University of Idaho
2010-2011
FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #19

3:30 p.m.
Tuesday, March 1, 2011
BRINK HALL FACULTY LOUNGE

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2010-11 Faculty Senate Meeting #18, February 22, 2011

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.

VI. Committee Reports.

   Faculty Affairs
   FS-11-024: FSH 3520 F-9. Tenure Clock (Crowley)
   University Budget and Finance Committee
   Meetings Update (Edwards)

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 #18
Present: Baillargeon, Baker (w/o vote), Barlow, Bathurst, Bird, Budwig (Boise), Dakins (Idaho Falls), Edwards, Eveleth (Chair), Fairley, Halloran, Hasko, Hill (w/o vote), Hoversten, Joyce, Krug, Marshall, A., Marshall, J., Riesenberg, Strawn. Absent: Barlow, Duval (Coeur d'Alene), Garrison, Huber, Limbaugh, Mosman, Padgham-Albrecht, Stark. Guests: 3

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

Minutes: It was moved to accept the minutes of meeting #17 (Fairley/Bathurst) with minor editorial corrections.

Chair’s Report: The General Faculty Meeting will be held at 3:00 p.m. (Pacific), 4:00 p.m. (Mountain) on Thursday May 5 in the University Auditorium in Moscow and Boise, Coeur d’Alene, Idaho Falls and Twin Falls sites. Faculty across the state are encouraged to add the meeting to their calendars. There will be discussion of important issues that will require a quorum. The Chair particularly thanked the Assistant to the Faculty Secretary, Ann Thompson for organizing the meeting and finding a meeting room in Moscow, as the logistics of coordinating multiple sites, minimizing the impact of the meeting on the academic schedule and working with the President’s busy calendar were difficult to coordinate.

The issues around the dispute at Idaho State University between the faculty, the senate and the ISU President had made the front page of the Chronicle of Higher Education. An independent account of the details around the issues was not available and it was difficult to obtain a balanced picture. The Chair had stated that he was very much in favor of the shared governance model as an effective way to run higher education in the state and the nation. Although the item was not on the agenda, there would be time available as the last item today for a discussion of the issue. The Chair recommended that the University of Idaho senate take no formal action on the issue at this meeting (other than discussion) until it can be determined what would be most beneficial for helping ISU.

Provost’s Report: The university unveiled new, state-of-the-art technology that allows faculty, student and staff researchers to see images in 3-D. The IQ Station is a 3-D data modeling box that converts large complex datasets into interactive images. The IQ Station was given to the University of Idaho by the Idaho National Laboratory (INL) and the Center for Advanced Energy Studies (CAES). Senator Fairley had provided data for the new technology. Provost Baker noted that CAES had high regard for Professor Fairley’s research. INL/CAES is seeking to consolidate further research partnerships with University of Idaho faculty particularly around the theme of sustainable energy. There would be open meetings that interested faculty were encouraged to attend in Albertson Board Room (311) from 9:00 a.m. till noon, Wednesday, February 23. The Jazz Festival is on this week: February 23 to 26. There will be 10,000 student visitors on campus. The Provost encouraged the university community to make them welcome pointing out it was a good opportunity for recruiting. An interdisciplinary discussion was a feature in a Jazz Festival pre-event today. It featured faculty and students in an on-stage dialog exploring aspects of jazz performance. The Provost offered that it was his hope that the community would really enjoy this great event.

The Chair introduced the newly recruited Assistant Vice President for Human Resources (HR), Mychal Coleman to address the senate.
Dr. Coleman provided his vision for the future of Human Resources. He spoke to discipline perspectives around the importance of empathy in leadership. In a recent report in the journal “Psychology Today” three groups of people were shown pictures of distressed people. The three groups represented were those with annual incomes 1) in excess of $1 million, 2) those with incomes around $250,000 and 3) those on low incomes. Those in group 1 could not empathize with the distressed people in the scenes. Only 80% of those in group 2 could empathize and all of those in group 3 could empathize. He noted that we all have a responsibility to empathize and to help everyone in our community with no exceptions.

There were two competing philosophies in HR: 1) Human Resource Management and 2) the Strategic Business Partner approach. He noted that the former was a traditional approach, was highly structured and provides answers but not solutions. His strong preference was to adopt the latter which supports business, introduces cutting edge HR technologies and provides real solutions to people’s problems. His view was that the university community had many individuals who wanted to be led to achieve excellence but at present there was some unknown disconnect between the leadership and the community. He will bring the disciplines of anthropology and sociology to his approach to HR issues. He sees the way forward is to advance the entire organization: all university community members. He also noted his desire to bring the talents of the faculty to assist with HR issues. He sees a system that will develop the talents of every employee. His own new approach, he terms the Flex Initiative will provide avenues for all community members to write and publish their experiences – a platform to allow individuals to study specific HR issues, to come up with creative solutions and to share their solutions broadly with others. He foresees an open learning and teaching paradigm where the University of Idaho community could learn and then pass on that learning to others – for example at Boise State University or Lewis-Clark State College. He wishes to evolve a cultural belief system he calls “One Idaho” – a strategic business partner model.

*Will it be possible to streamline hiring practices under this model?*
When his vision is implemented, the whole community will be engaged and informed. It is not up to only the HR department, but to improve process across-the-board.

*Are you advocating a model in which we work more in partnership and with more of an open source approach?*
A faculty advisory group to HR is envisioned. The group can change over time. People who have an interest can join the group.

*There had been an issue discussed at senate recently around the overly complex procedures that appeared to be needed to hire temporary help. The question at issue was what can faculty do to make this process go more smoothly?*
It will be very important for Dr. Coleman to be in the loop. If there is a specific issue such as this, he needs to know and wishes to be well informed.

The Chair thanked Dr. Coleman for discussing his views with senate and invited him to stay connected.

**FS-11-023: FSH 1640.20 – University Budget and Finance Committee (UBFC) Restructure.** Senate Vice-Chair and Chair of Committee on Committees (CoC), Professor Joyce noted that CoC had expeditiously worked through the suggestions provided by senate and now had brought forward as a seconded motion, policy describing a revised structure for UBFC. Elements suggested by senate and students had been incorporated. Under the proposed revision, student and staff voting members would remain under the previous configuration (each with three members). Total faculty representatives will be unchanged.
at five. Senators would be elected by senate in their second year as senators and serve on UBFC for two
years, their third year of service on UBFC will typically be as a past senator. The CoC would continue to
choose the additional two faculty members. The Chair will be selected by CoC from any of the faculty
members. The senator who was serving on senate in their third year (and UBFC in their second year of
service) would fulfill the reporting role, making a communication link from UBFC to senate. As the
university administrative structure had changed the administrator role (ex officio) would now be the
Executive Director for Planning and Budget, substituting for the Vice President for Finance and
Administration.

The Chair called for discussion. It was moved to amend (Baillargeon/Krug) by increasing the number of
staff representatives from three to four.

Senator Baillargeon noted that staff had indicated that they numbered about twice that of faculty in the
community and that many staff were paid lower salaries and were more heavily affected by the issues
dealt with by the UBFC than were faculty.

Was there a problem under the current structure in which staff interests were not being well
represented?
There was not a clear answer immediately to hand. There had been staff conversations around issues
such as furloughs and budget hold-backs and there appeared to be a broad range of concerns but these
were not well-defined.

Was there an issue of need for broader, more diverse staff representation?
It was suggested that it would be helpful if staff who worked in budget roles across the campus (not
those who were employed in the budget office, who were ineligible to serve) would be able to make a
strong contribution to the committee.

There being no further discussion, the question on the amendment was called – 4 in favor, 6 opposed.
Amendment failed.

One senator noted that he abstained from voting on the amendment because he didn’t understand the
staff’s objective.

The Chair noted that if Staff Affairs Committee wished, a further discussion with CoC may be beneficial.

The CoC had discussed possibly expanding the UBFC to have faculty representatives from each college.
This notion had been rejected because it was suggested that the committee would become too large
and ineffective. It was further noted that one of the reasons for proposing the change to the senate
member structure was to reduce the demands on senators who also served on UBFC as both
committees demanded heavy service commitments.

There being no further discussion, the question was called. Twelve in favor. Approved.

Discussion of Idaho State University Crisis. Following on from his opening remarks, the Chair asked
senate for their immediate concerns.

Could the State Board of Education dissolve any university senate body?
This seems like a very heavy-handed option. It seems counter-productive to have an elected body that
appeared to be providing effective representation of the faculty and to dissolve that elected body.
The sequence of events as known was that there had been on-going disputes that led to the appointment of a mediator. There was ISU senate dissatisfaction with the mediator and/or the process. This was part of the series of events that led to a faculty meeting at which 72% of those present voted “no confidence” in the ISU president. Of the total faculty, this represented 55% suggesting that there were broad and serious faculty concerns. It appeared that ISU faculty were in compliance with the SBOE policy guidelines for conducting the vote. It was noted that there had also been a vote of no confidence in the ISU provost last spring, further indicating long-term dysfunctional interactions between the ISU executive leadership and the ISU faculty.

Is it possible to obtain a more detailed description of the chronology of events?
The situation had been highly charged for some time and it was difficult to obtain an independently verifiable view of the detailed events and procedures.

There had been a task-force report delivered earlier in the fall that suggested that an alternative senate structure be implemented in which the senate members would not be elected by the ISU faculty but be appointed by the ISU president. This was one of the factors that had led to the impasse, another contributing factor being that ISU senate was not underpinned by a constitution and documentary support for committee structures was lacking.

The Chair noted that a role for the University of Idaho senate might be to suggest how ISU could move to an outcome that will be desirable to the majority of the ISU community. He had been in communication with the ISU senate chair and had asked him to consider identifying the long-term goal of the ISU faculty as a first step to finding suggestions that the University of Idaho faculty might be able to offer. He hoped that mediation could still be an option. The University of Idaho faculty leadership would be meeting with President Nellis tomorrow for a discussion on this issue. Faculty leadership will provide a follow-up report to senate.

Adjournment: It was moved (Krug/Fairley) to adjourn at 5:03 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Rodney A. Hill, Faculty Secretary and
Secretary to Faculty Senate
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I. Policy/Procedure Statement: Briefly explain the purpose/reason of proposed addition, revision, and/or deletion to the Faculty/Staff Handbook or the Administrative Procedures Manual.

To make automatic the process of obtaining a year extension in the tenure clock in cases of childbirth/adoption.
This policy change will promote the strategic goals of faculty retention and diversity.

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

Pre-maturely discarding a promising faculty member is extremely expensive because of search costs (10K-20K), startup costs (20K-300K) and the cost of faculty development that is necessary for beginning faculty members. Without the clock stoppage, in the appropriate situations, it is highly likely that the university will be paying the (30K-320K) cost of a new hire. With the clock stoppage, it is highly likely that the faculty member will be successful and continue an illustrious career here at UI (remember that we hired this faculty member because of her or his high potential). Furthermore, because of a delay in the bump in pay for promotion, the university saves approximately 13K (promotional increment for Associate and then for Full) in salary for each year of stoppage that leads to a successful tenure case. Rarely is it true that the “right” thing, the “best” thing and the least expensive thing are all the same thing. That is the case here.

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

IV. 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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F. TIME REQUIREMENTS FOR TENURE ELIGIBILITY.

F-9 Extensions:

A. Childbirth/Adoption: A faculty member in a tenure track position who becomes the parent of a child by birth or adoption, can request an automatic one-year extension of the probationary period for tenure. The faculty member must notify the Provost in a timely fashion and include appropriate documentation of the birth or adoption. Extension will not prejudice a subsequent contract renewal decision. In the event that the extension occurs before the third year review, the review is automatically delayed for one year.

B. An extension of the probationary period for tenure may be granted in certain other exceptional circumstances that may impede a faculty member’s progress toward achieving tenure, including responsibilities with respect to childbirth/adoption, significant responsibilities with respect to elder/dependent care obligations, and disability/chronic illness, or other exceptional circumstances.

a. The procedures for requesting an extension are:

1. The faculty member provides a written request to the Provost.
2. Requests should be made in a timely manner, proximate to the events or circumstances that occasion the request. All requests should state the basis for the request and include appropriate documentation.
3. Except to obtain necessary consultative assistance on medical or legal issues, only the Provost will have access to documentation pertaining to a request related to disability or chronic illness. The provost will, at his or her discretion, determine if consultation with the dean and/or department is appropriate. The provost shall notify the faculty member, department chair, and dean of the action taken.
4. In most cases, extension of the probationary period will be for one year. However, longer extensions may be granted upon a showing of need by the faculty member. Multiple extension requests may be granted. All requests for probationary period extensions shall be made prior to commencing with a tenure or contract renewal review.
5. If a probationary period extension is approved, a reduction in productivity during the period of time addressed in the request should not prejudice a subsequent contract renewal decision. In the event the probationary period is approved before the third year review, the review is automatically delayed.