be the same percentage at all salary levels.

b. Promotions, Inequities, and Special Situations. Second consideration is given to: (a) adjustment of inequities, and (b) providing for special situations.

c. Incentive. Third consideration is given to providing an increment, in addition to the authorized cost-of-living adjustment, as an encouragement to those whose service has been sufficiently deserving. Departmental administrators and deans, in consultation with their faculties, may establish criteria for this level of salary increase and may establish two subcategories within it.

d. Outstanding Performance. Final consideration is given to rewarding those whose performance is recognized by virtually all observers as exceptional. Subject to budgetary constraints and applicable presidential directives, departmental administrators and deans may determine the size of such increments.

A-2. SALARY MODEL. Each year the budget office issues Salary Guidelines, which provide information on how to apply the University’s Salary Model given the fiscal issues relevant to the upcoming fiscal year. The Salary Model is maintained by the office of institutional research & assessment, planning and budget and can be read at http://www.webs.uidaho.edu/ira/salarymodel.htm [ed. 7-07]

A-3. CONSULTATION PROCEDURES.

a. In matters of salary adjustments, the primary role of the Faculty Council’s Institutional Planning and Budget Advisory Committee is to participate in the determination of the total amount of money to be made available for these adjustments. In applying these guidelines, the provost should work closely with the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Council of Academic Deans.
b. The Faculty Council is keenly interested in salary-adjustment matters and expects that, when they are being considered by the Faculty Affairs Committee, the chair of that committee will keep the council informed of the committee’s recommendations so that the Institutional Planning and Budget Advisory Committee may, in turn, be informed of the manner in which the guidelines are being applied.  
c. A faculty member who believes that his or her salary is not equitable may grieve the salary recommendation through the Faculty Appeals Hearing Board, 3840.

B. SALARY DETERMINATION. This process is carried out at the departmental and higher levels of academic administration. Each year the provost specifies the definitions of the salary-increment categories to be used and prescribes their proportionate distribution. A “Salary Recommendation” form is completed for each faculty member according to the schedule established by the provost. [See also 3380 E and 3420.]

B-1. Departmental Action. The departmental administrator enters a recommended salary-increment category in the space provided on each salary form. This recommendation will reflect the performance evaluation described in A, relative salary position, and other relevant factors. Special considerations should be noted in the “Comments” section at the bottom of the form or by an accompanying written statement. The departmental administrator will submit written justification if his or her assignment of specified salary-increment categories departs substantially from the prescribed distribution. Such justifications are taken into consideration by the dean in arriving at an equitable college-wide distribution among the categories. The departmental administrator forwards the salary form for each faculty member to the dean, together with a listing of all members of the unit.

B-2. College Action. Deans, at their discretion, may require administrative officers under their jurisdiction to supplement their salary-increment recommendations by such means as copies of the evaluation forms, written statements, or personal conference. The dean enters a recommended salary-increment category in the space provided on each salary form. The dean’s distribution of faculty members among the salary categories is guided by the recommended proportions and takes into account possible differences in qualifications and merit among departments; e.g., it may be that the average members of an outstanding department are given consideration equal to that accorded the top members of an average department. When this stage has been completed, the dean meets individually with each departmental administrator for review of the dean’s recommendations. The dean forwards the salary form for each faculty member to the provost.

B-3. Presidential Action. Review and action by the provost consists primarily of making adjustments necessary to arrive at an equitable distribution of faculty members among salary-increment categories for UI as a whole. After a recommended salary-increment category has been established at the departmental, college, and presidential levels, a copy is sent to the faculty member. The president determines, on the basis of funds available, the salary-increment range applicable to each category.

B-4. Budget Office Action. The Budget Office provides computer printouts showing current salary and tentative salary for the coming year and sends the appropriate list to each dean.

B-5. Review and Adjustment. The dean, in consultation with each departmental administrator in the college, makes corrections and minor adjustments as necessary to place each faculty member on the proper salary basis within the department. The aggregate of final salary recommendations must fall within the total salary-increase budget established for the college.

B-6. Final Approval. The provost, after consultation with the deans, approves the corrected lists. When they have been approved by the president and the regents, faculty members are officially notified of their salaries for the coming year and “Salary Agreement” forms [see 3080 E-2] are sent to them for completion.

B-7. Merit-based Salary Increases Not Funded. If, in any year or consecutive preceding years, funding is not provided for merit-based salary increases or funding is only provided for cost-of-living increases, the annual review reports will be retained at the unit level. At such time as merit-based salary increases are available, the recommendation for merit increases shall be based upon the average scores of the current period and any preceding consecutive periods for which merit-based funding was not provided. [add. 7-01]
ARTICLE III—FACULTY MEETINGS.

Section 1. Clause A. Meetings. The university faculty meets at least once each semester. Meetings of the university faculty may be called at any time, with due notice, by the president. Meetings of the university faculty must be called with due notice by the president on the request of the Faculty Council or on the written petition of 25 members of the university faculty. The president, or a member of the university faculty designated by the president, presides at meetings by being physically present at the designated venue on the Moscow campus, or by attending one of the designated Center campus venues in Coeur d’Alene, Boise or Idaho Falls, or at another venue in the state that may be connected via electronic video and audio link as outlined in Clause B.

Clause B. Participation in Meetings via Electronic Linkage of Venues. To be eligible for meeting participation, venues remote from the Moscow campus Center venues must be linked to the Moscow venue via compressed video link or other electronic means that conveys audio and visual signals in both directions between Moscow and the remote venue Center. In addition, an authorized delegate of the Secretary of the Faculty must be present at each site to facilitate meeting participation and counting and reporting of votes (see Section 3, Clause C, Secretary’s Delegates at remote sites).

Section 2. Secretary. The president appoints the secretary of the faculty from among the tenured members of the university faculty [see 1570]. The secretary is responsible for recording and distributing the minutes and tallying and recording of votes at General Faculty Meetings. And performs such other duties as may be assigned by the president or the university faculty. (this is redundant as all secretary duties are outlined in 1570).

Section 3. Quorum, and Recognition of Speakers and Recording of Votes

Clause A. A quorum consists of the number that is at least one-sixth eighth of the membership of the university faculty, as defined in article II, section 1, who are assigned to the Moscow campus. If there is not a quorum at a faculty meeting, Faculty Council actions reported in the agenda for that
meeting have faculty approval and are forwarded to the president and regents. [rev. 7-97].

Clause B. Arrangements for Recognition of Speakers and Recording of votes at multiple sites.

Participants wishing to speak at the Moscow site or at remove sites will be recognized by the presiding officer in Moscow and may obtain the floor with his/her approval. In determining the outcome of motions, the secretary will determine the number of votes for or against. The Secretary’s Delegate (usually a member of faculty council) at each electronically linked site Center campus will convey each Center’s votes for and against to the Secretary.

Clause C. Secretary’s Delegates at remote sites. Delegates at remote sites shall be members of the University Multi-Campus Communications Committee appointed by the Committee on Committees.

Section 4. Agenda. An agenda listing all subjects to be voted on, other than routine matters, must be issued to all members of the university faculty at least one week in advance of each meeting of the university faculty, except as provided in clause E. Faculty Council actions that require approval by the university faculty must be published in full in the agenda. [See also 1420 A-1-c.] [ed. 7-00]

Clause A. Responsibility. The president is responsible for the agenda and it is issued under the president’s direction. The agenda will be posted on the President’s web-page not less than five calendar days before the scheduled meeting time.

Clause B. Agenda Items from Individual Members. Individual members who wish to suggest items for the agenda are to submit them to the president. No items may be considered under this clause that are presented to the president less than twelve calendar days before the meeting.

Clause C. Resolutions Requiring Action. Ten or more members of the university faculty desiring to submit a resolution that requires action at the next meeting are to submit the signed resolution to the president at least twelve calendar days before the meeting. Such resolutions must be published in full with, and included in, the agenda. [But see 1540 B.] [ed. 7-00]

Clause D. Proposed Changes of Written Policies or Regulations. Any proposed change in a written policy or regulation of the university to be
voted on by the university faculty must be published in full in the agenda, or final action on the proposal must be delayed until the next meeting. This provision can be waived only by unanimous consent.

**Clause E. Agenda for Emergency Meetings.** If circumstances require an emergency meeting of the university faculty, the president declares the emergency and calls the meeting. In such circumstances the agenda may be limited to items approved by the president and must be published not less than three calendar days before the meeting. Policy actions taken at emergency meetings require an approving vote of two-thirds of the members of the university faculty in attendance at the meeting, a quorum being present. This constitution cannot be amended at an emergency meeting.