University of Idaho  
2011-2012 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA  
Meeting #20  
3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, February 28, 2012  
BRINK HALL FACULTY LOUNGE – Moscow  
IWC Room 390 – Boise  
TAB 321 IF4 – Idaho Falls  
 
Order of Business  
I. Call to Order.  
II. Minutes.  
• Minutes of the 2011-12 Faculty Senate Meeting #19, February 21, 2012  
III. Chair’s Report.  
IV. Provost’s Report.  
V. Other Announcements and Communications.  
VI. Committee Reports.  
UCC:  
• FS-12-024: Regulation J-3 (General Education Core) (Price/Shafii) (vote)  
VII. Special Orders.  
• University of Idaho “Flagship” in Mission Statement Resolution (vote)  
VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.  
IX. New Business.  
• FS-12-025: FSH 3520 – Tenure (Joyce)(vote)  
• FS-12-026: FSH 1540 – Standing Rules of University Faculty - Open Meetings (Bird)(vote)  
• FS-12-027: FSH 3560 – University Promotion Committee membership (Provost/Senate Leadership)(vote)  
• FS-12-016rev: (UCC-12-039) Regulations B and C (Krogh)(FYI)  
X. Adjournment.  
 
Professor Paul Joyce, Chair 2011-2012, Faculty Senate  
Attachments: Minutes of 2011-2012 FS Meeting #19  
FS-12-024 (previously distributed)  
Resolution  
FS-12-025, 026, & 027; FS-12-016rev
University of Idaho  
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
2011-2012 Meeting #19, Tuesday, February 21, 2012

Present: Baillargeon, Baker (w/o vote), Barlow, Bathurst, Budwig (Boise), Corry, Dakins (Idaho Falls), Eckwright (w/o vote), Goddard, Halloran, Hartzell, Hasko, Joyce (Chair), Marshall, Miller, Morra, Ostrom, Padgham-Albrecht, Pendegraft, Riesenber, Safaii-Fabiano (Coeur d’Alene), Strawn  
Absent: Aiken, Bird, Bowlick, Garrison, Hopper, Stark  
Guests: 15

A quorum being present, Senate Chair Joyce called the meeting to order at 3:30PM.

Minutes: It was moved and seconded (Marshall, Corry) to approve the minutes of meeting #18. Approved unanimously.

Chair’s Report. The Chair opened his report with a reconstruction of his day last Friday, which began with reading the headlines from the Lewiston Morning Tribune indicating that the State Board of Education (SBOE) had sunk UI’s “flagship,” i.e., removed the term “flagship” from UI’s mission statement. Chair Joyce subsequently:

- Received a phone call from the Idaho Statesman asking for UI faculty reaction to SBOE’s decision.
- Received a phone call from a Coeur d’Alene faculty member upset by the SBOE action.
- Conducted a search of UI’s mission statements back to the ‘80s which revealed that “flagship” was not previously used in UI’s mission statements, including the last mission statement to appear in FSH that was edited in 2007. In UI’s recent work on its mission statement in September 2011, SBOE had approved the inclusion of “flagship,” but now SBOE has removed it.

- UI has contracted with a new company to provide commencement regalia. The deadline for ordering is April 6. For further information: http://www.uidaho.edu/commencement/apparel

Provost’s Report. Provost Baker, who arrived at Senate 5 minutes early, reported on the following items:

UI submitted its year-one report in September to the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) accrediting agency. The report consisted of three pieces: mission, core themes, and measures. Last week NWCCU provided a good response to the UI’s one-year report, encouraging UI to continue with learning outcomes assessment and to fine tune measures used in assessment. Provost Baker commended the work of Senator Jane Baillargeon, Jeanne Christiansen, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Brenda Helbling, Executive Assistant to the Provost, in putting the report together.

Institutional mission and role statements have been a continuing discussion with SBOE. SBOE voted on UI’s mission statement in August 2011 but with the provision that they would revisit mission statements later in the fall. SBOE has been especially interested in finding efficiencies, given the budget reductions of the past years, and was looking to reduce duplication particularly with new programs. During their review SBOE removed “flagship” and “from UI’s mission – perhaps because SBOE views “flagship” as meaning “best” and they do not want one institution to have superiority over another? President Nellis was very clear in his opposition to the removal of “flagship” from UI’s mission. Provost Baker would argue that “flagship” represents mission and missions are different across the schools. UI is the leader in graduate education, in research and in graduation rates and we have been doing that for 123 years – we are the “flagship” institution. While it was disappointing for SBOE to remove “flagship” from UI’s mission, it has become a rallying point for UI with very positive responses from alumni, faculty, staff and students. Provost Baker added that “flagship” and funding are not necessarily conjoined, but there is some proximity between them. Chair Joyce indicated Senate Leadership could work with UI administration to draft a letter from Faculty Senate in response to this issue.

Lionel Hampton Jazz Festival, in its 40th year, takes place this week and brings approximately 10,000 people to the Moscow campus. UI’s Jazz Festival was the recipient of the National Medal of Arts award – UI is the only public university and flagship institution to win this prestigious award.
Other Announcements and Communications. Chair Joyce invited leaders of UI’s interdisciplinary group to give a presentation about their programs and recent changes in the reporting structure. Dr. Jan Boll, Director of Environmental and Water Resources program, Professor Stephen Drown, Interim Director of Bioregional Planning and Community Design program, Dr. Paul Joyce, Director of Bioinformatics and Computational Biology program, and Dr. Terry Soule, Director of Neuroscience briefly described their programs as follows:

- **Boll** gave an overview of interdisciplinary programs:
  - UI is becoming a more collaborative university, which is beneficial to students and faculty. Interdisciplinary programs are problem-solving-based and faculty are excited to get together and work through process and procedures that may not happen with a university-wide approach.
  - In the past these programs had reported to the College of Graduate Studies (CoGS), but in the new reporting structure they are overseen by a council of deans. This structure has been in place since fall 2011 and makes it easier for program directors to work directly with the deans involved, although it has been a challenge to get all 8 council deans together for meetings.
  - CoGS curriculum committee has not been meeting and needs to figure out how to keep that going.
  - The environmental sciences program is the only interdisciplinary program available to undergraduate students.

- **Drown** described the Building Sustainable Communities Initiative:
  - 7 faculty members from 6 colleges are involved.
  - Great deal of interest in interdisciplinary planning and concept of bioregional planning.
  - Participate in communities’ long term planning across the state.

- **Soule** referred Senators to the neuroscience program website: [http://www.uidaho.edu/cogs/cogsdegrees/neuroscience](http://www.uidaho.edu/cogs/cogsdegrees/neuroscience)
  - Began in 2003.
  - Faculty across UI were doing research involving neuroscience.
  - Very successful interdisciplinary research relationships give faculty competitive advantages in terms of research and grants.

- **Joyce** spoke briefly about the Bioinformatics and Computational Biology program:
  - Began in 2003.
  - All graduate students in the program are fully supported Research Assistants (RA).
  - Faculty representation in the program comes from nearly all colleges.
  - Students in the program currently are involved in approximately $40 million in grants and have been in involved with nearly $80 million since the program’s inception.
  - BCB estimates that for every dollar spent UI receives a 130-fold return on the investment.
  - Interdisciplinary programs build synergy across the campus and save UI money that it would otherwise spend on creating new departments.

In answer to a senator’s question about funding, it was noted that because the environmental science program has an undergraduate degree it obtains some general education funds to support it, unlike the others.

 Provost Baker added that with the previous organizational structure, directors of interdisciplinary programs were required to work with the dean of CoGS and other deans on an individual basis. The new structure allows for focal deans to work with a subcommittee on specific interdisciplinary programs. The deans will be studying the effectiveness of the new structure at the next deans’ meeting.

RA/TA Policy. Chair Joyce invited Keith Ickes, Executive Director for Planning and Budget, Dr. Jie Chen, Dean of the College of Graduate Studies, and Jack McIver, Vice President for Research and Economic Development, to begin the discussion about a new Research Assistants/Teaching Assistants tuition waiver policy.

Ickes explained that this proposed policy came about as a result of a systemic look at UI’s finances particularly the general education budget, which comes from state funding and tuition:
Two years ago UI was giving out $16 million in undergraduate out-of-state tuition (OST) waivers for the Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE) program.

- Made adjustments to the WUE program last year.
- Fall 2011 UI increased enrollment by 10 students, but gained nearly $2.8 million in additional net revenue, before adding on the tuition increase.

In the process of systematic review the next item was the use of waivers in graduate programs.

- Approximately $5.4 million at this time.
- In the past no one reviewed the numbers – awarding of waivers had been on “autopilot” (automatically given with no questions asked)
- Needed to find a way to manage $5.4 million in waivers.
- New process needed to understand how many dollars are being given out.

Chen provided the following information:

- UI is not looking at reducing TA OST waivers.
- UI budgeted $2.6 million for waivers this year.
- This proposed process for tracking TA OST waivers will provides accurate information regarding the number of TA waivers and how many we need.
- Current TA support at UI consists of OST waivers, in-state fellowships and stipends.
- Also need to establish good definitions for “TA” and “RA” as part of this process.
- Ultimate goal is to establish a package for each TA.

McIver presented the following information:

- In most cases a portion of RAs are paid from grants by contractual arrangement and all contractual arrangements are handled through the research office.
- RAs currently in place will continue next year.
- Research office will survey colleges and departments in order to collect data on waivers.

McIver, Ickes and Chen provided the following information in response to Senators’ questions and comments:

- McIver manages RAs, Chen manages TAs.
- CoGS is working with the research office regarding funding for RAs.
- The “Graduate Waivers – Summary of Changes” is still a draft proposal at this time and is not yet institutional policy.
- 70-75% of students on assistance are out-of-state; out-of-state students are very important to UI’s graduate program.
- UI benefits from the Idaho state funding formula which says it’s 10 times more expensive to teach doctoral engineering students than history undergraduates.
- Current deadline for implementation is April 1, but that is not a hard deadline – could be moved back to June or July.
- McIver is willing to talk to colleges and/or units about the draft proposal.

In closing out this lengthy discussion, Chair Joyce pointed out that the proposed changes to the TA program are procedural changes with the amount of funding and the number of TAs remaining constant. The proposed changes to the RA program, however, are more substantial and the timeline for the implementation of the RA changes is too aggressive.

Adjournment: It was moved and seconded (Marshall, Padgham-Albrecht) to adjourn at 5PM. Approved unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Gail Z. Eckwright
Faculty Secretary
RESOLUTION
by the Faculty Senate
of the University of Idaho

WHEREAS the University of Idaho ("University") was established to serve the entire state under the provisions of the Morrill Act of 1862;

WHEREAS the University was chartered in 1889 by the Idaho Territorial Legislature and was recognized in the state Constitution adopted when Idaho was admitted to the Union in 1890;

WHEREAS the University opened its doors on October 3, 1892, and graduated its first class in 1896;

WHEREAS in the succeeding 115 years, the University has awarded more than 100,000 degrees;

WHEREAS the University annually attracts more than $100 million each year in grants and contracts to fund innovative research;

WHEREAS the University enrolls a record number of National Merit Scholars, first among public institutions of higher education in the Northwest;

WHEREAS the University is considered by its peers to be Idaho’s flagship institution, by virtue of its primacy, its statewide mission and the scope of its graduate and professional programs, consistent with commonly accepted criteria for such universities;

WHEREAS its status as a flagship institution enhances the University’s ability to attract top students, staff and faculty from across the country and around the world;

WHEREAS the people of Idaho recognize this status, just as they acknowledge the unique roles and missions of the other state-supported institutions of higher education;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate expresses its profound disappointment at the February 16, 2012, decision of the University’s Board of Regents and State Board of Education to remove the word “flagship” from the University of Idaho’s Mission Statement.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate calls upon the Regents to reconsider this decision at their April 2012 meeting in Moscow.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Secretary be directed to send copies of this resolution to each member of the Board of Regents, to the Board’s executive director and to the news media in Idaho.

ADOPTED this 28th day of February, 2012.

Signed: Paul Joyce, Chair of the Senate

Attest: Gail Z. Eckwright, Faculty Secretary
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Briefly explain the purpose/reason of proposed addition, revision, and/or deletion to the Faculty/Staff Handbook or the Administrative Procedures Manual.

1. **Student membership:**

   Regents policy simply states that students be included on tenure committees and university policy states no less than 25% and no more than 50%. In smaller units the use of a percentage minimum of 25% creates a larger number of students than is necessary.
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FACULTY TENURE

PREAMBLE: This section defines tenure and sets out the procedure by which a faculty member is evaluated, at the department, college, and university level, for a possible award of tenure. In general, the material gathered here was all an original part of the 1979 Handbook. The material that provides the first sentence of what is now subsection F, H-1, I-1 through I-3 was added in July 1987. At that time what is now subsection D (criteria for tenure) and subsections I-4 and J-1 (specifying review at the university level) were added and what is now H-4 (concerning the formal tenure-review process) greatly enlarged. Substantial revisions to D, H-3, H-4, H-5, and I-4 were made in July 1998. The tenurability of lecturers and senior instructors was clarified (Section E) in July 2001. Subsections F, G, and H were revised and J-3 added in July 2002, G-1 and H-3 were substantially revised July 2005. In July 2007 the form underwent substantial revisions to address enforcement and accountability issues in the UI promotion and tenure process as well as align the form with the Strategic Action Plan. Minor rearrangements and clarifications were made January 2008. In January 2010 this section was again revised to reflect changes in the faculty position description and evaluation forms intended to simplify the forms while better integrating faculty interdisciplinary activities into the evaluation process. In July 2011 changes to F-9 were made to make automatic the one year extension for childbirth/adoptive. Except where specifically noted, the rest of the text was written in July 1996. More information may be obtained from the Provost’s Office (208-885-6448). [ed. 7-97, 7-02, rev. 7-98, 7-01, 7-02, 7-05, 7-07, 1-08, 1-10]

CONTENTS:

A. General
B. Definitions
C. Criteria for Tenure
D. Tenurable Ranks
E. Tenure Eligibility
F. Time Requirements for Tenure
G. Evaluation for Tenure
H. Review of Evaluations at the College Level
I. Review of Evaluations at the University Level

A. NO CHANGES HAVE BEEN MADE FROM A THROUGH G-4.

G-5. Formal Tenure Review.

a. The formal evaluation for tenure requires assessing the faculty member’s performance in meeting the criteria for tenure. To initiate the formal evaluation for the granting of tenure to a faculty member, the unit administrator (or college dean if the unit administrator is under consideration for tenure) obtains the position descriptions and annual evaluations (including all narratives) for the relevant period, the third-year review (all maintained in the unit office), the professional portfolio (from the faculty member, see FSH 3570), summary scores of student evaluations from all classes taught (Institutional Research and Assessment), and the curriculum vitae and reviews all of the previous listed documentation for its completeness and accuracy with the candidate. [rev. 7-98, 7-02, 1-08, 1-10]

b. The unit administrator will request an evaluation of the candidate’s performance from three to five appropriate external reviewers, who should include tenured faculty at peer institutions. Persons asked to write peer reviews should be at, or above, the rank the candidate is seeking. The names of at least two of these reviewers will be selected from a list suggested by the candidate. See also External Peer Review Guidelines on the Provost website at http://www.uidaho.edu/provost/policyguidelines/tenure.) Final selection of external reviewers should take place at the unit level, in accordance with college policy. The letter of request will include the candidate’s curriculum vitae, position descriptions (including narratives) for the relevant period, the professional portfolio,
and up to four examples of the candidate’s scholarly work. In addition, the letter of request shall include instructions that the candidate be evaluated in relation to the candidate’s personal context statement and unit and college criteria. When all deliberations within the university have been completed, the external reviewers’ evaluations will be shown to the faculty member after every effort has been made to ensure the reviewer’s anonymity. [add. 7-98, rev. 7-02, 1-08, 1-10]

c. Copies of position descriptions, unit tenure criteria, annual evaluations including all narratives, the third-year review (if applicable), the professional portfolio, summary scores of the student evaluations, the curriculum vitae, and external peer review letters are forwarded to each person participating in the review at the unit and higher levels. Supplementary material, if any, shall be available for review in the unit office. The results of the student evaluations of teaching must be carefully weighed and used as a factor in assessing the teaching component in tenure determinations. The unit administrator making the recommendation concerning tenure will solicit, and address in his/her summary, the evaluative comments regarding the candidate from all tenured faculty members of the unit, and from interdisciplinary program directors and center administrators (if applicable), and from the unit tenure-recommending committee (see G-5-d). The unit administrator’s summary should assess the candidate’s record in light of the criteria established at the unit, college and university level. Any person having a familial or other similar significant relationship with the candidate is not permitted to serve in any capacity in the review process. Each unit is responsible for developing procedures in its bylaws that meet the requirements of this subsection (unit bylaws are subject to review and approval by the provost, see FSH 1590). A copy of the form to be used in transmitting the recommendations made at each stage of evaluation for tenure appears as the last two pages of this section. [See also FSH 3380 D.] [rev. 7-98, 7-02, 1-08, 1-10]

d. The unit tenure-recommending committee includes the following, each with full vote: one or more tenured faculty members, one or more nontenured faculty members, one or more persons from outside the unit, and, in cases involving the evaluation or review of members of the instructional faculty, one or more students sufficient to ensure equity of representation and who have had experience in the unit with which the faculty member being evaluated is associated. In cases involving the evaluation of individuals involved significantly in interdisciplinary activities, one or more members of the appropriate interdisciplinary program(s) faculty shall be included on the committee. Students are to comprise no less than 25 percent and no more than 50 percent of the committee. No faculty member serves on the unit tenure-recommending committee when it is considering his or her own case. The dean is excluded from the unit committee’s process. Each unit is responsible for developing procedures, including protocols for voting, in its bylaws that meet the requirements of this subsection (unit bylaws are subject to review and approval by the provost, see FSH 1590). [rev. and ren. 1-08, rev. 1-10]
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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.

This change is intended to clarify attendance and participation by non-faculty members in meetings of the University Faculty. It recognizes that students, non-faculty administrators, staff, journalists and the general public regularly attend and observe these meetings. The current policy, which limits attendance by nonmembers, is inconsistent with the spirit of Idaho’s Open Meeting Law and with current practice. By establishing procedures for nonmembers to participate, this change provides clear guidelines for those who might wish to address the faculty.

II. **Fiscal Impact:** What fiscal impact, if any, will this addition, revision, or deletion have?
None known.

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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STANDING RULES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY

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. In 2009 constitutional changes giving off-campus faculty voting rights at faculty meetings necessitated adding venue determination to A. In July 2011 processes were clarified and updated to current practice and again in January 2012. For further information, consult the Office of the Faculty Secretary (208-885-6151). [ed. 7-97, rev. 7-09, 7-11, 1-12]

CONTENTS:

A. Voting Privilege
B. Referral of Catalog-Change Proposals
C. Circulation of Curricular and Policy Proposals
D. Admission of Nonmembers to Faculty Meetings
E. Procedures for First Fall Meeting
F. Minutes
G. Identification of Speakers

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 and adjunct faculty, staff, students, and others may be permitted to participate in faculty meetings in an advisory capacity only, and they may serve as voting members of committees (see FSH 1520 Article II, Section 3 for affiliate voting rights). [rev. 1-12]

A-1. Venue Determination. Remote sites that seek full participation at faculty meetings must submit to the Office of the Faculty Secretary by April 15th (when senate elections are due) a participation form for approval of their venue by Faculty Senate. The form is available on the Faculty Senate website under University Faculty Meetings. (see also 1520, III-1-A). [add. 7-09, ed. 7-11, rev. 1-12]

B. REFERRAL OF CATALOG-CHANGE PROPOSALS. When substantive catalog changes of a curricular nature that have not been considered by the University Curriculum Committee are presented directly to the university faculty, such proposals are referred automatically to the University Curriculum Committee for study and recommendation.

C. CIRCULATION OF CURRICULAR AND POLICY PROPOSALS.

C-1. Routine Catalog-Change Proposals. Additions, deletions, and changes of courses and changes in existing curricula may, after approval by the University Curriculum Committee, be circulated in a general curriculum report (GCR) to the faculty for consideration and published at an appropriate UI web-site. [ed. 7-02, rev. 7-11]

C-2. Policy-Change Proposals. Proposals that affect university policy see FSH 1460. General university academic requirements, e.g., those in part 3 of the catalog, or that concern the addition or expansion of instructional programs may, after approval by the Faculty Senate, be circulated in a general policy report (GPR) to the faculty for consideration. The report is also published on the Faculty Senate web-site and its publication announced through electronic means to the faculty. [ed. 7-02, 7-09, rev. 7-11]
C-3. Actions of the University Curriculum Committee and of the Faculty Senate that are circulated in general curriculum-policy reports (C-1 and C-2) are considered to have the necessary faculty approvals unless a petition requesting further consideration of specific items is signed by five faculty members and submitted to the chair of the Faculty Senate within 14 calendar days after the date of circulation. If no petition is received within 14 days, the entire report is submitted to the president for approval and transmittal to the regents, if regents’ action is required. [ed. 7-09, 7-11]

C-4. If a petition is received, the items in the report for which further consideration is requested will be referred to the Faculty Senate, and the remainder of the report will move forward. On items referred to it, the Senate may (a) affirm the action and report it to a meeting of the university faculty, (b) amend the action and report it to a meeting of the university faculty, or (c) rescind the action. [NOTE: If a petition concerns courses or curricula in the College of Letters and Science or in the College of Agriculture, and is signed by five faculty members of the respective college, those items will be returned to the college concerned for further consideration.] [ed. 7-09]

C-5. Faculty Approval. Any policy item approved by Senate and not circulated on a general policy report will be included in the agenda of the next appropriate university faculty meeting for faculty approval. Items approved at a university faculty meeting are forwarded to the president for approval and transmittal to the regents, if regents’ action is required. See 1420 A-1 c. for time periods for presidential action on Faculty Senate items. [add. 7-11]

C-6. Interim Approval. If there is insufficient opportunity for the faculty to act on a routine catalog-change proposal [see C-1] between the time of its approval by the University Curriculum Committee and the date that it is to be effective, it may be reported directly to the president. Upon approval by the president, the change will be considered temporarily approved for implementation. Such interim approval is valid only until the end of the succeeding semester. Actions thus approved will be reported to the faculty at the earliest possible time, either in the agenda for a faculty meeting or in a general curriculum-policy report. Continuing approval of the change is subject to ratification at a faculty meeting or by the procedures described in C-3 and C-4. (To illustrate: Late in the spring semester, the University Curriculum Committee approves a routine catalog change that is to be effective during the next fall semester. That action is reported to the president and, if approved by the president, the change can be put into effect. If it is included in a curriculum-policy report that is circulated to the resident faculty early in the fall semester, the approval of the change may, by means of the steps outlined in C-3 and C-4, become permanent or it may be terminated at the end of that semester. Alternatively, the faculty may take either of these actions in a meeting if the change is included in the agenda.) [ren. 7-11]

D. ADMISSION, ATTENDANCE AND PARTICIPATION OF NONMEMBERS INTO FACULTY MEETINGS. Nonmembers are allowed to attend and may be admitted to participate in meetings of the university faculty under the following conditions:

D-1. Student government leaders, specifically the ASUI president, vice president, attorney general, and members of the ASUI Senate, may attend meetings of the university faculty. The presiding officer must be informed of the names of four of their number who may speak for the group at any particular meeting.

D-2. Two representatives from each campus or other news medium, designated to the presiding officer by the editor or manager, as applicable, may attend meetings of the university faculty as auditors.

D-3. Members of the Faculty Senate or of university-level committees who are not members of the university faculty may attend meetings of the university faculty at which proposals of the Senate or of their committees are being considered. They may speak only on issues presented by the body on which they serve. [ed. 7-09]

D-4. Under unusual circumstances any nonmember may submit a request to the Faculty Senate, through the Faculty Secretary. The request must be received at least two days prior to the meeting, and must identify the purpose for participation including a description of the focus of the request. The request may be granted at the discretion of the Faculty Secretary, after such consultation with Faculty Senate Leadership as the Faculty Secretary sees fit. [ed. 7-09, rev. 7-12]
E. PROCEDURES FOR FIRST FALL MEETING.

E-1. Substantive policy matters are not included in the agenda for the first fall meeting of the university faculty unless emergency action is needed on particular items.

E-2. To expedite the proceedings, each new member of the resident faculty is introduced by name and department only. The person's name, degrees, past experience, new assignment, campus telephone number, and the location of his or her office are supplied by each dean or division head to the president’s office well ahead of the meeting. The president’s office compiles the information by colleges or similar units and distributes it at the meeting. [7-02]

F. MINUTES. Minutes of the meetings of the university faculty, constituent faculties, and committees are to be sent on a regular basis to the Department of Special Collections and Archives in the University Library.

G. IDENTIFICATION OF SPEAKERS. Those who are recognized by the chair for the purpose of speaking at meetings of the university faculty are to identify themselves by name and discipline or position.
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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.

Change FSH (3560 a and b) to reflect current practice so that CLASS will have 4 nominations and 2 members on the University Promotions Committee. When Art & Architecture was re-established as a college in 2005, the FSH language dealing with CLASS membership on the committee was not readjusted.

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

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.

If not a minor amendment forward to: ____________________________________________

Track # ____________
Date Rec.: ____________
Posted: t-sheet ____________
h/c ____________
web ____________
Register: ____________
(Office Use Only)
FACULTY PROMOTIONS

PREAMBLE: This section discusses promotion in rank and the procedures by which a faculty member is evaluated, at the department, college, and university level, for a possible promotion. In particular the charge of the University Level Promotions Committee is given (subsection G). This section was an original part of the 1979 Handbook and has been revised in very minor ways several times since. In July 1994 it was more substantively revised: subsections A and B were largely rewritten to emphasize the faculty’s responsibility for promotion, G-2 (add a “presumption in favor” of the candidate under certain conditions at the university level) and the last sentence of H (providing feedback to the candidate) added. Again in July 1998 there were substantial revisions to E-2 (making formal the requirement and procedures for an external review), and E-5 and F-5 (providing a feedback loop between candidate and subsequent evaluators). In July 2000 section B was revised to make clear that eligibility for promotion in rank necessitated a history of position descriptions that required activities consistent with the criteria for that rank. In July 2002 section D was edited to clarify promotion schedules at each rank. In July 2007 the form underwent substantial revisions to address enforcement and accountability issues in the UI promotion and tenure process as well as align the form with the Strategic Action Plan. In January 2008 the section underwent some minor editing and revising to bring it into greater conformity with other sections of the Handbook. In January 2010 this section was again revised to reflect changes in the faculty position description and evaluation forms intended to simplify the forms while better integrating faculty interdisciplinary activities into the evaluation process. Except where otherwise noted, the text is as of July 1996. Further information may be obtained from the Provost’s Office (208-885-6448). [rev. 7-00, 7-02, 7-07, 1-08, 1-10]

CONTENTS:

A. General
B. Bases of Evaluation
C. Responsibility
D. Schedule
E. Evaluation and Recommendation at the Unit Level
F. Review of Recommendations at the College Level
G. Review of Recommendations at the University Level
H. Report of Recommendations Forwarded
I. Appeal
J. Annual Timetable for Promotion Consideration

A. NO CHANGES A THROUGH G.

H. REVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS AT THE UNIVERSITY LEVEL BY THE PROMOTIONS REVIEW COMMITTEE. [ren. 1-08]

H-1. All individual recommendations, together with the summary recommendations of the unit administrator, the recommendations of the college committee and those of the dean, including all narratives, are forwarded for review by the provost. Any individually signed recommendations are placed in the faculty member’s personnel file. [rev. 1-08, 1-10]

H-2. A University Promotions Committee of faculty members, chaired by the provost, is named each year. The committee reviews each promotion recommendation with specific reference to university guidelines and to the criteria established by the unit and college of the faculty member concerned and reflected in the faculty member’s position descriptions for the relevant period. This review involves full consideration of the material that was used in making the recommendations at the unit and college levels. [ed. 7-10]
a. One-third of the committee’s membership is randomly selected by the provost from the previous year’s committee; the remaining members are selected by the provost and the chair and vice chair of the Faculty Senate from nominations submitted by the senate. The random selection of carryover members is done one week before the senate makes its nominations. The delegation representing the College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences on Faculty Senate nominates six-four faculty members who should be representative of the breadth of the disciplines within the college. The delegation representing the College of Agricultural & Life Sciences on Faculty Senate nominates four faculty members from the college--two each from (a) faculty with greater than 50% teaching and research appointments and (b) faculty with greater than 50% University of Idaho Extension appointments. The delegations from each of the other colleges and the Faculty-at-Large each nominate two faculty members from their constituencies.

b. Membership of the committee, including carryover members, consists of the provost (chair), three-two representatives from the College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences, two representatives from the College of Agricultural & Life Sciences, one representative from each of the other colleges, the vice president for research, the dean of the college of graduate studies, and the vice provost for academic affairs. The provost, the vice president for research, the dean of the college of graduate studies, and the vice provost for academic affairs shall be ex-officio members without vote. Applications of faculty members being considered for promotion from the University Library, Law Library, Counseling and Testing Center, and the University of Idaho Extension will be represented by the University Promotions Committee’s representative whose own position most closely matches that of the applicant. The names of the members of the University Promotions Committee will be made public as soon as the committee’s recommendations have been forwarded. The chair will conduct voting on candidates by closed ballots. [rev. 7-97,1-10, ed. and ren. 1-08, ed. 7-09]

NO CHANGES FROM HERE ON.
February 20, 2012
Dear Senate Leadership:

I’ve attached a draft of language we believe needs to go back to the Senate for clarification. As you recall, the original proposal was amended from the floor of the Senate, but did not address how students can add courses through the tenth day. We believe we need to have a mechanism for students to do so because they are able to drop through tenth day and will need to ensure a fulltime schedule for the financial aid census date on the tenth day of the term. In order to encourage students to enroll and attend courses from the beginning of the semester, students would need to petition to add any course after the tenth day. This mirrors the intent of the original proposal.

Will you take a look at this language and advise me of next steps? Do you have questions?

I appreciate your time in this.

Thanks, Nancy Krogh
TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Office of the Registrar and Office of Advising
RE: Changes in Registration (Regulations B & C) [Summer 2012]
DATE: February 20, 2012

B - Registration

B-1. Registration Access. Registration access is given to new students as described above. It is also given to students who were previously enrolled within two years of the term in which they wish to register. Former students who have not been enrolled at UI within those two years must be re-admitted by the Undergraduate or Graduate Admissions Office at least one month prior to the term in which they wish to register. Such students will be required to submit transcripts from any institutions attended since their last registration at UI, and they may also be required to complete a residence questionnaire. Failure to meet the deadline may cause a delay in registration. Undergraduate students are required to meet with their academic advisor prior to registration.

B-2. Admission to Classes. Instructors do not admit anyone to class whose name does not appear on the class roster. UI professors are given the authority to grant or deny access to classes by visiting scholars.

B-3. Auditing Classes. Auditing a course consists of attendance without participation or credit. Audited courses will be recorded on a student's permanent record. The permission of the instructor is required before a student may audit a course. Seating preference in a course will be given to students who are completing the course for credit. (See C-2 and C-3 for deadlines)

B-4. Independent Study Courses. A student enrolled in the regular program is permitted to carry independent study courses for college credit only with the prior written approval of his or her academic dean. Credit for correspondence-study courses will not be accepted without such approval.

B-5. Registration for Courses without Completion of Prerequisites. Students who have not completed the prerequisites to a course for which they are otherwise eligible may register for the course with the instructor's approval.

B-6. Registration of Lower-Division Students in Upper-Division Courses. All academic programs give priority in the first two years to meeting the general requirements for the appropriate degree and acquiring the foundation for advanced study; therefore, freshman students may not take upper-division courses. Exceptions may be made for students who have fulfilled the prerequisites and who are well prepared in their field of study. In such cases, the instructor may, with the concurrence of the student's advisor, authorize the exception.

B-7. Registration of Undergraduate and Non-degree Students in Graduate Courses. Undergraduate and non-degree students may register in graduate courses under the conditions outlined in the College of Graduate Studies section with the prior written approval of the instructor of the course, the student's advisor, and the Dean of the College of Graduate Studies.

B-8. Registration of Students with Baccalaureate Degrees as Undergraduates. To register as undergraduates, students with baccalaureate degrees must secure the permission of the dean of his or her undergraduate college and file a statement with the registrar indicating that they understand that the work will not be classified as graduate work and cannot be used toward a graduate degree at a later date. (See J-7-b and c.)
B-9. Registration for Full Semester Courses. Students may register for full semester courses through the sixth day of the semester. A course may be added by instructor approval through the tenth day of the semester.

B-10. Registration for Accelerated and Other Short Courses. Students may register for accelerated and other short courses at any time up to and including the starting date of the course without petition.

C - Changes in Registration

C-1. Adding a Course. A student may add a full semester course online through the sixth day of the semester. A course may be added by instructor approval through the tenth day of the semester. These periods are prorated for accelerated or short courses.

C-2. Dropping a Course. A student may drop a full semester course through the tenth day of the semester without a grade of W. This period is prorated for accelerated or short courses. Students may not drop a course by simply staying out of class.

C-3. Withdrawing from a Course. Beginning with the eleventh day of the semester and ending with the tenth week of the semester a student may withdraw from a course. During this period a grade of W will be recorded on the student’s record and will count against their 21 credit withdrawal limit (see regulation C-4). This period is prorated for accelerated or short courses.

C-4. Credit Withdrawal Limitation. The number of credits that a student may withdraw from during his or her undergraduate career at UI is limited to 21 credits. If a student attempts to drop a course(s) that would bring the total credits he or she will have withdrawn from above 21, the student will not be allowed to do so. When a student withdraws from the university the credits in the courses for the semester do not count against the withdrawal credit limitation (see regulation G).