University of Idaho  
2009-2010  
FACULTY SENATE AGENDA  

Meeting #21  

3:30 p.m.  
Tuesday, February 23, 2010  
BRINK HALL FACULTY LOUNGE  

Order of Business  

I. Call to Order.  

II. Minutes.  
   - Minutes of the 2009-10 Faculty Senate Meeting #20, February 16, 2010  

III. Chair’s Report.  

IV. Provost’s Report.  

V. Other Announcements and Communications.  
   - Art & Architecture forthcoming NOI (Hoverston)  
   - FS-10-036: Discussion – Distinguished Professorship  
   - 2:30 start-time for Faculty Senate beginning Fall 2010 (follow-up of meeting #12)  

VI. Committee Reports.  

VII. Special Orders.  

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.  
   - Furloughs discussion – benefits status  

IX. New Business.  

X. Adjournment.  

Professor Jack Miller, Chair 2009-2010, Faculty Senate
Present: Baird, Christiansen (for Baker, w/o vote), Battaglia, Edwards, Eveleth, Fritz, Geist, Graden, Guilfoyle, Hill (w/o vote), Horn, Huber, Hume (for Joyce w/o vote), Limbaugh, Marshall, Mihelich, Murphy, Stark, Williams, Wilson. Campus-Centers Senators: Budwig (Boise), Dakins (Idaho Falls), Newcombe (Coeur d’Alene). Absent: Baillargeon, Baker, Barlow, Holbrook, Joyce, Miller, Padaghm-Albrecht. 6 guests.

A quorum being present, the Chair opened the meeting a little late at 3:38 p.m. as there had been a technical problem in connecting to the Centers.

Minutes: It was moved (Battaglia/Horn) to accept the minutes of meeting #19 of the Faculty Senate. Approved.

Chair’s Report: The Vice-Chair was chairing the meeting today as Professor Miller was in Boise for the SBOE meeting.

The Vice-Chair noted that materials would be sent out with the agenda for the next meeting that outlined a proposal for policy that outlines establishment of appointment at the level of Distinguished Professor at UI. This item had been referred to FAC for their recommendations. The FAC had not forwarded the item to senate as a seconded motion as they wished neither to support nor deny the proposal. However, there were elements of the draft upon which the committee wished to comment and this information will be forwarded to senators with the draft policy proposal.

The Vice-Chair then invited Mike McCollough, Director of the Vandal Innovation and Enterprise Works [VIEW] program to present the VIEW Annual Business Plan Competition. This initiative is designed to stimulate the entrepreneurial culture of UI with the aim of engaging broad UI community participation. The VIEW annual Business Plan Competition will include – for the first time – a competition track that is open to members of the University community focused on internal revenue enhancement for the institution, or "intrapreneurship." These will be plan proposals developed by members of our community for our own community. The plans would outline ways to increase revenues and/or lower expenses for the University, while at the same time enhance the institution's ability to fulfill its mission. The Internal Revenue Enhancement track competition is open to all University of Idaho faculty, staff and administrators, and to students who are enrolled during spring semester 2010; individuals, as well as teams may enter. Any plan that emphasizes revenue enhancement and/or expense control and return on investment can be developed and submitted according to the competition guidelines, which are available online at www.uidaho.edu/view. The plans will be vetted through a series of judging rounds culminating with a final round on May 1. The first deadline is March 1 to provide a notice of intent to submit a plan, with final plans due on April 21. Plans will be judged by a panel of external business industry representatives, who may be managers, business owners or venture capitalists. The winning plan(s) in this track will be eligible for total awards of $10,000, which the president's office will provide from non-state funds to launch this venture. The College of Business and Economics will develop private funding to support the awards for this track in subsequent years. Business plans that receive recognition in this track will be forwarded to the administration for further consideration of implementation.

Provost’s Report: The Provost was traveling on University business and was represented by Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs, Jeanne Christiansen. Appreciation was expressed for the efforts of the student leadership in contributing to the student fee setting process.
FS-10-033 - Partner Accommodation: Note: Senator Geist withdrew from the discussion of this item. Vice-Chair Eveleth noted that there had been a long lapse of time since the partner accommodation draft policy had been discussed and the plan was to allow staff affairs to work with present FAC Chair, Professor Locke and past FAC Chair, Professor Crowley to incorporate suggestions before the issue came back to senate for vote on March 9. The Vice-Chair then invited former FAC Chair Crowley to address senate. Professor Crowley was well acquainted with its history and progress. FAC had originally passed the version before the senate in January 2008. It had gone forward to the General Counsel before being discussed at senate as there was an issue with the term “partner” accommodation rather than “spousal” accommodation, the former term apparently being inconsistent with state law.

This version of the draft policy had not been returned to the senate from the General Counsel’s office and the senate chair had asked that senate wait no longer and proceed with a recommendation on the issue. The longer history of the issue began when a spousal accommodation policy was passed by the Faculty Council in the late 1980’s. In a subsequent General Faculty Meeting the issue met with considerable discussion as there was no allowance for staff input at that time and many faculty felt that in that form, it may disadvantage staff and as a result the policy was defeated at the GFM.

In the more recent form, the FAC had sought input from staff and Professor Crowley believed that it was receiving broad support. The present process would ensure that the Staff Affairs Committee had the opportunity to provide input to senate. He went on to note that it was University policy to be non-discriminatory and that the use of the term “spousal” accommodation was discriminatory, whereas “partner” accommodation was not. It was up to the University to adopt the moral high-ground and show leadership in the Idaho community by being proactively non-discriminatory in this process of policy development.

Discussion: Two senators who were absent today had indicated to the Vice-Chair that their constituents were generally in favor of the draft policy in its present form. Another senator found that constituents were split about half in favor and half against. Those against were concerned about the previous version from the 1980’s that was not favored by staff.

Another view was that partner accommodation does happen sporadically but there is no policy to guide the process. There was also general support for the policy from other constituents 13/14. It was noted that the issue had been incorporated in part into a recent NSF “Advance” grant proposal designed to provide support for female faculty. President Nellis was the Executive PI on the proposal. Research for the proposal revealed that a Stanford University study had developed “best practices” for implementing partner accommodation. One recommendation was that a senior faculty reporting to the Provost should provide oversight of a process of partner accommodation to provide uniformity of principles in dealing with the issue. There were many complexities and subtleties that in many ways determined that development and crafting of suitable policy was somewhat problematic.

Other questions addressed the relative resources available to smaller institutions versus a strongly funded institution such as Stanford and how the availability of funds affected development of such policies. In addition, what were the standards for admission of a person to a second position? In Section C1, the term “competent” is used. Who would determine whether the person was “competent”? Admission to a second position would be determined by a search committee and the same standards would be applied to the appointment.

In the present economic climate, how could there be funding available to support appointments of second positions? Professor Crowley noted that in its present form, there was nothing in the draft policy that would compel units to provide a second position. Rather, the policy would set the guidelines for offering a second position if the decision was to make such an offer. Others also noted the difficulties of offering second positions during the present, difficult economic climate.
Language in the policy also would allow consideration of present employees as well as prospective new employees. It was further noted that if the policy were to be implemented that a funding pool to support temporary appointment of a second position would be essential.

It was further suggested that the wording in Section C should be changed – from “faculty member’s” to “employee’s”, thus “Human Resources shall assign a staff member who will be responsible for aiding an employee’s faculty member’s partner in finding local employment”.

The Vice-Chair indicated that senators could expect to see edited and updated versions of the draft policy following input from Staff Affairs and following other suggestions from the UI community.

**FS-10-034** – FSH 1640 - Committee Directory. Vice-Chair Eveleth who also serves as Chair of Committee on Committees introduced the changes. Discussion of changes to UCGE structure focused upon whether the changes in faculty representation were more or less restrictive. It was noted that there was now broader representation of the colleges and that some faculty could fill dual roles such as for example being a college representative and a Core Discovery instructor representative. Other changes to the policy were mostly minor editorials and updates of position titles.

A friendly amendment was suggested to the wording of *ex officio* positions described in the Administrative Hearing Board section, to include “without vote”. Professor Eveleth accepted the friendly amendment. There being no further discussion, the question was called. Approved unanimously.

**FS-10-035** – FSH 1620 University Level Committees. Changes to this policy included wording to cover appointment process for committee chairs. Generally they were appointed by Committee on Committees unless otherwise noted in the policy. Thus wording was included in B7: “Unless otherwise noted within the structure of a committee in FSH 1640, chairs are selected by the Committee on Committees. The chairs of faculty standing committees generally are rotated so that no committee comes to be identified with one person.” The only other changes were updates of the term “Faculty Council” to “Faculty Senate”. There being no further discussion, the question was called. Approved unanimously.

**Adjournment**: It was moved (Wilson/Marshall) to adjourn at 4:37 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Rodney A. Hill, Faculty Secretary and
Secretary to Faculty Senate
The attached Distinguished Professor proposal should be treated as a new matter rather than a seconded motion as Faculty Affairs did not recommend the proposal. Email from Committee Chair Ken Locke:

“While we still do not favor implementing the proposal at this time, we also do not oppose the Faculty Senate pursuing the proposal. If Faculty Senate considers the proposal, then we would like to offer the following suggestions. (1) Increase the stipend to between $10,000 and $15,000 per year, even if this means only conferring 1-2 awards per year until the university’s finances improve. (2) Mention intramural service in the selection criteria, as shown in the attached document. (3) Streamline the selection process. We estimated that the current process would require at least 30 hours per candidate (totaling the time spent by the nominator, candidate, deans and unit administrators, various students and colleagues writing letters of support, and the seven-person selection committee), and thus (depending on the number of candidates) could cost the university hundreds of hours of lost time.”
UNIVERSITY DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR

The acknowledgment of outstanding academic contributions to the university is appropriate and desirable. The title of University Distinguished Professor will be bestowed upon University of Idaho faculty in recognition of sustained excellence in teaching, scholarship, and outreach, and service. The title will be held for the remainder of the recipient’s active service at the University of Idaho; if the recipient retires while still employed by the University of Idaho, the title University Distinguished Professor Emeritus will be conferred upon retirement. The title is meant to be highly honorific and therefore will be conferred on no more than three faculty members university-wide in any given academic year. Selection of University Distinguished Professors will reflect the diversity of scholarly fields at the University of Idaho. University Distinguished Faculty will receive a stipend of $5000 per year for five years to be used to enhance salary or support professional activities (e.g., professional travel, student support, equipment, materials and supplies, etc.). No more than 3% of the total active faculty may hold the title with stipend at any time.

Criteria for Selecting University Distinguished Professors

In general, University Distinguished Professors will have received national and usually international recognition. They will have brought distinction to the University of Idaho via their activities.

Specifically, a University Distinguished Professor will have achieved a superior record, as judged by peers, in at least two of the following areas: scholarly, creative, and artistic achievement; breadth and depth of teaching in their discipline; and university service and public service involving the application of scholarship, creative, or artistic activities addressing the needs of one or more external publics.

University Distinguished Professorships will be conferred on members of the UI Faculty who have already attained the rank of Professor. There is no rigid time period between promotion to Professor and designation as University Distinguished Faculty. However, only faculty who have served at the UI a minimum of seven years are eligible. The title University Distinguished Professor is not to be used for recruiting outsiders. The candidate must not currently hold an endowed chair, professorship, or faculty fellowship.

Selection Process

University Distinguished Professorships will be awarded by the State Board of Education upon recommendation of the Provost and President. An advisory committee of deans and faculty will assist the Provost and President in making their recommendations. The composition of the committee should reflect all dimensions of diversity in the university community. The committee will be appointed by the Provost and will serve three-year terms on a staggered basis. Nominations for committee members will be made by Faculty Council and the Academic Deans, in consultation with faculty and administrators of departments and schools. Committee members must be tenured professors who themselves have outstanding records of teaching, research and/or outreach.

1. Each year the Provost will determine the maximum number of conferrals of the title University Distinguished Professor permitted for that year (three in most cases but eventually may be less depending on retirements and resignations among existing holders of the title) and then request nominations from faculty, deans, directors and department heads.

2. Written nominations will be submitted to the Provost and will include:

   a. A cover letter making the nomination and providing a brief summary of the candidate’s achievements;

   b. The candidate’s curriculum vitae, including a list of any significant previous awards;

   c. A personal statement of the candidate’s approach to teaching, scholarship and/or outreach;

   d. A signed letter of support from at least one faculty member from another institution.

   e. The candidate’s curriculum vitae, including a list of any significant previous awards.

Comment [k1]: If service is not included, then a full professor working towards this title would be advised to avoid all service responsibilities.

Comment [k2]: Redundant if stipend given to no more than 3 faculty members and term is five years.

Comment [k3]: See comment 1 above.

Comment [k4]: We deleted or condensed the following sections to reduce the burden on everyone involved.

1 As a result of Development Fund efforts, endowment support eventually may be obtained for many University Distinguished Fellowships, in which case a name may be added to the title.

2 Scholarship in this context includes scholarship of discovery, scholarship of pedagogy, scholarship of application and integration, and artistic creativity.
d. A small but representative selection of the candidate’s achievements which could include published papers, works of art, recordings of performances, course materials, etc.;

c. Letters of endorsement from the appropriate deans and department heads or directors. These administrators will consult with department, school, or college advisory committees as appropriate before endorsing the nominations. The candidate also may include letters of support, as appropriate, from students or from colleagues at the University of Idaho or other institutions.

d. Letters of support from faculty and other colleagues at the University of Idaho and especially other institutions (academic, governmental or industrial as appropriate), evaluating the candidate’s record in teaching, scholarship or outreach.

e. Letters of support from present and former students where appropriate.

The nomination materials should be compiled in the same way as tenure and promotion dossiers.

3. A standing advisory committee composed of four faculty members and three deans will review the nominations and make recommendations to the Provost for transmittal to the President.

4. Because the title University Distinguished Professorship is intended to be highly honorific, it is possible that in a given year no suitable candidates will be identified.

5. The applications of nominees who are not selected in the first year of nomination will remain active for a total of three years. Nominators will have the opportunity to update their nomination during subsequent years in which their candidate is under consideration.