The Chair tried to call the meeting to order at 3:32 although the actual start of the meeting was delayed, once again, by problems with the new Scopia system which left off-site Senators lost in the cloud. A motion (Brandt/Stoll) to accept the minutes from meeting #20 was accepted without objection.

Chair's Report: Chair Ytreberg announced that next week Brant Miller will visit Senate to discuss a proposal regarding obtaining access to licensed software for Emeritus Faculty and Honored Staff. Two weeks from today will be spring break so we will not have a meeting. The Chair asked for volunteers to serve on a couple of committees. The first committee is the Campus Community Coalition on Alcohol and Risk related Drugs and the second is an ad hoc committee on Professional Development. Receiving no volunteers from the Senate the Chair asked senators to talk to their colleagues and send suggestions to him.

Provost Report: Vice Provost Jeanne Stevenson sitting in for Provost Aiken reminded everyone that the time for mid-term grades was approaching. The timely posting of mid-term grades allows advisors to develop strategies to help students be successful.

University Curriculum Committee – Curriculum Process/Timeline. The Chair invited Professor Dan Eveleth (Chair of UCC) and Dwaine Hubbard (Associate Registrar) to discuss the curriculum approval process. Professor Eveleth shared with the Senate a workflow chart (on senate website at http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/facultycouncil/2014-15FS/Agendas/2014-15fs_agendas.htm) showing the timelines and decision points that a curriculum proposal will go through. The deadlines and the number of decision points depend on the nature of the proposed change. The flowchart discusses three slightly different types of processes.

- Group A (involving course changes—adding or dropping courses). These changes need to be to UCC by December 15th and after going through UCC end up on the General Curriculum Report.
- Group B (adding or dropping minors, options, name changes). These changes also need to be at UCC by December 15. They must ultimately be approved by the Faculty Senate, the general faculty, the President and the Board/Regents.
- Group C (adding or dropping majors, programs, degrees). These proposals must be to UCC by October 15th, go through the same bodies as Group B but also must receive approval from the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU).

Professor Eveleth emphasized that the purpose of the chart wasn’t to propose any changes but to help communicate and clarify the different processes that proposals must go through. The only changes reflected in the flowchart is the due date for Group A & B proposals which used to be October but now is being pushed back to December. The reason that Group C proposals still have the earlier due date is the need to go to the Board/Regents and NWCCU.
A concern was raised that the chart doesn’t reflect the process that the law school must go through. A short discussion followed on how the law school fit into (or doesn’t fit into) the curriculum processes followed by the rest of the University.

More generally Professor Eveleth pointed out that the deadlines are there to insure that proposals get through the process in a timely manner but that there are risks in waiting to the last second to send a proposal to UCC. There have been times when UCC has had questions or noticed mistakes and ended up sending proposals back. There was a question about why the deadlines for both Group A and B were the same even though Group B proposals go through more steps. It was stated that UCC would prioritize Group B proposals and there was a desire to keep it simple and avoid having multiple due dates. With reference to mandated processes like PPP or the more recent FFF, Professor Eveleth noted that UCC believed that in the future all proposals should go through the regular curriculum processes with one exception. He argued that following traditional processes has advantages of transparency and communication across the university. The exception involves what happens when a mandated process, like FFF, results in a recommendation for elimination of a program. Professor Eveleth suggested that in such situations the process should be followed except that negative votes at the unit level would not stop the proposal from moving forward as it would in a typical situation. A senator expressed a concern that always going through the regular processes even when decided by a special process like FFF creates a lot of redundancy and confusion. Professor Eveleth responded that there is a value in making sure units are involved in the implementation decisions even if the decision to do something had already been made through a special program prioritization process. The Chair noted that the Provost last week had reiterated that further decisions implementing FFF decisions would go through regular processes.

The discussion ended with Professor Eveleth emphasizing the need to communicate the curriculum process so faculty can feel in control.

**FS-15-042rev: FSH 1640.95-University Security and Compliance Committee.** This proposal involves a revision of the proposed membership for the newly established University Security and Compliance Committee which is needed to comply with the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act. The Senate had expressed the desire to make the membership of the committee smaller and asked ConC to accomplish this. ConC asked Matt Dorschel to specify what representation he considered essential. He responded by removing four of the proposed members thus reducing the committee to thirteen members. The revised membership passed unanimously.  

**FS-15-043: FSH 1640.89—University Committee for General Education.** This proposal involves a revision to the function of UCGE. The proposed revision would add a sentence giving UCGE responsibility over courses eligible for transfer to other state institutions (SBOE GEM courses). Before voting on this several senators expressed a desire to edit the wording specifying the membership of UCGE. The wording was not sufficiently clear that CLASS and Science would each have two members on UCGE. After some give and take on the exact wording, a motion (Foster/Wolf) was offered making the Faculty Secretary’s Office responsible to clarify the wording on membership. This passed unanimously. The proposal as amended then passed unanimously.

**FS-15-044: FSH 1640.90-General Education Assessment Committee.** This proposal would create a General Education Assessment Committee that would report directly to UCGE regarding the assessment of general education courses. The Director of General Education would select members to ensure broad representation. A senator asked whether it was normal for members to be selected in this way. It was
acknowledged that this wasn’t typical but that for reasons of specialization and expertise it would be more efficient to give this responsibility to the Director of General Education. The selected members would need to have the time and ability to norm and assess courses.

Another senator raised a concern about creating another committee. While there was considerable sympathy with this claim, the case was made that this proposed committee was necessary given the importance and need for assessment. Another senator wondered why CLASS and Science weren’t guaranteed members on this assessment committee since the vast majority of the courses came from CLASS and Science. The Director of General Education suggested that CLASS and Science probably would have representation but that the overall purpose was to obtain faculty skilled in assessing courses regardless of the college. This proposal was passed unanimously.

Note: Several times in today’s Senate meeting a question was raised as to when it was correct to refer to SBOE (State Board of Education) and when we should be referring to the Regents of the University of Idaho. The Faculty Secretary’s Office agreed to look into the distinction and attempt to clarify which reference was appropriate at which times.

**FS-15-045: FSH 1640.36—Dismissal Hearings Committee and FS-15-045: FSH 1640.43—Faculty Appeals Hearing Board.** Both of these proposed changes from ConC were attempts to address concerns raised about perceived reliance on General Counsel by these committees. The proposed additions are to communicate that the panel chair should seek a meeting with the Faculty Secretary to discuss and review the process. The panel chair may also request assistance from the Faculty Secretary, Ombuds or General Counsel’s office throughout the hearing. Another provision was added to allow both parties to have an advisor or neutral party at the hearing.

A senator suggested that the University did not need an advisor or neutral party at the hearings. A motion (Brandt/Kennelly) was offered to amend C-2 in 1640.36 and B-2 in 1640.43 to read: “Observers: The faculty member requesting a hearing may have an advisor or neutral party at the hearing.” This amendment passed unanimously. FS-15-045 as amended for both FSH 1640.36 and FSH 1640.43 passed unanimously.

**Adjournment:** A motion to adjourn (Teal/Brewick) passed unanimously at 5:02.

Don Crowley, Faculty Secretary and Secretary to the Faculty Senate