University of Idaho  
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
2014-2015 Meeting #19, Tuesday, February 17, 2015

Present: Brandt, Brewick, Caplan, Chung, Couture (Boise), Crowley (w/o vote), Earl, Flores, Foster, Frey, Godfrey (Coeur d’Alene), Hiromoto, Jeffery, Karsky, Kennelly, Lowe, Mahoney, Murphy, Nyavor, Perret, Safaiai, Stauffer, Stoll, Teal, Wolf, Ytreberg  
Absent: Aiken (w/o vote), Boschetti, Qualls  
Guests: 3

The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:30. For the first time this semester all four Senators from off-site were visible and could actually be heard.

A motion (Murphy/Lowe) to approve the minutes for meeting #18, February 10, 2015 passed with no objections.

Chair’s report: Chair Ytreberg recognized Andrew Brewick as the new Senator representing Staff (replacing Mark Miller) and also announced that Brian Wolf was sitting in today and would probably be temporarily replacing Annette Folwell as a CLASS representative for the rest of the semester. He announced that there would be two more provost candidates visiting campus in the next week. Special sessions in Brink Lounge for senators have been arranged with these candidates for Friday (Feb 20th) at 9am and Monday (Feb 23rd) at 9am. The open forums are being recorded and Chair Ytreberg encouraged all to either attend or watch the sessions and provide feedback for this important position.

Next week the Senate will discuss and vote on proposed changes to the College of Graduate Studies bylaws that were introduced last week. Also Provost Aiken will provide an update on the Focus for the Future process. In two weeks, Dan Eveleth (Chair of UCC) will join us for a discussion on timelines for curriculum changes. The Chair reminded senators that they should be working with their colleges to get the election process started for next year’s Senate. Given the bylaws change approved at the last UFM, senators in their last year can run for a second term. Elections need to be completed by April 15th.

The Chair raised an issue related to the Senate’s endorsement of the CEC proposal from UBFC two weeks ago. That proposal included a plan to bring the lowest paid employees up to $25,000 if there was at least a 2.5% increase in overall compensation. The cost of creating a new minimum salary of at least $25,000 was approximately $140,000. The Chair noted that several times this year the Senate had expressed its concern over low staff salaries. Given this, perhaps we would like to amend the UBFC’s proposal and endorse raising the salaries of lower paid staff even if an overall increase of 2.5% is not available. A senator stated that she would be in favor of this but only if we receive at least a 1% increase. If we only receive 1% we should stick to an across the board increase. After a short discussion of the possible compression effects of creating a new minimum and what a “living wage” might be, a motion (Foster, Murphy) was made to endorse bringing all full time employees up to a minimum of $25,000 regardless of what the overall CEC might be. It was further clarified that this assumed that there would be some CEC for the year. This motion passed 21-0-2.
There was no Provost Report this week.

**FS-15-042: University Security and Compliance Committee.** The Chair invited Matt Dorschel to discuss the proposal to create a new security and compliance committee coming as a seconded motion from Committee on Committees (ConC). The Jeanne Clery Disclosure Act is a federal law that requires universities to report information about crime on campus and recommends that Clery compliance committees be established to ensure full compliance with the act. This committee would meet that mandate and also broaden awareness of security issues on campus.

A senator asked whether the Moscow Police Department should be a voting member on the committee. Mr. Dorschel responded that the University was under contract with the Moscow Police Department and they work closely with his office. He believes they are essential to obtaining the statistics necessary to comply with the Clery Act. In his view they would offer valuable input to the committee.

While there was widespread support for the establishment of the committee there were many questions raised about the size of the committee. Some senators suggested having more members on the committee while others advocated having a smaller committee. Mr. Dorschel noted that having buy in was important and that was one reason for having a larger committee. After considerable discussion of the representative nature of the committee and its proper size a motion (Lowe/Kennelly) was made to add another undergraduate student to the committee. This motion passed 15-7-2.

Another motion (Brandt/Couture) was made to add a faculty or staff member from an off (Moscow) campus site. This motion passed 21-3.

Having added 2 members, thus raising the membership of the committee to 18, the voices in favor of a smaller committee returned. A motion (Foster/Earl) was made to send the proposal back to Committee on Committee’s with instructions to make the committee smaller.

There was considerable discussion of who might be removed. Mr. Dorschel stated that he could still work closely with the various areas under discussion even if not all of these areas had direct representatives on the committee. As the debate over the membership of the committee continued, a motion (Wolf, Brandt) to call the previous question was presented. Calling the “previous question” ends debate and requires a 2/3 vote. This motion failed 8-5-9. The Senate then returned to the original motion of sending the proposed committee back to ConC for the purpose of making the committee smaller. This motion passed 17-5-2 with little discussion.

**Teaching and Advising: FS-15-024rev: FSH 2700--Student Evaluations.** Patricia Hartzell was unable to attend the Senate meeting this afternoon. New Senator Andrew Brewick is on this committee and was asked to comment on this most recent version of the student evaluation of teaching form. He noted that the scale had been changed to run from strongly agree to
strongly disagree and that the form was well designed to obtain useful information from the students. Faculty could also add questions to the form. Addressing a question from a senator, Chair Ytreberg stated that the issue on the floor is the student evaluation form, nothing more. Other issues like peer evaluation of teaching are being discussed at the committee level and will be addressed at another time.

Several senators raised questions relating to the purpose of the form and how it might be used. One senator suggested that administrators would end up focusing on questions 7 and 8 and the scale could easily be converted to numbers in a fashion similar to the old form.

While various philosophical and pedagogical concerns were raised, ultimately the Senate ended up focusing on questions 3 and 4 on the form. Question 4 asks students whether they had taken advantage of available help by communication with the instructor outside the classroom. After some discussion a motion (Brandt/Wolf) was made to alter the question. The wording was changed to ask if the student “attempted” to take advantage of available help. Also the motion asked for a student to be able to answer “no” and be provided with a drop box providing the student with an opportunity to explain why they didn’t seek help. This motion passed 20-0-3.

There was considerable discussion of the intent of question 3 which asks whether “the instructor expressed clear expectations for learning outcomes in this course.” Some suggested that the question should ask whether “the expectations for the course were clear” while others argued that this proposed change would alter the entire nature of the question. One senator argued that focusing on learning outcomes was an important sea change on campus. Another senator worried that the emphasis on learning outcomes was something that was being forced on faculty. Despite considerable debate no motions were made to alter question 3 and it remained the same.

Many senators noted that the form being discussed was an improvement but they voiced a desire to couple this with some type of peer evaluation and to look more holistically at evaluations of teaching. The Chair reiterated that other concerns involving faculty evaluation was under discussion by a committee and the issue before the Senate today was this specific form. With this in mind a motion to call the “previous question” was made (Wolf/Brandt). The motion to stop debate passed 18-1-2. The student evaluation document with question 4 amended was then brought to a vote. The amended student evaluation form passed 12-8-1.

**Adjournment:** Given the late hour the presentation by Vice Provost Kim on her vision for enrollment management was postponed to a later meeting. A motion to adjourn (Murphy/Lowe) passed unanimously and the Senate adjourned at 5:17.

Don Crowley, Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Senate