University of Idaho
2010-2011
FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #18

3:30 p.m.
Tuesday, February 22, 2011
BRINK HALL FACULTY LOUNGE

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2010-11 Faculty Senate Meeting #17, February 15, 2011

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.
   • Assistant Vice President of Human Resources (Mychal Coleman)

VI. Committee Reports.

   CoC:
   • FS-11-023: FSH 1640.20 - University Budget and Finance Committee Restructure

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Dan Eveleth, Chair 2010-2011, Faculty Senate

Attachments:
   Minutes of Meeting #17
   FS-11-023
Meeting Minutes:

**Present:** Baillargeon, Baker (w/o vote), Barlow, Bathurst, Bird (w/o vote), Budwig (Boise), Dakins (Idaho Falls), Duval (Coeur d'Alene), Edwards, Eveleth, Fairley, Halloran, Hasko, Hill (w/o vote), Hopper, Hoversten, Huber, Joyce, Krug, Limbaugh, Marshall, A., Marshall, J., Mosman, Riesenberg.

**Absent:** Padgham-Albrecht, Stark, Strawn.

**Guests:** 5

A quorum being present, the Chair opened the meeting at 3:37 p.m.

**Minutes:** It was moved to accept the minutes of meeting #16 (A. Marshall/Bathurst)

Discussion: A clarification was suggested; (Edwards/Baillargeon). Clarification appears in square brackets:

“It was suggested that senior faculty, not only the deans, should be engaged in the review process.

Yes, [faculty doing research should be included in the review process]. The newly established classification of "Distinguished Professors" at UI would be an ideal group to provide review in the future. This is intended to be implemented.” Amendment approved, 13 in favor 0 against.

The secretary explained that the minutes are written each Tuesday evening. They capture the spirit of the discussion and record motions and their outcomes. Minutes are not quotations.

**Chair’s Report:** The Chair reminded senators that he had requested lists of courses that were considered to be bottlenecks, preventing students from progressing through the normal course sequence. These lists must be provided to the Chair by 5:00 p.m. tomorrow. He would assemble the master-list and a plan would be determined. He went on to note that the Senate tour of campus facilities was confirmed for April 12 during normal senate meeting time.

The Chair welcomed new senator Professor Kenton Bird, Director of the School of Journalism and Mass Media who will represent the College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences. Professor Bird will be officially confirmed within the next few days.

**Provost’s Report:** The deans and leadership had spent a long day yesterday in further budget hearings. There will be many factors that affect the budget on both the projected revenue and expenditure sides. Discussions included cuts to state funding and the potential increase in enrollment and proposed increases in student fees/tuition. Executive Director for Planning and Budget, Keith Ickes and the Provost had met with student groups: GPSA and ASUI to discuss proposed tuition/fees increases which were very well received. The State Board will be meeting this week in Boise. It is anticipated that the Degree Doctor of Athletic Training recently approved by senate would also be approved by the Board.

The Diversity Council hosted a faculty and staff reception held in the College of Law foyer yesterday evening. Professor Eaglewoman, College of Law and Carmen Suarez, Director of Human Rights, Access and Inclusion, welcomed guests to celebrate diversity. When Reverend Jesse Jackson was at the university last week he emphasized the notion that diversity should be an integral part of the student learning experience and students should graduate with a sense of embracing diversity for all the richness that it brings to our lives. The law group meeting was a celebration of that idea.
The Provost had met with the Lionel Hampton Jazz Festival Artistic Director, John Clayton last week and noted that it is now only two weeks to festival time. Mr. Clayton had been in Los Angeles at the Grammy Awards Presentations. He had been nominated. He noted it was good to be at the presentations but he felt much more at home in Moscow. There were many events at the festival. On Thursday night, there would be three venues operating: The Administration Auditorium, the SUB Ballroom and the Haddock Performing Arts Auditorium. On Friday and Saturday nights, Manhattan Transfer will be performing in the Kibbie Dome. The Provost suggested that faculty come along to all of the events and encourage students to attend.

**What is the target figure for budget cuts?**
There were many factors to be determined. The complexity of unknowns such as increased student enrollment and the size of the tuition increase that will be approved by the State Board along with the uncertainty around the state budget deficit made it very difficult to speculate at this time.

**Would there be a work-load adjustment to the budget this year?**
The last four years, the state has not funded the work-load adjustment. If this had been funded, the state would owe the university an additional $900,000.

The Chair noted that there will be several issues coming up for a General Faculty Meeting (GFM) towards the end of the semester. There is one item on today’s agenda, Clinical Faculty, that will require a constitutional change, if approved. Senate is asked to encourage their colleagues to make time for the GFM. A date for the GFM would be set soon.

**FS-11-022: FSH 1565 – Faculty Ranks – Clinical Faculty.** The Chair invited Professor Bird (who was the organizer of the policy change) to address senate.

Professor Bird explained that the School of Journalism and Mass Media is working toward official accreditation and the accreditation body has required standards for faculty qualifications and experience that are difficult to meet. Peer institutions including, Arizona State University and Washington State University had addressed this issue by adopting the category of Clinical Faculty who are not tenured, but may be appointed or promoted to the ranks of assistant, associate and full professor. Expanding the terms and conditions for Clinical Faculty at the university in a similar way to our peers would provide another track by which to hire faculty who possess significant professional experience but lack a terminal degree. Under the present policy, Clinical Faculty sat under the designation of Temporary Faculty and the proposed change would move the classification under University Faculty in the Constitution. Other universities had appointed Clinical Faculty under multi-year contracts but this was not possible under State Board of Education policy. Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, Professor Don Crowley added that the intention was to attract Clinical Faculty and retain them on a continuing basis.

Other departments such as Theater Arts and Music are interested in recruiting Clinical Faculty under the proposed change in policy. Clarification on the policy section addressing promotion was sought.

**Would standards for promotion be parallel to tenured/tenure track faculty, such as an expectation to publish a minimum number of papers in discipline-specific journals?**
No. It was anticipated that Clinical Faculty would carry heavier teaching roles and the metrics would be more in tune to their position descriptions with majority teaching responsibilities. However, the process underpinning promotion should be parallel to the tenured faculty process.
The discussion moved to a proposed need to establish general university guidelines for promotion of Clinical Faculty. There was debate as to whether guidelines would establish general standards and provide clear direction for Clinical Faculty who wished to seek promotion; or whether general guidelines might be unworkable because of specialist metrics that would need to be set at college and particularly at unit levels. Discussion addressed metrics for those faculty who worked outside of the roles of teaching and scholarly activity. It was noted that principles for promotion of Faculty-at-Large relied on peer review of work that was described in position descriptions. The expectations for extension faculty were supported by considerable documentation. Many extension faculty were in the tenure-track/tenured ranks. The discussion then turned to the policy in the FSH that guided promotion of tenure-track/tenured faculty. It was suggested that although there was extensive description of general principles and process, there was little describing content and thus this was determined at college and unit levels.

Would this category allow colleges to promote faculty who were primarily teachers with little scholarship in their portfolios?  
No. This was more a matter of the nature of Clinical Faculty Scholarship.

The Provost was asked: How well had the process worked at Washington State University?  
Provost Baker noted that the School of Veterinary Medicine had a need for this category. The achievements of those working in clinical practice, whose scholarship was based in case-based reports rather than in traditional research were recognized through this category. The system works very well.

Would Clinical Faculty be eligible to vote for and serve on committees convened to review the promotion of tenured faculty?  
Yes; but they would not be eligible to vote in the case of tenure decisions.

There being no further discussion, the question was called. Approved, unanimously.

FS-11-023: FSH 1640.20 – University Budget and Finance Committee (UBFC). Discussion of possible restructure.

Chair of Committee on Committees (CoC), Professor Joyce explained that initial discussions of the proposed changes in structure had been suggested by the Executive Director of Planning and Budget, Keith Ickes. His concern was that there were too few faculty members and that communications from the committee may not be effectively reaching faculty across all colleges. The CoC in reflecting the present structure noted that it required three senators and two additional faculty. Recently, there had been some resignations of senior senators from UBFC and there was presently an open senate position on the committee for which there were no senators wishing to serve. In addition, there was a Student Bar Association (SBA) position for which there appeared to be no interest in the past several years and consideration of reducing the two graduate positions from two (GPSA and SBA) to one position was also proposed. With changing roles in administrators, it was also proposed to substitute the position held by the Vice President for Finance and Administration with the Executive Director for Planning and Budget; a better fit for the needs of the committee. The suggestion for the senate position was to revise the committee membership from three senators to two but to increase the non-senator faculty representation from two to three.

Some senators felt that it was very important to retain the three senators because of the importance of this committee and the need to keep the senate informed of issues arising in the UBFC. It was also acknowledged that the disadvantage was that the reality of a heavy service load was always thrust upon
those senators, serving both on the senate and UBFC, two very active bodies. It was suggested that one solution may be to revise the senate membership to two but to have a regular brief written communication from UBFC provided to senate. It would then be up to senators to distribute the information to their constituents. Senator and staff representative Jane Baillargeon noted her communications with the Chair of the Staff Affairs Committee, Vicki Trier, who suggested that staff wished to maintain their presence on the UBFC and suggested that an increase in staff representation from three to four members would be desirable.

A variation on the present appointment of senators was proposed. A senator at the beginning of the second year of their senate term could be elected to UBFC. This person could continue for three years becoming the first preference as Chair of UBFC in their third year; although in this year, the person would have cycled off senate. In this way, the more experienced senator could still contribute to the senate representation on UBFC and communication back to senate would be more strongly assured.

The Chair then requested input from any student representatives present. Mr. Sargent, a member of the SBA noted that there had been a breakdown in communications at the SBA. There had been a desire for the SBA to participate on UBFC but SBA was under a mistaken impression that they did not have a place on the committee. This would be remedied and Mr. Sargent would be attending UBFC meetings regularly. A student representing GPSA also noted that he would be attending UBFC meetings regularly. The Chair asked the student senators for their views. ASUI Senator Limbaugh agreed that it was important to have ASUI representation on UBFC. It also provided a great learning experience for undergraduate students interested in budget issues. The senator also asked why there was no SBA representation on Senate as each of the student groups were different. No one could answer that question and thus it was suggested to look into including SBA on senate.

Professor Joyce thanked the senate for input. The discussion had provided useful guidance for CoC to move forward with a proposed restructure.

**Adjournment:** It was moved (A. Marshall/Fairley) to adjourn at 4:48 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Rodney A. Hill, Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Senate
A. FUNCTION. The function of the University Budget and Finance Committee is

A-1. To advise the president, provost and the executive director of planning and budget vice president of finance and administration on matters pertaining to operating and capital budgets. The Committee will periodically review revenue streams (e.g., tuition, fees, indirect costs, etc.), revenue diminution (e.g., fee remissions, etc.), the use of state appropriated funds, university expenditures (e.g., salaries, benefits, operating costs, capital outlays, etc.), operating and strategic reserves, long and short term capital plans, and deferred maintenance plans. [ed. 7-06, rev. 2-11]

A-2. To be involved strategically in the university budget process. The Committee will help define the budget process and goals, and participate in university budget hearings and meetings.

A-3. To monitor consolidated financial reports for potential irregularities or imbalances and to comment on proposed corrective actions.

A-4. To initiate the study of budget and financial policies and issues.

A-5. To provide periodic reports to Faculty Senate and Staff Affairs on matters pertaining to university finances and budgets. [ed. 7-09]

B. AGENDA. The agenda of each meeting will be set by the Chair of the committee in collaboration with the executive director of planning and budget the vice president of finance and administration and/or the provost. The executive director of planning and budget vice president of finance and administration is the point of contact for the committee and is responsible for notifying the committee of relevant meetings dealing with university finances and budgets. The Senator in the second year, or designee, on the Budget and Finance Committee is responsible for reporting to the senate activities of the committee. [ed. 7-06, rev. 2-11]

C. STRUCTURE AND MEMBERSHIP. The committee is composed of 11 voting members, all (except students) serving on three year staggered terms, and 4 nonvoting members as follows: five faculty (two selected by Committee on Committees, three elected by Faculty Senate from among senators beginning their second year of service on the senate), three staff (not associated with the university financial or budget offices), three students (selected by the Committee on Committees from nominations provided by the Associated Students of the University of Idaho, Graduate & Professional Student Association and the Student Bar Association). Ex Officio (w/o vote) membership includes: Provost and Executive Vice President, Executive Director of Planning and Budget, Budget Director, Director of Institutional Research and Assessment. [rev. 2-11]

The committee’s chair will be selected by the Committee on Committees from one of the five faculty members and will usually be the senior member of the voting membership elected by Faculty Senate. A broad representation of faculty, staff and students across the various colleges of the university is expected. [ed. 7-09, rev. 2-11]

Including the committee chair, the voting membership includes: Three Faculty Senators selected by Faculty Senate, two faculty (currently not serving on Faculty Senate, selected by the Committee on Committees), three staff, (not associated with the university financial or budget offices), selected by the Committee on Committees from nominations provided by the Staff Affairs Committee), three students (selected by the Committee on Committees from nominations provided by the Associated Students of the University of Idaho, Graduate & Professional Student Association and the Student Bar Association). Ex Officio (w/o vote) membership includes: Provost and Executive Vice President, Vice President of Finance and Administration, Budget Director, Director of Institutional Research and Assessment. [ed. 7-06, 7-09]