University of Idaho  
2008-2009 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA  
Meeting #25

Tuesday, March 31, 2009, 3:30 p.m.  
BRINK HALL FACULTY LOUNGE

Order of Business

Consent Agenda

I. Regular Agenda.

II. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.  
   - Minutes of the 2008-09 Faculty Council Meeting #24, March 24, 2009

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.

VI. Committee Reports.

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.  

   FC-09-071: FSH 1520 – University Constitution (Hill)

IX. New Business.  

   Discussion of RFI's  
   Faculty led discussion of the University’s strategic direction – PPP & beyond (4:30 p.m.)

X. Adjournment.

Professor Karen Guilfoyle, Chair 2008-2009, Faculty Council

Attachments: Minutes of 2008-2009 FC Meeting #24
University of Idaho  
Faculty Council Meeting Minutes  
2008-09 Meeting #24 Tuesday March 24, 2009

Present: Baird, Baillargeon, Baker, (w/o vote), Battaglia, Crowley, Eveleth, Fairley, Fritz, Graden, Hill (w/o vote), Huber, Johnson, Limbaugh, Machlis, Makus, Mihelich, Miller, Murphy, Oman, Schmeckpeper, Stohner, Sullivan, Williams, Wilson. Liaisons: Steciak for Budwig (Boise), Newcombe (Coeur d’Alene), Dakins (Idaho Falls). Absent: Guilfoyle (chair), Budwig (Boise). Visitors/Guests: 4

A quorum being present, the chair opened the meeting at 3:33 p.m.

Minutes: It was moved and seconded (Miller/Murphy) to approve the minutes of the meeting of March 10, 2009 as distributed, approved with a change of wording in FC-09-033 thus “was denied-disapproved by UCC...”.

Chair’s Report: Vice-Chair Miller noted that chair, Professor Guilfoyle was not well and wished her a speedy recovery. He went on to note that there was a likely 3 to 5% pay cut for all personnel imposed by the state legislature. He noted that the recently discussed resolution circulated from ISU protested that the pay cut would be a tax on state workers.

There was general consensus that if a pay cut is to be imposed that UI should lobby the legislature to implement a cut over a sliding scale, sparing lower paid employees and putting a heavier burden on those paid higher salaries. The merits of putting a motion were discussed.

The Provost noted that administration was working to influence JFAC to move away from the flat rate proposed 3% cut to a model as proposed by faculty council members. He also noted that an additional 2% cut was mooted perhaps hitting open salary lines, but the details were unclear. He also noted that these cuts would be in addition to the previous 7% cut already imposed by the state. On a more positive note, the details of implementation of the federal stimulus package were still unclear and there is a possibility that some of these funds may at least be partially used to offset the proposed pay cuts.

The Vice-chair noted that a solution would be for the state legislature to implement an additional tax across the state, perhaps sales tax, to distribute the burden of the economic down-turn more broadly across the Idaho population.

Provost’s Report: The Provost noted that the imposition of additional cuts in state funding reinforced the importance of the university’s work on the PPP. He further noted that the legislature was anticipating that there would be no improvement in the state economy during the next year, and were budgeting accordingly. It is clear that we will live in a smaller fiscal environment.

The Provost added a positive note that he and the President had just met with the RFI Review Committee and the discussion was uplifting. The RFI’s pointed the way towards building institutional strategic vision and a more vital UI in the future. The blog site suggestions were used by the committee to refine the structure of proposals. There had been broad UI community input. He went on to note that UI is moving to a different tone from previous years. To be competitive, a different mindset in this time of real transformation will build a more strategically focused and vital university.

A discussion of the UI benefits package followed. It was noted that the Benefits Advisory Group is not a faculty council committee and FC does not receive regular reports from this committee. There was discussion of the appointment of a FC member to this committee and it was noted that there had been a
one year time-lapse as a previous faculty member on the BAG had completed his term on FC but apparently remained on the BAG. This resulted in a loss of communication between the BAG and FC. It was noted that FC member Professor Evelleth had been nominated to the BAG during the fall. Professor Evelleth noted that he was unaware that there had been any BAG meetings and had not received any invitation to attend.

In further discussion it was noted that BAG and other such presidentially appointed committees have inherently different structures to FC committees. Our constitution specifically provides that FC committees cannot be chaired by the administrator who oversees their activities and this serves as a check on the system.

It was further noted that UBFC was in the process of discussing a liaison with BAG and it was hoped that there would be opportunity for faculty input into the next benefit contract.

The Provost completed his report on a high note. During spring break a group of 140 students and faculty had travelled to Iowa to assist in flood relief activities and to the gulf coast to assist with hurricane relief. He noted that he had spoken with a number of students on their way back. They were exhausted but once again had transformative experiences. The Provost thanked the students, faculty and staff who had done such great work.

**FC-09-071** – FSH 1520 University Constitution amendment – preliminary discussion on remote site faculty participation in General Faculty Meetings (Hill). The Faculty Secretary spoke to the draft changes as distributed. He noted some background information. The revisions were drafted to reflect changes in the structure and organization of the university. There was now a much greater proportion of faculty at sites away from the Moscow campus. Also, the changes were conceived in the spirit of embracing statewide faculty into university activities.

Some guiding principles were: to extend the privilege of vote and voice to off-campus faculty; to utilize two-way video/audio electronic communication to facilitate meaningful interaction at GFM; to consider conduct of orderly proceedings by appointing or electing delegates at each site to assist with reporting of votes and numbers of attending members at each site; to design generic changes that would not require revision for some time.

*Question: What is the rationale for reducing the quorum from one-sixth to one-eighth of the faculty number?*

In the present form the constitution calls for one sixth of the members of the resident Moscow campus to form a quorum. By changing this to include all faculty members from across the state in the quorum, the base is expanded. The number of faculty making a quorum using either calculation would be very similar. Based on the most accurate estimates of present faculty numbers available: one-sixth of the Moscow faculty (589 / 6 = 98) and one-eighth of the entire faculty (782 / 8 = 98).

**PPP/NOI's: FC-09-072** –discontinue MS Veterinary Science. UCC chair Professor Dacey noted that this NOI was raised due to low enrolments in the degree. It was noted that the department vote was 16:2 against the NOI; the CALS curriculum committee, 2:2:2, and the graduate council, was in favor of the NOI, 10:3. The UCC vote was 8:2 in favor of the NOI. FC member, Professor Battaglia (Animal and Veterinary Science Department) explained that there was essentially no distinction between the MS Veterinary Science and the MS Animal Science which had strong enrolment. The department vote was understandably in favor of keeping the degree, but there was a real cost in terms of assessment. There
being no further discussion, the seconded motion from UCC was approved in favor of the NOI, the faculty council vote being unanimous.

**FC-09-073** – Discontinue MS Architecture. The Architecture faculty did not want to give up this degree and proposed a temporary freeze on student intake. The college vote was unanimous against the NOI, the graduate council against the NOI 2:6:4 and UCC against 0:10.

Ms Architecture is the only research degree offered by the department. The other master’s degree is for the professional stream (M Arch).

There was considerable discussion of the limited resources available to run the program despite the potential to admit more students. There was a pool of more than 15 students who applied each year and only two or three were accepted to work on research degrees with the faculty. To teach the degree the time devoted to the committee work required for this degree caused all faculty teaching to be an overload. Discussion ensued around the relatively light nature of overload compared to teaching a formal course. Nonetheless, as Art and Architecture Dean Hoversten pointed out, many of the faculty were stretched with teaching load and there were other additional teaching demands arising due to an increased credit load brought to a higher quality M Arch degree now requiring 45 class credits compared to 30 credits previously.

The Provost pointed out that this program was typical of many that had small student numbers and were unsustainable. The A & A college might have chosen to move resources into this program but with limited resources available, the priorities had not been with this degree.

The issue of the availability of an alternative multi-disciplinary degree was raised. Architecture Department HOD, Professor Armpriest noted that the MS Bio-regional planning was evolving but presently focused on non-design elements. Implementation of the design component of the bioregional planning degree is a priority and once that is established an alternative to the MS Arch would be available. There being no further discussion, it was noted that votes should be cast in favor or against the NOI, 5 in favor, 14 against, thus the NOI was disapproved.

**FC-09-067, 68, 69 and 70** – revisions to FSH 3050 Position Description, FSH 3140 Performance Expectations, FSH 3320 Annual Evaluations and FSH 3420 Faculty Salaries, respectively.

Chair of Faculty Affairs, Professor Crowley introduced the changes to policy (as distributed) that accompanied the changes to corresponding forms (reviewed and passed by FC in the fall). A brief discussion of the proposed changes resulted in broad consensus. There had been thorough review of the policy by a sub-committee of Faculty Affairs followed by further review by the Faculty Affairs Committee. There being no further discussion the vote was unanimously in favor of the proposed policy revisions.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Rodney A. Hill, Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Council
ARTICLE III--FACULTY MEETINGS.

Section 1. 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 of the university faculty.

Clause A. Venue. Faculty may participate and vote in meetings by being physically present at the designated venue on the Moscow campus, or by being physically present at another designated venue in the state that is connected via electronic video and audio link as outlined in Clause B. Venues will be designated annually by faculty council as described in 1540 A-1.

Clause B. Participation. To be eligible for meeting participation, venues remote from the Moscow campus 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. 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, tallying and recording of votes, and performs such other duties as may be assigned by the president or the university faculty.

Section 3. Quorum, Recognition of Speakers, Recording of Votes and Delegates.
**Clause A. Quorum.** A quorum consists of one-sixth 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. Recognition of Speakers.** Participants wishing to speak at the Moscow site or at remote sites will be recognized by the presiding officer in Moscow and may obtain the floor with his/her approval.

**Clause C. Recording of Votes.** In determining the outcome of motions, the secretary will determine the number of votes for or against. The Secretary’s Delegate at each electronically linked site will convey votes for and against to the Secretary (see FSH 1540 A).

**Clause D. Secretary’s Delegates.** Delegates at remote sites shall be members of the University Multi-Campus Communications Committee appointed by the Committee on Committees as outlined in 1640.
PREAMBLE: The university faculty have adopted for their convenience certain standing rules, given in this section. This section appeared for the first time in the 1979 edition of the Handbook and remains essentially in the form it took then. For further information, consult the Office of the Faculty Secretary (208-885-6151). [ed 7-97]

A. VOTING PRIVILEGE. Constituent faculties of colleges and other UI units must limit the voting privilege to those who are qualified under the provisions of the constitution of the university faculty. [See 1520 II-1 and II-3.] Moreover, those who are qualified cannot be deprived of their vote in meetings of constituent faculties. [See 1520 IV-8.] Emeritus, adjunct, and affiliate faculty members, staff members, students, and others may be permitted to participate in meetings in an advisory capacity only, and they may serve as voting members of committees.

A-1. Venue Determination. The approved sites remote from the Moscow campus for General Faculty Meetings will be determined annually. At the first faculty council meeting in the fall, with other committee elections, the remote sites for the year will be approved (see also 1520, III-1-A).
**1640.94**

**University Multi-Campus Communications Committee**

**A. FUNCTION.**

**A-1.** To coordinate the orderly conduct of General Faculty Meetings at multiple sites across the state.

**A-2.** To design, review and recommend for approval by Faculty Council, operating protocols with respect to conducting faculty meetings with active participation of faculty across the state. Focus points include methods of recording and reporting of votes, recognition of members and other logistical issues.

**A-3.** To work in collaboration with the *Information Technology Committee (see 1640.55)* to review and make recommendations to Faculty Council on appropriate communication technologies to maintain high-quality faculty meetings.

**A-4.** To report annually to the Faculty Council on faculty satisfaction with communications during faculty meetings.

**B. STRUCTURE AND MEMBERSHIP.** Secretary of the Faculty who serves as chair, one faculty member who resides at the Moscow campus, the Executive Director of Information Technology or designee (w/o vote), and one faculty member from each designated remote site (see FSH 1540 A-1) who serves as the secretary’s delegate at faculty meetings. To assure a quorum and remote site participation one alternate faculty member from each designated remote site will be selected. Committee members are appointed by the university's Committee on Committees and serve a three-year period.