University of Idaho
2014-2015 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA
Meeting #19
3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, February 17, 2015
Brink Hall Faculty-Staff Lounge

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Consent Agenda.

III. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2014-15 Faculty Senate Meeting #18, February 10, 2015 (vote)

IV. Chair’s Report.

V. Provost’s Report.

VI. Committee Reports.
   
   FS-15-042: University Security and Compliance Committee (Dorschel)(vote)
   Teaching & Advising
   • FS-15-024rev: FSH 2700 Student Evaluations (Hartzell)(vote)

VII. Other Announcements and Communications.
   • Vision for Enrollment Management (Kim)

VIII. Special Orders.

IX. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

X. New Business.

XI. Adjournment.

Professor Marty Ytreberg, Chair 2014-2015, Faculty Senate

Attachments:   Minutes of 2014-2015 FS Meeting #18
FS-15-042
FS-15-024rev
Present: Aiken (w/o vote), Brandt, Caplan, Chung, Couture (Boise), Crowley (w/o vote), Earl, Flores, Foster, Frey, Godfrey (Coeur d’Alene), Jeffery, Karsky, Kennelly, Lowe, Murphy, Nyavor, Perret, Qualls, Stoll, Teal, Wolf  
Absent: Boschetti, Hiromoto, Mahoney, Safaii, Stauffer, Ytreberg  
Guests: 5

The Senate was called to order at 3:31 by Vice Chair Teal sitting in for Chair Ytreberg. A motion (Flores/Brandt) to approve the minutes as written passed with no objections and 5 abstentions.

There was no Chair’s Report.

Provost Report: 
The times scheduled for Forum’s to meet the Provost and Executive Vice President candidates was distributed. Provost Aiken noted the importance of this hire for the University of Idaho (UI) and expressed hope for widespread participation in the process. There is a SBOE meeting in Boise next week. The Provost did not anticipate any major items specific to the UI to be on the agenda.

Faculty Appeals Hearing Board (FAHB): 
Sarah Nelson, Chair of FAHB, was invited to share her thoughts on the board’s functions. Professor Nelson commented that this was her third year on the board which hears between 3-5 appeals annually. She asked senators to take note of FSH 1640.43 which outlines the functions and structure of the FAHB. Also she called the Senate’s attention to FSH 3840 which specifies the procedures for faculty appeals. In response to a concern over whether the hearing board is perceived by some as an arm of the administration. She noted that there is not a document that explains exactly how the FAHB hearings are to be conducted. Since she has been on the committee Kent Nelson (UI General Counsel) advises the board. The Provost is there to respond to the issues raised by the appeal and is usually accompanied by Debra Ellers also from counsel’s office. The faculty member raising the appeal doesn’t usually have a lawyer. She assured the Senate that in her experience counsel is there to give advice. The board doesn’t necessarily do what the counsel wants them to do. Professor Nelson commented that although she understands why a faculty member might feel that the process is stacked against them, the FAHB is there to give a full and fair hearing to a faculty member.

The Faculty Secretary noted that the specific complaint he had heard was aimed at the Dismissal Hearings Committees but that the concern was similar. He wondered whether the FAHB could be structured in any other way. Professor Nelson stated that she thought it could. She didn’t feel that the FAHB needed to rely on General Counsel and that since it wasn’t a judicial proceeding competent faculty generally knew how to proceed. It was intended to be a collegial process but there could be more distance between the board and General Counsel’s Office. She also noted that the FAHB was advisory to the President. The President is supposed to issue his decision within 45 days.

A senator asked how the room is configured and suggested that General Counsel should not be at the table with the members of the FAHB. Another senator suggested that someone from the board should present the findings of the board in person to the President rather than a written report. Written reports do not reflect all the nuances of the case as one that is given in person.

Another senator asked whether General Counsel was in the room during the deliberation. Professor Nelson responded no although there could be a situation where the board might ask him a follow-up question. This led to a concern that seeking further advice from General Counsel at this stage may present transparency concerns. Another senator noted that putting General Counsel in the position of providing follow-up interpretations of the rules during the deliberation process might open the
University up to potential litigation. A short discussion followed relating to who General Counsel represented in these appeals.

The Chair noted that Committee on Committee’s would be discussing this issue further and if senators had any further concerns about the functioning of the FAHB they should contact the Faculty Secretary’s Office and their comments would be passed on to ConC.

**College of Graduate Studies Bylaws:** The Chair introduced to the Senate for discussion purposes some proposed changes to the College of Graduate Studies (COGS) Bylaws. These proposed changes will not be voted on today but senators should share them with those in their college. The produced change would drop the member on graduate council representing a university wide academic program. A senator pointed out that College of Law did not have a representative on Graduate Council and further wondered if this proposed change wasn’t a step back from the university’s commitment to interdisciplinary programs.

Another senator suggested that some of the programs previously designated as university wide programs were extremely large graduate programs. The decision has been made to locate all these programs in a college and this proposal seems to suggest that because of that there is no longer a need for separate representation on the Graduate Council. A discussion followed as to whether some of these programs had interests that might differ from the interests of a specific college. There was also a short discussion as to whether the College of Law should have representation on the Graduate Council. The Senate will discuss the proposed changes when representatives from COGS will be present. In the intervening period if someone has an issue they would like COGS to address, they might forward their concern to the Faculty Secretary’s Office.

**FS-15-041 (UCC-15-067): Science Pre-Health Professions Studies.** Andrew Brewick, Director of Academic Advising, and Liz Bryant, Pre-Health Advisor, were invited up to discuss the proposal which involves the creation of a pre-health profession’s minor. This minor will enable the UI to better support the academic and professional development of our pre-health students.

A Senator asked whether it was really necessary to have a minor in order to create reports and track pre-health students on campus. Liz Bryant noted that there are around 750 students who have indicated some type of pre-health academic interest. Andrew Brewick noted that the creation of the minor would help in working with the Registrar’s office to develop codes which will help in creating contact with students. A short discussion ensued as to whether there were any rules about excessive overlap between a major and a minor. It was generally agreed that there were no such rules.

A senator noted that the minor designated Statistics 251 but some majors require Statistics 301 and students cannot receive credit for both. This eventually turned into a motion (Qualls/Jeffery) to make the requirement in the minor read Stat 251 or Stat 301. This motion passed unanimously. The amended motion also passed unanimously.

**Adjournment:** With no other business scheduled, a motion to adjourn (Foster/Lowe) passed unanimously and the Senate adjourned at 4:30.

Don Crowley, Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Senate
UNIVERSITY SECURITY AND COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE - Proposal

Background

The Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (20 USC § 1092(f)) is the landmark federal law, originally known as the Campus Security Act that requires colleges and universities across the United States to disclose information about crime on and around their campuses. The law is tied to an institution's participation in federal student financial aid programs and it applies to most institutions of higher education both public and private. The Act is enforced by the United States Department of Education. Possible consequences for an institution’s non-compliance with the Clery Act include:

- A suspension or limiting of the institutions Title IV funding
- The Department of Education may issue a civil fine up to $38,500 per violation
- The institution may suffer reputational loss due to negative media attention
- Failure to comply with the Clery Act can be used in various litigation matters

Justification/Rationale for establishment of the University Security and Compliance Committee

The Clery Center for Security on Campus recommends that institutions formally charter Clery Compliance committees to ensure full compliance with the Clery Act. The formation of such a committee at University of Idaho would both ensure Clery Act compliance and aid the University Office of Public Safety’s commitment to creating and maintaining a safe environment for the UI Community and those who visit. Establishing the Security and Compliance Committee would also help broaden awareness of security issues facing the University of Idaho and help enhance policies and programs that support a secure campus environment.

Proposed Charter

The University Security and Compliance Committee (USCC) is charged with ensuring the University’s compliance with the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Clery Act), and planning and facilitating activities that support a safe and secure living, learning and working experience. USCC will focus on accurate disclosure (reporting of Clery crime statistics) and implementation of best practices regarding safety policies and procedures. The USCC will conduct an annual review of all reportable crimes prior to submitting crime statistics to the U.S. Department of Education. The committee will also perform a thorough review of the Annual Security and Fire Safety Report (ASFR) prior to its publication.

The USCC shall meet a minimum of three times each year. Topics will include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Review updates to the law, policies and procedures related to security and Clery Act compliance
- Ensure timely collection of Clery crime statistics from applicable jurisdictions
- Recommend enhancements to security policies

1 The Clery Center for Security on Campus a nonprofit dedicated to preventing violence, substance abuse and other crimes on college and university campuses across the United States
• Identify programming efforts and recommend improvements.
• Review crime and disciplinary data to avoid report duplication.
• Conduct a final review of the data elements for the ASFR and recommend policy changes.
• Confirm procedures for distributing the ASFR.

**Proposed Membership**

Executive Director, Office of Public Safety & Security, Chair – Voting
Human Resource Services - Voting
Athletic Department - Voting
Staff Affairs - Voting
General Counsel Non-Voting
Dean of Students Office- Voting
Moscow Police Department- Voting
Faculty members (X 2) - Voting
Title IX Coordinator - Voting
Admissions- Voting
EHS Fire Safety Specialist - Voting
Women’s Center- Voting
Information Technology Services- Voting
Undergraduate Student - voting
Graduate Student - voting
POLICY COVER SHEET
(See Faculty Staff Handbook 1460 for instructions at UI policy website: www.webs.uidaho.edu/uipolicy)

Addition □ Revision* □ Deletion* □ Emergency
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Chapter & Title: FSH 2700 Student Evaluations

All policies must be reviewed, approved and returned by a policy sponsor, with a cover sheet attached to apm@uidaho.edu or fsh@uidaho.edu respectively.

*Note: If revision/deletion request original document from apm@uidaho.edu or fsh@uidaho.edu, all changes must be made using “track changes.”
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Reviewed by General Counsel _ _Yes _X___No Name & Date: __________________________

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 is a revision of the student evaluation form that has been updated to ensure that it is useful for both classroom and on-line classes, provides feedback on use of technology in teaching, and lets the student provide course/instructor feedback as it relates to learning.

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

Institutional testing and assessment will redesign the website.

III. Related Policies/Procedures: Describe other policies or procedures existing that are related or similar to this proposed change.

None

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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STUDENT FEEDBACK ON AN ACADEMIC COURSE AND LEARNING ENVIRONMENT


1. How often did you attend class?  
   Less than 60%  60%+  70%+  80% + 90%+

2. How many hours per week (outside of class) did you do work for this course?  
   [ <2   2+  4+  6+  8+ ]

3. The instructor expressed clear expectations for learning outcomes in this course.  
   [SD – D – N - A - SA]

4. Did you take advantage of available help outside the course by meeting in person or otherwise communicating (via email or through BbLearn) with the instructor?  
   [N – Y]
   If YES - This communication was helpful.  
   [SD – D – N - A - SA]

5. What were some positive aspects of the course that supported learning?  
   Comment: text input box

6. What aspects and/or content of the course could be improved to better support learning?  
   Comment: text input box

7. Overall, the content presented in this course contributed to your understanding of this subject.  
   [SD – D – N - A - SA]

8. Overall, the delivery of information and organization contributed to your understanding of the course material.  
   [SD – D – N - A - SA]

9. Additional comments?  
   Comment: text input box