University of Idaho
2010-2011
FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #21

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

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2010-11 Faculty Senate Meeting #20, March 8, 2011

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.
   Committee on Committees:
   • FS-11-028: FSH 1640.18 – Borah

VI. Committee Reports.

VII. Special Orders.
   • Resolution/Recommendation on Firearms

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Dan Eveleth, Chair 2010-2011, Faculty Senate

Attachments:
Minutes of Meeting #20
FS-11-028
Resolution/Recommendation
A quorum being present, the Chair called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m.

Minutes: It was moved to accept the minutes of meeting #19 (Krug/Marshall, J.) following clarification affirming that the cut in state health funds “holiday cut” was in addition to the overall state cuts in university funding and that reserve funds “could” be used rather than “would” be used to pay for the short-fall, the minutes were approved as amended.

Chair’s Report: The chair announced that Rod Hill, Secretary to the Faculty has decided not to seek another three year term. He thanked Secretary Hill for his service saying that he looked forward to working with Rod through the remainder of this year.

Provost Report: JFAC has set a 3.5% budget reduction for higher education. They also funded the Center for Advanced Energy Study (CAES) at $1.6 million. This $1.6 million comes out of the total higher education appropriation, bringing the true cut to 4.06% for all state institutions. He noted that LCSC, who has no part in CAES, also took a 4.06% cut. Although better than the 7% earlier prediction it is not as good as hoped. Thus the battle continues on this front; while revenue opportunities exist there are also revenue holes. The provost noted an 8.4% tuition increase request has been sent to the SBOE. Although this won’t cover the deficit it will help, but more needs to be done and the deans have been asked to plan for 1.5% internal cut. He mentioned Vandal Friday in relation to enrollment stating that if we continue to increase enrollment we increase the budget. Other actions taken have been a reduction in WUE (Western Undergraduate Exchange) I scholarships allowing for an increase in financial aid to students in need. Recruiting efforts by the Enrollment Office staff have netted many more applicants including out of state, even given the WUE reduction. The Provost had the honor of attending Senator McClure’s amazing service acknowledging the McClures’ longtime support and active involvement at the University of Idaho. Dr. Charles R. Buck, Molecular Biologist from Purdue University’s Bindley Bioscience Center has been selected for the associate vice president and center executive officer for northern Idaho - Coeur d’Alene. The three candidates for the College of Graduate Studies presentations and CVs are online at http://www.uidaho.edu/cogs/dean and comments are still being accepted.

Weapons on campus. The Chair briefed the Senate on a proposed Bill to be discussed at 8:00 a.m. the following morning (Wednesday March 9, 2011) in the House State Affairs Committee in Boise. The Bill will change the authority currently entrusted to the state universities by the State Board of Education or the Board of Regents on how they dictate rules on campus with respect to firearms and moving this authority to the state level. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) has discussed the proposed Bill recommending the statement that is currently being distributed asking that Senate take some form of action. The chair stated he viewed the Bill in one of two ways: First, it is clear that both sides of the issue agree that safety at institutions of higher education is an important concern. However, it is clear that differing beliefs about how safety is achieved is at the core of the disagreement. Second, he pointed out that while many states have said the federal government should stay out of decisions at the state level, this Bill seems to be proposing an opposite view of decision-making and control – i.e., take control away from the local level and move it to a more global level, in this case the state level. General Counsel Kent Nelson was present to assist with today’s discussion.
The Bill is to clarify that the SBOE/Regents (that governs all the various institutions) has no authority to regulate the lawful possession of firearms except to prohibit the possession of firearms in undergraduate student housing.

A lengthy discussion ensued on the Bill and FAC’s statement. Some senators disagreed with the term weapon and prohibiting firearms anywhere on campus pointing out that there are shooting sports courses which require the use of firearms. They also questioned whether this was a legislative issue.

*Under any existing Idaho law, does a valid permit holder allow them the right to carry a concealed weapon on campus?* General Counsel responded no, not under university policy.

*Is law enforcement required to notify the university when a student has such a permit or do we have access to records of permit holders?* Since there has never been an issue for the University to have access to this information, Counsel does not know.

*For the 4-H shooting sports the firearms are not considered concealed in terms of this Bill, correct?* University policy does not distinguish between concealed or open carry, it disallows weapons. Counsel acknowledged the displeasure of some given the term weapon, explaining that is the term used in policy. He also noted that there are very limited exceptions to university policy, e.g., ROTC and curricular. Other exceptions to the Firearms Policy must go through Fred Hutchison, Director of Environmental Health & Safety, generally he will require disabling before bringing the firearm on campus. Firearms may always be stored at the University Visitor Center on Line Street where they can be retrieved through a phone call at any time.

*Is there any data out there in terms of safety in areas where weapons are allowed or not?* Later in the meeting a guest noted that Utah has allowed firearms on campus for years and there has never been a single incident with a firearm.

It was pointed out that we need to keep separate the two issues currently being discussed. That of whether or not current university policy is acceptable versus whether or not the university should be able to set its own policy.

Some senators felt very uncomfortable that if this Bill passed it would impact their teaching. Others felt it would send the wrong message/image, that of symbolizing a vigilante university and state at a time when we are trying to establish a climate of civility and safety. Idaho already has a reputation and we should be mindful of this perception. It was recognized that obviously there are individuals who use firearms in a respectful and responsible manner and having shooting programs for training is vital. Some felt it would violate their right of feeling safe as an employee and a teacher, while other’s concerns lay with mentally unstable or intoxicated individuals. Other arguments included a student population and emotional age of same, allowing them to carry firearms becomes a real danger. It was pointed out that by carrying firearms we may then skip the civil step of what takes place with simple dialogue. Given all the concerns expressed, the overwhelming consensus of the Senate seemed to be clear that the University should be able to set its own policy.

Senator Bird proposed a two part response from Senate, one a motion that would be given to the University’s governmental relations staff for the Staff House Committee Hearing in the morning and the second a well prepared resolution, or recommendation, for consideration by Senate at its meeting following spring break. The latter would deal with the rights of a university to set its own policies in this area and would also address the broader issues of safety, civility, and security. We would then be in a better position to present how we feel about firearms on campus. Something that would be carefully
and thoughtfully crafted drawing from experts on our campus as well as Faculty Affairs. The chair asked those interested in this task to remain following today’s meeting.

Nearing the end of a lengthy, yet important discussion, the first part of Senate’s response to firearms on campus took root. It was moved and seconded (Bird, A. Marshall) that Faculty Senate opposes House Bill 222 currently before the House State Affairs Committee because Senate believes that these type of policies are best set by the universities and colleges through the State Board of Education and/or the Board of Regents. It is also requested that the Secretary of Senate be instructed to convey this motion to the President and to the University's governmental relations staff to be presented in Boise.

The chair then allowed guests one minute to speak to the motion. One guest, NRA certified, firearm owner/seller/educator, noted that Utah having no incidents disputes the notion that civility through dialogue will be lost. A female guest noted that as a woman on campus she lacks upper body strength and feels she would be unable to defend herself, thus she carries a weapon while off-campus. Another guest, also NRA certified, said we should be careful about referring to guns as vigilantism or as an automatic move towards violence. Violence happens whether one is carrying a firearm illegally or not. The guest stated that he respected the University’s right to choose, but also respected the right of an individual to protect themselves and to choose.

The chair called for the question and the motion passed unanimously.

**FS-11-027:** FSH 1640.89 University Committee on General Education: A change to the function of this committee, coming as a seconded motion from Committee on Committees, was to remove specific language that becomes too restrictive and forces changes to policy each time the core is tweaked. The second change is to make clear final approval authority lies with UCC, Senate and up the line. Unanimously approved.

**FS-11-028:** FSH 1640.18 Borah Committee was removed from the agenda as Committee on Committees wished to review it further.

**FS-11-025:** FSH 1520 - University Constitution. The proposed change to this policy brings it in line with Senate’s earlier approval of including Clinical Faculty as a rank under University Faculty in FSH 1565 – Ranks and Responsibilities. It is also to revise policy language to clarify associated faculty’s voting and/or participation rights. A senator noted that he had been asked whether clinical faculty without a terminal degree might be entitled to vote in the promotion and tenure process, and if so was this a good idea? Lacking the ability to answer this question, although it was believed units would have control over clinical faculty serving and/or voting through their by-laws, some were still uncomfortable with this change. Others noted that in the smaller units the ability for clinical faculty to vote might be desirable. A point was also made about serving on graduate committees or whether students voted on these committees. Student voting appeared to vary across units. Acknowledging these concerns it was suggested that perhaps a FAQ be prepared and circulated before the general faculty meeting in an attempt to address any and all concerns. It was then moved and seconded (Bird, A. Marshall) to accept the proposed changes. Unanimously approved.

**FS-11-026:** FSH 1565 – Ranks and Responsibilities. The earlier switch of the terms affiliate and adjunct created a contradiction with the University Constitution (FSH 1520) with regard to associated faculty voting rights. It was moved and seconded (Krug, J. Marshall) to accept the changes as presented. Unanimously approved.
FS-11-029: FSH 3320 Form 1 – Annual Performance Evaluation. The chair reminded Senate of an attempt last fall to remove the example box from Form 1 of the faculty evaluation form because it appeared to cause confusion. However, within that box language on how rounding decimal points is now felt best to keep, thus this has come back before Senate. Considerable discussion followed from removal of the example box to a lengthy, detailed and confusing dialog on the weighted score, the decimal, rounding and where to round. Some did not like the option to use decimals saying it would cause inconsistencies at the university review level and preferred an across the board requirement. Others having recently filled out several of these forms found the example box to be quite helpful and asked if it could be somehow preserved? The provost said that it could be put on the letter sent out by his office.

Senate then embarked on an all too familiar discussion to this scribe of mathematical mania on decimals, their proper use, their placement, at what point does one round up or down, was this rounding to one decimal place or whole integers as the term “may” indicates, etc. A motion being made brought about further discussion prompting several amendments to the motion. Discussion ranged from the statistical likelihood of landing exactly on .5, many numbers occur between integers, did rounding occur at .05 or .5, does 3.45 drop back to 3 or 3.4 or 3.45, or 3.5 and a word of caution from one senator that we must be careful as there have been cases where the rounding has gone wrong. It was noted that the earlier attempt to go from a 9 point system to 5 with the decimal allowance has taken us to a 50 point system and thus we should get rid of decimals. After several determined and valiant attempts to amend the main motion and its success at passing unlikely, the motion was withdrawn.

Adjournment: Having unsuccessfully presented a previous motion with various amendments, Senator Fairley swiftly moved for what was sure to receive unanimous consent, a motion to adjourn. This motion was immediately seconded by Senator A. Marshall with Senate enthusiastically and unanimously approving this motion to adjourn at 5:10 p.m.

Ann Thompson
Assistant to the Faculty Secretary and Scribe
BORAH FOUNDATION COMMITTEE

A. FUNCTION. To outline and execute a continuing program to achieve the objectives of the foundation established at UI in memory of United States Senator William E. Borah. In accordance with those objectives, the Borah Foundation Committee will sponsor programs and projects focusing on understanding the causes of war and the conditions that contribute to peace.

B. STRUCTURE. Eight faculty members, two staff, four students, and (without vote) the director of the Martin Institute for Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution. This committee requires a heavy time commitment; as such, elected members will serve two year terms. The Borah Foundation Committee meets weekly and elects its own chair. Service on this committee requires a large commitment of time and effort. The Borah Foundation Committee members serve from April 1st of the year of appointment.
WHEREAS, a university or college campus serves as a gathering place for a wide variety of people, activities and events; and

WHEREAS, maintaining safety on university and college campuses in Idaho is a common goal among all interested parties; and

WHEREAS, firearms policy and procedures play a significant role in determining the level of safety on university and college campuses; and

WHEREAS, each university and college in Idaho possesses unique geographic, physical, financial, human and community characteristics that impact safety procedures; and

WHEREAS, the University of Idaho Faculty Senate takes the position that a critical tool for maintaining safety on university and college campuses lies in the ability of individual universities, in collaboration with local government, law enforcement and citizens to customize firearms policy to fit the unique characteristics of their institution, campus and community;

WHEREAS, the unrestricted carrying of firearms on campus – either openly or concealed – by anyone except law enforcement officers would be contrary to the university’s goal of providing a supportive environment for civil dialogue and the exchange of ideas; therefore, be it

RESOLVED that the University of Idaho Faculty Senate recommends that the Idaho Senate State Affairs Committee, Idaho State Senators, and Idaho Governor C. L. “Butch” Otter oppose HB 222; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the University of Idaho Faculty Senate supports existing statutes and the public opinions of Idaho law enforcement that promote the value of local decision making in forming policies and procedures that underpin safety for all university employees, students and visitors to campus.