University of Idaho
2013-2014 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #14

3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, January 28, 2014
Brink Hall Faculty-Staff Lounge
IWC Room 390 – Boise
213 – Coeur d’Alene
TAB 321B IF4 – Idaho Falls

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2013-14 Faculty Senate Meeting #13, December 3, 2013 (vote)

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.
   • Institutional 5-year plan (Aiken)
   • Research at the University (McIver)

VI. Committee Reports.

   Sabbatical Leave Committee
   • Approval of 2014-15 Sabbatical Leave

   Brink Lounge Advisory Committee final report (Bird)

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Trish Hartzell, Chair 2013-2014, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2013-2014 FS Meeting #13
Research Infrastructure Questions
Sabbatical 2014-15
University of Idaho
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
2013-2014 Meeting #13, Tuesday, December 3, 2013

Present: Aiken (w/o vote), Awwad-Rafferty, Baillargeon, Bird, Brandt, Cobb, Couture (Boise), Eckwright (w/o vote), Flores, Frey, Hartzell (chair), Kennelly, Manic (Idaho Falls), Miller, Morra, Murphy, Pendegraft, Perret, Qualls, Safaii, Smith, Stoll, Stuntzner (Coeur d’Alene), Wolf, Ytreberg Absent: Becker, Davis, Karsky, Ostrom, Pregitzer Guests: 4

A quorum being present, Senate Chair Hartzell called the meeting to order at 3:32pm.

Minutes: It was moved and seconded (Cobb, Frey) to approve the minutes of meeting #12. Motion carried.

Chair’s Report. The Chair reported on the following items:

- We are very saddened by the untimely death of Arthur Taylor, UI indigenous affairs officer who died unexpectedly on Thanksgiving Day after a medical emergency. A memorial service will be held this evening and a funeral service tomorrow, both in Lapwai.
- Chair Hartzell met with leaders from staff and student groups to discuss a smoking ban proposal. UI will need to have a smoking ban in place or lose federal funding. The group meets again in January to devise a plan to phase-in a smoking ban and hopes to submit the plan to the Safety & Loss Control Committee in spring.
- The Chair met with the Planning for the Future group (formerly known as Vision 2020) and the newly revised goal for future enrollment is 13,500 students. Keith Ickes, executive director for planning and budget, has been reevaluating the student numbers and revenues generated by those students for next year. Mr. Ickes is pleased by the October reports’ numbers and although enrollment numbers are down, the situation is not as dire as previously thought.
- Chair Hartzell had heard from University of Idaho Retirees Association (UIRA) that some retirees are unhappy about changes to the UI email plan. The plan was to migrate existing retiree email addresses from @uidaho.edu to @gold.uidaho.edu. The @gold account would include all their original email data and email sent to @uidaho.edu would continue to be received by their new account. Some of the changes are due to security issues, but Ben Kirchmeier and Dan Ewart have decided to modify the plan as follows:
  - Existing faculty emeritus accounts will not be migrated.
  - New faculty emeritus retirees will have the option to either have their account sponsored by their department or close their account. We will handle department sponsorship behind the scenes; it will not affect access or rights associated with the account.
  - Retirees who have only an email-based need may have an account created for them in @gold.uidaho.edu.
- Senate leadership attended an enrollment management roundtable at the recent President’s Breakfast for Progress. Jeff Dodge, Cezar Mesquite and Anna Sherwood gave brief presentations
and attendees came away with a positive view of the work that the team is doing.

- David Sigler, chair of Teaching and Advising Committee (TAC), has submitted a report regarding the committee’s work on students’ evaluations of teaching. The full report, including recommendations, is available on the committee’s webpage at: http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/facultycouncil/CommitteeWebPages/Agenda_Minutes_Teaching_and_Advising.htm

  TAC identified four areas of concern with the current course evaluation system:
  o Low response rate.
  o Outlying score may significantly affect the numerical averages.
  o Questions are too general.
  o Questions are not tied to learning outcomes.

- President’s holiday party is on Wednesday, December 4, in the SUB Ballroom.

- Nominations for a faculty member to serve a three year term on the University Distinguished Professor Committee are due on Friday, December 6.

- The Office of Community Partnerships and the Food and Economic Development Working Group are seeking partners to pursue funding that supports research, outreach and teaching related to local and regional food systems, economic development, and food security. The first discussion will take place on Thursday, December 12, 2013, from 12:00-1:30pm in the Commons Horizon room.

- Gala for the newly remodeled Brink faculty-staff lounge will be held on Tuesday, January 14, at 3:30-5pm.

- Today is the last Faculty Senate meeting for the Fall semester. The University Faculty Meeting will be held next Tuesday, December 10, at 3pm (PT) in the SUB Ballroom.

Provost’s Report. Provost Aiken reported on the following items:

- Provost Aiken reported that she is thrilled to announce that Eckwright has agreed to continue in this role. Senators responded to the announcement with a very warm round of applause which Eckwright very much appreciated.

- The University of Idaho 125th Anniversary committee met today and they are concerned that the joyous nature of the year-long celebration has not been widely communicated to the UI community – we need to mention this to people in our units. President Burnett is very interested in having colleges, departments and other programs play a vital role in celebrating the anniversary. For more information, including templates and other resources: http://www.uidaho.edu/125years/resources

Focus for the Future. Provost Aiken began her report on Focus for the Future (FFF) by referring senators to a comprehensive article about it in today’s issue of the Argonaut, available here: http://www.uiargonaut.com/2013/12/02/rank-and-report-ui-finishes-first-phase-in-sboe-mandated-program-prioritization/ The Argonaut reporter did a nice job of encapsulating the disparate threads of the FFF program and quotes from Richard Westerberg, State Board of Education (SBOE), are helpful in understanding the process. Provost Aiken had hoped to provide more information today regarding the data that has been collected for FFF, but the data-reporting deadline was moved to yesterday and some units have not yet reported their data. Provost Aiken provided the following general comments about FFF: the Board of Regents had asked that this be a rigorous and comprehensive process and for at least this first data-gathering part UI people have taken this seriously and worked very hard on these reports; a
positive outcome for this process is that people in the various units are able to see and be recognized for all of their accomplishments – and this is very gratifying and uplifting; we have gathered information that will be useful in writing the self-study for next year’s accreditation report. The FFF process is data-informed but not data-driven: we could spend months trying to perfect it and tweak it, but the outcome would not be very different. A task force is looking at how we will engage with this information beginning in January and where we will go from there. A side effect of the FFF process is that it creates some anxiety for people because everyone is very committed to their work and may be concerned that others may not view their work as they do. This is an unfortunate part of the process and there is no way to get around it, given this assignment from the Board of Regents.

Provost Aiken responded as follows to senators’ questions:

- **It is my impression that unit directors, department chairs and on up through deans, worked at putting this data together but that the extent of faculty participation in this representation of unit strengths may have varied from one unit to another?** It may have varied, although this process included all programs – and not only academic programs; and more people who are not faculty than who are faculty are engaging in the process. I believe there have been pretty wide-ranging conversations in units about what this looks like and what we want to say about it. Faculty were to discuss how we measure scholarship in various disciplines and I understood those conversations did take place. Some units may have had a more participatory process than others, but there were certainly opportunities to have as much participation as possible depending upon the units. It was important that the process not be too prescriptive about what individual units should do, but rather units should engage in conversations about what makes sense for them to do.

- **WSU went through a similar process and posted a good deal of intermediate data on a website. Will program reports and data collected thus far be shared with the larger community or is that part of Phase 2?** I think that is part of Phase 2, yet to be determined. We need to determine when we would make this information available, and in what format and with what kind of detail. This requires a wider conversation with the university community. We also need to determine what things we want to make public – what is “work-product” and what is “result”? We do not yet have the answers to those questions.

- **Would it be possible to hold a meeting for anyone to attend where you give a presentation of the results?** We could consider that, although the document currently is 1200 pages in length and that is only about one-third of it. I have been asked about an “appeals’ process” and I am not sure that results from this process will be debatable. We may debate how one acts on the results, but the results themselves will not be very debatable. Some of this is proprietary information and we will want to present it in a reasonable and sensible format. We will want to have some conversations about this before we decide how to present it.

- **It is difficult to imagine the magnitude of this undertaking!** I appreciate that. Also, I was pleased to see that Mr. Westerberg was quoted in the Argonaut article as saying that this process will not be used by SBOE to focus on any perceived weaknesses in programs. Mr. Westerberg also said that the purpose of this is to help inform our own process. All institutions of higher education in Idaho are doing the same process, but in their own ways.

- **The recent staff classification study ran into problems because there was a lack of oversight during the process. What will prevent the same thing from happening here?** We contracted out the classification study. In this FFF process we are in control of our own destiny and if we do not do it “right” we have no one to blame but ourselves.
**Campus Planning Advisory Committee.** Senate Chair Hartzell, who also serves as chair of the Campus Planning Advisory Committee (CPAC), provided the following information:

- Renfrew Hall remodel – chalkboards vs. whiteboards. Some chemistry and math faculty had met with individuals from the registrar’s office prior to the recent remodel of several Renfrew Hall classrooms. Faculty had requested that chalkboards be installed in the remodeled rooms and believed that it had been agreed to do so; but whiteboards were installed instead. CPAC invited Juli Hafin, registrar’s office, to a CPAC meeting to discuss faculty needs regarding chalkboards in classrooms. The meeting resulted in a new awareness by the registrar’s office regarding faculty needs for remodeled classrooms.
- CPAC also discussed the issue of faculty input on all building projects. In the past, faculty have given input but then their requests and/or recommendations are forgotten. CPAC asked that those UI groups that are involved in remodels and new building planning allow end-user faculty to have some final approval over plans.
- Ms. Hafin reported on the Classroom Strategic Planning Workgroup. This group will work with faculty when designing new buildings and redesigning classrooms. They are looking for money to do some of the renovations and they are looking to do some simple cosmetic improvements, such as painting classrooms, replacing ceiling tiles and so on.
- Brian Johnson, assistant vice-president for facilities, and Keith Ickes, executive director of planning and budget, also talked about plans for the new campus property “legacy crossing” area. Architecture students in Professor Nels Reese’s class have been working on plans for this area.
- Music students use the rooms in Ridenbaugh Hall for practice space, but the rooms have very little acoustic value. It needs to be made a high priority to improve facilities for these students.
- At this point Senator Pendegraft offered a correction to an earlier statement made by Chair Hartzell in her CPAC report. The correction exonerated the provost’s office in conversations with faculty regarding chalkboards in classrooms. Provost Aiken offered a very sincere “thank you, Norman.”
- CPAC notes are available here: [http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/facultycouncil/CommitteeWebPages/UploadAM_Campus_Planning_Advisory_Committee/Campus%20planning%20and%20advisory%20Nov%2024%202013.pdf](http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/facultycouncil/CommitteeWebPages/UploadAM_Campus_Planning_Advisory_Committee/Campus%20planning%20and%20advisory%20Nov%2024%202013.pdf)

A senator then inquired about the newly remodeled Brink Lounge and whether it will be available for use by student groups. Senator Bird, a member of the Brink Lounge remodeling advisory committee, responded that the planning committee had expressed a desire that the only scheduled meetings in the remodeled Brink Lounge would be the weekly senate meetings and that it would no longer be available for thesis and dissertation defenses, for example. [N.B. From the outset of the remodeling project the room was intended as a place for individual faculty to meet for “random collaborations” on grant proposals and research. The organizers of the current UI faculty gatherings originally asked for space in the Commons to serve this purpose, but they were unable to secure a space. UI offices that provided funding for the remodel did so with the understanding that the room would be used as a place for individual faculty to meet and collaborate. If we schedule other events in the room, faculty are likely to steer clear of it as a place to go to randomly meet with other faculty. The opportunities for random collaborations would be lost or at least, greatly reduced.]

Provost Aiken noted that a space on the main floor of the Commons near the rotunda will be used for student lounge space during spring 2014. Another senator added that the commitment is only for spring
2014, as the College of Education building remodel will take two years and all faculty and staff from that building will need to be housed elsewhere during the remodel.

Committee on Committees.

FS-14-022:

- FSH 1640.93 – University Judicial Council. Vice-chair Marty Ytreberg then explained two committee changes which have come as seconded motions from the Committee on Committees (ConC). The first item is the addition of section “D” to FSH 1640.93. This language makes it clear that faculty who may be interested in serving on the committee will need to be available for hearings on short notice. Motion carried unanimously.

- FSH 1640.58 – Ubuntu. Jeff Dodge, former chair of Ubuntu, requested that the Coordinator for Disability Support Services be added as an ex officio member to the structure of the committee. Motion carried unanimously.

Adjournment: It was moved and seconded (Awwad-Rafferty, Kennelly) to adjourn at 4:27pm. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Gail Z. Eckwright
Secretary to Faculty Senate and Faculty Secretary
These questions were solicited from a broad range of faculty around campus.

1. What plans, if any, are there to build the research infrastructure to make it easier to submit proposals (e.g., staff to seek out opportunities, fill out forms, develop budgets, etc.)?

2. What plans, if any, are there to increase support for junior faculty whose tenure decision is sometimes tied to funding success (easy to access opportunities, easy to follow/find tutorials, staff support, etc.)?

3. Will UI invest in its current faculty to reach the $140M research goal? If so, how?

4. In some colleges it is difficult to obtain funding for travel, yet it is important to the success of the faculty members. Is it possible to have more funds available for travel?

5. What plans, if any, are there to build post award support infrastructure (e.g., budget projections, etc.)?

6. Is there a mechanism to provide bridge funding for labs when a renewal is in question and how long will bridge funding be available?

7. How are targeted hires selected? How many targeted hires are planned and who will pay for start-up and initial salary?

8. Is the Institute for Resilient Rural Communities being pursued? If so, will the senate be able to provide input on how the institute will be structured?

9. Whose salaries are covered by the Research Office budget? Has the growth of staff and expenditures in this office paralleled the growth in research dollars?
DATE: December 2, 2013

TO: Trish Hartzell, Chair and Marty Ytreberg, Vice Chair
Faculty Senate

FROM: Katherine C. Aiken
Interim Provost and Executive Vice President

SUBJECT: Items for Faculty Senate

The following members of the faculty have been recommended for sabbatical leave for 2014-2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awwad-Rafferty, Rula</td>
<td>Interior Design</td>
<td>F14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp, Stacey</td>
<td>Sociology/Anthropology</td>
<td>F14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connors, James</td>
<td>Ag Ed &amp; 4-H Youth Dev</td>
<td>7/01-12/31/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elger, Don</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Acad Year 14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flores, Stephan</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>F14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardiner, Mary</td>
<td>Leadership &amp; Counseling</td>
<td>F14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graden, Dale</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Jan-Dec 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlow, Mikaela</td>
<td>Psych &amp; Comm Studies</td>
<td>F14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan, Penelope</td>
<td>Forest, Rangeland, Fire Science</td>
<td>F14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy, James</td>
<td>Lionel Hampton School of Music</td>
<td>F14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrestha Dev Sagar</td>
<td>Bio &amp; Ag Engineering</td>
<td>F14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yager, Elowyn</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>Acad Year 14-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a request for approval by Faculty Senate.

cc: Gail Eckwright, Faculty Secretary
    Ann Thompson, Faculty Secretary Office
    Mary Stout, Provost’s Office
    Jill Robertson, Budget Office
    Dennis Geist, Chair, Sabbatical Leave
DATE: January 28, 2014  
TO: Trish Hartzell, Chair and Marty Ytreberg, Vice Chair of Faculty Senate  
FROM: Katherine G. Aiken, Interim Provost and Executive Vice President  
SUBJECT: Correction to December 2, 2013 Memo regarding Sabbatical Leave 2014-2015  

The sabbatical leave request for Dr. Dale Graden (History), was reported wrong in the recommendation memo sent to Senate on December 2, 2013. Dr. Graden’s request was for January through December of 2015, not 2014 as indicated.

KA/plh  

cc: Gail Eckwright, Faculty Secretary  
Ann Thompson, Faculty Secretary Office  
Dennis Geist, Chair, Sabbatical Leave Evaluation Committee