University of Idaho
2015-2016 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #12

3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, November 17, 2015
Brink Hall Faculty-Staff Lounge & Scopia

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2015-16 Faculty Senate Meeting #11, November 10, 2015 (vote)

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.

VI. Committee Reports.

   University Curriculum Committee
   • FS-16-014a (UCC-16-019) CNR: Minor name change Conservation Social Sciences to Natural Resource Conservation (Wilson)(vote)
   • FS-16-014b (UCC-16-019) CNR: Discontinue Certificate Fire, Ecology, Management (Smith)(vote)
   • FS-16-015 (UCC-16-018) CLASS: Martin School Reorganization (Ellison)(vote)
   Contingent Faculty Task Force Report (Stauffer)(FYI)
   Dean of Students Office (Eckles)(FYI)

VII. Special Orders.
   • Fall Graduate List (vote)

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.
   • FS-16-016: FSH 3320 – Faculty Evaluation (clarification edit)(Crowley)

X. Adjournment.

Professor Randall Teal, Chair 2015-2016, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2015-2016 FS Meeting #11
FS-16-014 through 016
Present: Adams, Anderson, Boschetti, Brandt, Brewick, Brown, Caplan, Couture (Boise), Crowley (w/o vote), Flores, Folwell, Godfrey (Coeur d’Alene), Hiromoto (Idaho Falls), Hrdlicka, Jeffery, LaPrath, Latrell, Murphy, Nicotra, Royer, St. Claire, Stoll, Teal, Wiencek (w/o vote), Wolf. Absent: Chung, Foster, Mahoney, Perret. Guests: 4

Chair Teal called meeting # 11 to order at 3:32. A motion (Murphy/Latrell) to approve the minutes for the November 3, 2015 meeting of the Faculty Senate passed without objection.

Chair’s Report: Chair Teal announced that faculty could get a free lunch by volunteering to be on a food service committee which will provide feedback on the varieties of food service on campus. They will meet the 2nd Tuesday of each month at 11:30. No one immediately volunteered. We will send an email out which can be shared with anyone interested. The Chair also announced that the 3rd interdisciplinary faculty gathering will be this Friday (the 13th) at 4:00 in the Brink Hall Faculty-Staff Lounge.

The Chair recognized Senator Latrell to make an announcement regarding Toys-for-Tots. Toys-for-Tots is a national non-profit program and he is heading the local area campaign seeking to expand participation. He hopes to challenge the various colleges in a campus-wide friendly competition to collect these toys for the holidays. Those interested in establishing drop boxes should contact him. Toys should be new, unwrapped and intended for kids up to the age of 14.

Provost’s Report: The Provost announced that the website for the Strategic Plan should go live this week. The key activity for this week is Enroll Idaho which starts tonight. This initiative is designed to encourage Idaho high school students to go to college. The purpose of tonight’s event is to answer key questions about how students can apply, how to get financial aid, and where students can get advising. This is an important initiative aimed at serving the interests of Idaho citizens.

University Promotions Committee: The Chair emphasized the need for Senators from each college to nominate faculty to serve on the University Promotions Committee. These are due in the Provost’s Office by this Friday the 13th. The appropriate forms and a page of FAQ’s are included in this week’s packet. A Senator inquired as to whether colleges should have set procedures to make these nominations. The Faculty Secretary suggested that the Senators from each college determined how they wanted to go about determining who to nominate. There really aren’t any rules other than considerations about ensuring balance and representation across the college. Vice Chair Brandt noted that some colleges may have this addressed in their by-laws. There was a short discussion about whether Senators needed to know who the hold-over members are in order to make the nominations.

Consolidated Fringe. The Chair introduced Vice Presidents Jack McIver and Brian Foisy along with Trina Mahoney from the Budget Office to discuss the implementation of the new consolidated fringe rate. Essentially, this involves developing a new methodology for charging employee benefits across all budgets, including grants and contracts. Brian Foisy explained that the need for a “consolidated fringe” rate arose from the difficulties of calculating benefits across the University when circumstances might change at any time, e.g. new child, marriage, etc. Determining these benefits also created particular problems for those writing grants. To create administrative efficiencies and reliability three basic rates were established. The faculty rate for this year was set at 31.6%, staff at 39.2% and students at 2.5%. This would create a central pool of money from which all benefits will be paid.
Acknowledging that in general this sounds like a good policy, a Senator asked if there were any programs that might be disadvantaged by this. Mr. Foisy stated that there were potentially some unintended consequences. The place this was most likely to occur was with temporary employees. He stated they were working with dean’s to offset any negative impact from this policy and that in future years they would look at creating a 4th rate category of temporary employees to deal with this.

Mr. Foisy emphasized that this policy did not affect employee eligibility for benefits. It did establish basic rates that would be charged to departments as a cost allocation mechanism. A question was asked about health benefits for RA’s and TA’s. It was pointed out that we would be having a discussion on TA’s/RA’s as well as other contingent faculty and their benefit eligibility in the future.

**Basic Overview of TA/RA Positions:** The Chair invited Jerry McMurtry, Interim Dean of the College of Graduate Studies, to discuss the stipends provided to TA’s and RA’s. Dean McMurtry provided some documents which showed the number of TA’s and RA’s across colleges and also compared our compensation levels to national averages based on the Oklahoma State survey. The UI currently employs 319 research assistants and 343 teaching assistants. They differ as to hours worked although a fulltime TA/RA is expected to work 20 hours a week. The average hourly rate for RA’s is higher than the average hourly rate for TA’s. When we compare our rates with the Oklahoma State study of our peer institutions, we pay 91% of the average hourly rate for RA’s and only 65% of the TA rate. We also have differences across the colleges on campus. All of the institutions in the Oklahoma State study provide out-of-state tuition waivers. Many provide full tuition waivers. The College of Graduate Studies waives in-state tuition for only 107 of the 342 TA’s on campus.

A Senator emphasized that our low compensation levels made it very difficult to recruit qualified TA’s and RA’s especially if we don’t provide full tuition waivers. Another Senator wondered whether we have a plan to deal with our current inability to compete with our peer institutions. Dean McMurtry acknowledged that the bottom line number ($1,780,958) of what would be necessary to provide a full tuition waiver for all TA’s was not something that we could resolve easily. He stated that this was an institutional issue. He was having conversations with the Provost about developing strategies to address this problem. Other questions raised included:

- **Would it help to have a more centralized system of determining the number of TA’s and their compensation levels?** It might help to have a more centralized system but that wouldn’t automatically solve the lack of funding. The Provost pointed out that people like certainty and having a more centralized system of distribution might cause problems for programs that are disfavored in any particular year.
- **Why have our peer institutions been able to provide higher levels of funding?** Dean McMurtry noted that COGS has made this their number one priority in the last couple of years.
- **How does a college get on the list to have COGS fund a tuition waiver?** Dean McMurtry noted colleges already do apply to COGS to obtain these tuition waivers. The College of Science and CLASS get the most due to the load they carry in providing general education courses. COGS does have a formula to help determine the number of waivers each college receives. Dean McMurtry stated he would be happy to share this formula.
- **There was a question raised as to how proposed changes in the Fair Labor Standards Act might affect TA’s and RA’s.** There is a specific exemption for teachers but there are questions of exactly how RA’s fit into this discussion. If RA’s are not included in the teaching exemption then they would be eligible for overtime.
- **RA stipends differ from TA’s because they are tied to grants.** Jack McIver noted that we didn’t always charge grants with the highest stipend allowed by agencies. Some agencies have caps on
what can be charged. The PI must include tuition waivers and stipends in their proposals and we
don’t always take full advantage of what can be charged to a grant. There seemed to be some
disagreement as to what was the best strategy to employ.

It was generally agreed that a discussion of stipends for RA’s and TA’s was an important discussion for
the University to have. The effort to develop a new system for budget requests might provide an
opportunity for COGS (and others) to pursue this as a priority.

**Adjournment:** As the discussion came to a close the Chair entertained a motion (Stoll/St. Claire) to
adjourn. This passed unanimously at 4:41.

Don Crowley, Faculty Secretary and
Secretary to the Faculty Senate
Instructions: Please use one form for each request/action. Clearly mark all changes using Track Change or strikethroughs for deletions and underlines for additions. Following the approval of the appropriate college curriculum committee, a single representative for the college will e-mail the completed form to the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President, provost@uidaho.edu for approval and then submission to the Academic Publications Editor in the Registrar’s Office for review by the University Curriculum Committee (UCC).

Deadline: This form must be submitted to the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President by December 15th for inclusion in the next available General Catalog and to be available for scheduling beginning with the next summer semester.

Submission Information
This section must be completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College:</th>
<th>Natural Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department/Unit:</td>
<td>Natural Resources and Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept/Unit Approval Date:</td>
<td>August 24, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Approval Date:</td>
<td>September 4, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP code (Consult Institutional Research):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Point of Contact (Name and Email):</td>
<td>Patrick Wilson <a href="mailto:pwilson@uidaho.edu">pwilson@uidaho.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Component Request
Leave blank if not adding, discontinuing, or modifying a program component which consists of option, emphasis, minor, academic certificate less than 30 credits, or teaching endorsement

Clearly mark all changes to existing program components by using Track Change or strikethroughs for deletions and underlines for additions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Create New:</th>
<th>Modify:</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Discontinue:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Level:</td>
<td>Undergraduate Level:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Law Level:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option:

Emphasis:

Minor: Conservation Social Sciences

Academic Certificate less than 30 credits:

Teaching Endorsement (Major/Minor):

Overview of Program Component: This is a request for a name change for an existing minor, Conservation Social Sciences that was created for students outside the department.
### Program Component
**Curriculum:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Required courses</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservation Social Sciences Minor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: This minor may not be earned by students in an existing degree program in the Department of Conservation Social Sciences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the following (3-4 cr):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS 235 or For 235 Society and Natural Resources (3 cr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS 287 Foundations of Conservation Leadership and Management (3 cr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the following (3-4 cr):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS 304 Conservation Social Sciences Field Studies (3 cr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS 310 Social Research Methods in Conservation (4 cr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the following (3 cr):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS 364 Politics of the Environment (3 cr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS 462 Natural Resource Policy (3 cr)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Electives from the following (9 cr)
- CSS 383 Natural Resource and Ecosystem Service Economics (3 cr)
- CSS 385 Conservation Management and Planning I (4 cr)
- CSS 387 Environmental Communication Skills (3 cr)
- CSS 475 Conservation Management and Planning II (4 cr)
- CSS 481 Conservation Leadership (3 cr)
- CSS 489 Personalities and Philosophies in Conservation (3 cr)

Courses to total 18 credits for this minor

| **Natural Resource Conservation Minor** |
| Note: This minor may not be earned by students in an existing degree program in the Department of Natural Resources and Society. |
| One of the following (3 cr): |
| CSS 235 or For 235 Society and Natural Resources (3 cr) |
| CSS 287 Foundations of Conservation Leadership and Management (3 cr) |
| One of the following (3 cr): |
| CSS 364 Politics of the Environment (3 cr) |
| CSS 462 Natural Resource Policy (3 cr) |

Electives from the following (12 cr)
- CSS 383 Natural Resource and Ecosystem Service Economics (3 cr)
- CSS 385 Conservation Management and Planning I (4 cr)
- CSS 387 Environmental Communication Skills (3 cr)
- CSS 475 Conservation Management and Planning II (4 cr)
- CSS 486 Public Involvement in Natural Resource Management (3 cr)

Courses to total 18 credits for this minor

### Name or Degree Change Only Requests
Leave blank if not making a name and/or degree change. This section can be completed for changes to the name of: degree, major, minor, option, emphasis, certificate, teaching endorsement

| **Current Name:** Conservation Social Sciences |
| **New Name:** Natural Resource Conservation |
| **Current Degree:** |
New Degree:

Other Details:

### Financial Impact
This section must be completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greater than $250,000 per FY:</th>
<th>Less than $250,000 per FY:</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brief Description of financial impact:</td>
<td>No financial impact. No new classes are proposed, only a name change and content.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rationale and Assessment Information
This section must be completed

Rationale for approval of this request as appropriate; include an explanation of how the department will manage the added workload of the new program component and any relevant assessment information that applies, describe whether the program component, curriculum, and admission requirements remain the same, describe the rationale for a name change or degree designation change:

This is a request for a name change for an existing minor: Conservation Social Sciences that was created for students outside the department. It was created when the department, and the degree, were titled "Conservation Social Sciences". We desire to bring the minor inline with the change of the degree to Natural Resource Conservation, and the department to Natural Resources and Society.

The change in the content adapts to changes in the course offerings and better meets employer and stakeholder needs thus making our students more employable. Simplifies the structure of the minor from four bins to three.

### Distance Education Availability
This section must be completed

To comply with the requirements of the Idaho State Board of Education (SBOE) and the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) the University of Idaho must declare whether 50% or more of the curricular requirements of a program may be completed via distance education. If the program component is to be offered via distance education, additional or different formwork may be required. Contact provost@uidaho.edu for assistance.

The U.S. Department of Education defines distance education as follows:

*Distance education means education that uses one or more of the technologies listed below to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the instructor and to support regular and substantive interaction between the students and the instructor, either synchronously or asynchronously. The technologies may include--*

1. The internet;
2. One-way and two-way transmissions through open broadcast, closed circuit, cable, microwave, broadband lines, fiber optics, satellite, or wireless communications devices;
3. Audio conferencing; or
4. Video cassettes, DVDs, and CD-ROMs, if the cassettes, DVDs, or CD-ROMs are used in a course in conjunction with any of the technologies listed in paragraphs (1) through (3).

Can 50% or more of the curricular requirements of this program component be completed via distance education? | Yes* | No | X
---|---|---|---
*If Yes, can 100% of the curricular requirements of this program component be completed via distance education? | Yes | No |
Geographical Area Availability
This section must be completed

Identify the geographical area(s) this program component can be completed in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>X</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeur d’Alene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Falls*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other**</td>
<td>Location(s):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Programs offered in regions 3, 4, and/or 5 may require additional formwork from the State Board of Education. Contact the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President for additional information.

**Note: If Other is selected identify the specific area(s) this program component will be offered.

Office of the Registrar Information

Implementation Effective Date: Summer 2016
Date Received by the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President: October 27 (processed): MDS
Date Received by UCC Secretary: 10/27/2015
UCC Item Number: 16-019
UCC Approval Date: 11/02/2015
Faculty Senate Approval Date:
Faculty Senate Item Number:
Faculty Senate Approval Date:
General Policy Report Number or Faculty Meeting Date: 281
Office of the President Approval Date:
State Board of Education Approval/Acknowledgement Date:
PROGRAM COMPONENT (Group B) OR NON-SUBSTANTIVE MINOR REQUEST FORM
Short Form

**Instructions:** Please use one form for each request/action. Clearly mark all changes using Track Change or strikethroughs for deletions and underlines for additions. Following the approval of the appropriate college curriculum committee, a single representative for the college will e-mail the completed form to the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President, provost@uidaho.edu for approval and then submission to the Academic Publications Editor in the Registrar’s Office for review by the University Curriculum Committee (UCC).

**Deadline:** This form must be submitted to the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President by December 15th for inclusion in the next available General Catalog and to be available for scheduling beginning with the next summer semester.

### Submission Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College:</th>
<th>College of Natural Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department/Unit:</td>
<td>Forest, Rangeland, and Fire Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept/Unit Approval Date:</td>
<td>September 14, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote Record:</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Approval Date:</td>
<td>September 18, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote Record:</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP code (Consult Institutional Research):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Point of Contact (Name and Email):</td>
<td>Alistair Smith <a href="mailto:alistair@uidaho.edu">alistair@uidaho.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Program Component Request

Leave blank if not adding, discontinuing, or modifying a program component which consists of option, emphasis, minor, academic certificate less than 30 credits, or teaching endorsement

Clearly mark all changes to existing program components by using Track Change or strikethroughs for deletions and underlines for additions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Create New:</th>
<th>Modify:</th>
<th>Discontinue:</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Level:</td>
<td>Undergraduate Level:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Law Level:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Requirement:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Certificate less than 30 credits:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Endorsement (Major/Minor):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview of Program Component: Provide a brief narrative description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Ecology Course Group (3 cr):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For 326 Fire Ecology and Management (3 cr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For 426 Global Fire Ecology and Management (3 cr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For 526 Fire Ecology (3 cr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology Course Group (2-4 cr):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For 330 Forest Soil and Canopy Processes (4 cr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For 531 Invasion Biology (3 cr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REM 429 Landscape Ecology (3 cr)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REM 440  Wildland Restoration Ecology (3 cr)
REM 459  Rangeland Ecology (2 cr)
REM 460  Integrating GIS and Field Studies in Rangelands (2 cr)

Fuels and Fuels Management Course Group (2-3 cr):
For 427  Prescribed Burning Lab (3 cr)
For 433  Fire and Fuel Modeling (2 cr)
For 450  Fire Behavior (2 cr)

FOR 451  Fuels Inventory and Management (3 cr)

Applied Tools and Analysis Course Group (3 cr):
For 375  Introduction to Spatial Analysis for Natural Resource Management (3 cr)
For 435  or For 535  Remote Sensing of Fire (3 cr)
For 472  or REM 472  Remote Sensing of the Environment (4 cr)
For 570  Advanced Remote Sensing Measurement Methods (3 cr)
For 572  Spatial and Biophysical Modeling (3 cr)
Geog 475  Intermediate GIS (3 cr)
REM 407  GIS Application in Fire Ecology and Management (2 cr)

Management, Planning and Policy Course Group (2-4 cr):
CSS 490  Wilderness and Protected Area Management (3 cr)
CSS 573  Planning & Decision Making for Watershed Management (3 cr)
For 424  Forest Dynamics and Management (4 cr)
For 430  Forest Operations (3 cr)
For 454  Air Quality, Pollution, and Smoke (3 cr)
For 462  Watershed Science and Management (3 cr)
For 484  Forest Policy and Administration (2 cr)
For 529  Forest Ecosystem Analysis (3 cr)
For 585  Natural Resources Policy Analysis (2 cr)
REM 456  Integrated Rangeland Management (3 cr)
WLF 492  Wildlife Management (4 cr)

Electives to total 15 for the certificate
Program Component
Curriculum:
Required courses

Name or Degree Change Only Requests
Leave blank if not making a name and/or degree change. This section can be completed for changes to the name of: degree, major, minor, option, emphasis, certificate, teaching endorsement

Current Name: 

New Name: 

Current Degree: 

New Degree: 

Other Details: 

Financial Impact
This section must be completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greater than $250,000 per FY:</th>
<th>Less than $250,000 per FY:</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brief Description of financial impact:</td>
<td>We do not anticipate any financial impact following the drop of the FEM Certificate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale and Assessment Information
This section must be completed

Rationale for approval of this request as appropriate; include an explanation of how the department will manage the added workload of the new program component and any relevant assessment information that applies, describe whether the program component, curriculum, and admission requirements remain the same, describe the rationale for a name change or degree designation change:

Following a program and curricular review by an employer’s summit and other stakeholder meetings, the faculty decided to remove the undergraduate certificate in Fire Ecology, Management, and Technology because (1) an 18 cr minor in Fire Ecology and Management exists and (2) a graduate certificate of the same name already exists.

These changes will not change faculty workload.
Distance Education Availability
This section must be completed

To comply with the requirements of the Idaho State Board of Education (SBOE) and the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) the University of Idaho must declare whether 50% or more of the curricular requirements of a program may be completed via distance education. If the program component is to be offered via distance education, additional or different formwork may be required. Contact provost@uidaho.edu for assistance.

The U.S. Department of Education defines distance education as follows:
Distance education means education that uses one or more of the technologies listed below to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the instructor and to support regular and substantive interaction between the students and the instructor, either synchronously or asynchronously. The technologies may include--

(1) The internet;
(2) One-way and two-way transmissions through open broadcast, closed circuit, cable, microwave, broadband lines, fiber optics, satellite, or wireless communications devices;
(3) Audio conferencing; or
(4) Video cassettes, DVDs, and CD-ROMs, if the cassettes, DVDs, or CD-ROMs are used in a course in conjunction with any of the technologies listed in paragraphs (1) through (3).

Can 50% or more of the curricular requirements of this program component be completed via distance education?  Yes*  No  X

*If Yes, can 100% of the curricular requirements of this program component be completed via distance education?  Yes  No

Geographical Area Availability
This section must be completed

Identify the geographical area(s) this program component can be completed in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moscow</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coeur d’Alene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Falls*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other**  Location(s):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Programs offered in regions 3, 4, and/or 5 may require additional formwork from the State Board of Education. Contact the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President for additional information.

**Note: If Other is selected identify the specific area(s) this program component will be offered.

Office of the Registrar Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Effective Date:</th>
<th>Summer 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Received by the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President:</td>
<td>10/27/15 (Processed) MDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received by UCC Secretary:</td>
<td>10/27/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCC Item Number:</td>
<td>16-019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCC Approval Date:</td>
<td>11/02/2015  Vote Record:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Item Number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Approval Date:</td>
<td>Vote Record:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Policy Report Number or Faculty Meeting Date:</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the President Approval Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board of Education Approval/Acknowledgement Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 22, 2015

John Wieneck  
Provost and Executive Vice President  
University of Idaho  
Moscow, Idaho 83844-3152

Dear Provost Wieneck:

The purpose of this letter is to request permission to conduct an administrative reorganization of several units in the College of Letters, Arts & Social Sciences at the University of Idaho. We also request that this reorganization take effect summer 2016.

The request affects five units at the University of Idaho in the College of Letters, Arts & Social Sciences: The Martin School, the Department of Political Science, the Department of Philosophy, the Department Modern Languages and Cultures, and the International Studies Program. Presently, the Martin School is composed of three units: Political Science, Philosophy, and International Studies. In order to develop new academic synergies, increase administrative efficiency, and position the university and college’s programs for a new generation of students, we propose the renaming of the school to Martin School of Global Studies. This renamed school will house the programs that focus on international education and languages. The Martin School of Global studies will therefore house the Department of Modern Languages and Cultures and the International Studies Program. The remaining departments (i.e., the Department of Political Science and the Department of Philosophy) will be merged into a single administrative unit: the Department of Politics and Philosophy. Both the Martin School of Global Studies and the Department of Politics and Philosophy will be academic units within the College of Letters, Arts, & Social Sciences. The merger will allow the university to address economy of scale issues by placing two complementary disciplines in the same administrative unit. This administrative reorganization will not require additional resources from the State of Idaho or the University of Idaho.

So, in summary:
1. We are proposing to rename the Martin School to the Martin School of Global Studies;
2. We are moving the Department of Modern Languages and Cultures into the new Martin School of Global Studies;
3. We are taking the Department of Philosophy and the Department of Political Science out of the Martin School;
4. We are leaving International Studies within the Martin School.
5. Outside of the Martin School, we will have a Department of Politics and Philosophy that is merged between those two disciplines.
This reorganization will not affect any degree programs at the University of Idaho. The Department of Politics and Philosophy will continue to offer the BA/BS, MA, and PhD in political science, the Master of Public Administration (MPA), and the BA/BS in philosophy. The Department of Modern Languages and Cultures will continue their BA programs in French, Latin-American Studies, Modern Language Business, and Spanish. The International Studies program will continue its BA program in International Studies. All minors and certificate programs will also remain unaffected by the reorganization. Additionally, all of these units and programs will continue to undergo rigorous internal and external reviews per university regulations to ensure academic quality and organizational effectiveness. Once again, it is our intention that increased administrative efficiencies and better degree marketing and positioning will lead to better service and more students in our programs.

All faculty members in the Department of Political Science, the Department of Philosophy, the Department of Modern Languages and Cultures, and the International Studies program are committed to the delivery of public service and research. In public service, faculty members in these units actively engage citizens, groups, organizations, governments, and businesses in Idaho, nationally, and internationally. These activities range from contract research and the direct provision of services to public workshops and presentations. All members of these faculties are engaged in research, some funded with significant external grants.

The university’s mission includes the development of the state through excellent teaching, research, and outreach. The vision of the University of Idaho is to be among the leaders of land-grant institutions in the 21st century. Within this context, and especially given Representative Morrill’s call for a liberal education for the industrial classes, the study of politics, philosophy, languages, and cultures, all on a local to international scale, provide the foundational knowledge for citizenship, engagement, and community development. Each of the departments and programs affected by this reorganization provides direct support to the University of Idaho’s mission and priorities. The study of politics and philosophy provides the foundation for the humanities and social sciences and the knowledge generated by them is fundamental to almost every field and discipline at the university. Students that study languages and cultures become more competitive in fields such as education, mass media, law, medicine, international business, natural resources, agriculture, and politics. The programs in language and culture serve the University of Idaho’s signature area on human communities and the strategic plan in community and culture. Finally, the International Studies program combines core training in global themes with specific training in particular issue emphases (international relations, global resources and development, global economics and business) and particular regional emphases plus advanced training in a second language. It directly addresses the University of Idaho’s State Board of Education mandate to promote global understanding.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Andrew E. Kersten, Dean
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OBJECTIVE STATEMENT:

To develop a list of issues concerning the employment of long-term contingent faculty (LTCF) and a recommendation of how to address them.

IN SCOPE:

• Faculty temporarily employed for two or more consecutive semesters at the UI and teach six or more credits per semester.

OUT OF SCOPE:

• Faculty temporarily employed for one semester at the UI or teach less than six credits (or one course) per semester.

DELIVERABLES:

• Report to the Faculty Senate that addresses the issues concerning the employment of long-term contingent faculty (LTCF) and a recommendation of how to address them.

MILESTONES:

• Status report to the Faculty Senate November 17th
• Final report to the Faculty Senate by mid-December

APPROACH:

1. Focus groups with representative LTCF’s
2. Conduct external benchmark of several peer institutions
3. Gather feedback from faculty, staff, and administrators
4. Develop recommendations
5. Document work in a report to Faculty Senate

ASSUMPTIONS and CONSTRAINTS:

• Recommendations must be in line with a sustainable budget and be aligned with benchmarked metrics
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1. **Focus groups with representative LTCF.**
   We will schedule focus groups with CLASS, COS, and in a neutral location. **Need:** 1 person to work with me on this task.

2. **Conduct external benchmark of several peer institutions**
   We will benchmark metrics from peer institutions to determine the significance of our problem and what others are doing about it. **Need:** 1 person to conduct this project.

3. **Gather feedback from faculty, staff, and administrators.** We will use the information from steps 1-2 above to draft an update and then present the information in a few forums. **Need:** 1 person to work with me to organize the information and present it at the forums. It would be good for all of us to attend these 3 sessions.

4. **Develop recommendations**
   We will use the feedback to develop recommendations. **Need:** this step will involve all of us. Hopefully it will be pretty obvious by this point.

5. **Document work in a report to Faculty Senate**
   We will present our work. My administrative assistant can do the report. But it will be good for all of the Task Force to attend the Faculty Senate meeting. Our target is mid-December but may be in early January.
OPEN COMMENT SESSIONS FOR LONG-TERM CONTINGENT FACULTY

The Faculty Senate has commissioned a task force to develop a list of issues concerning the employment of long-term contingent faculty and a recommendation of how to address these issues. The task force will be hosting four open sessions for the university community to provide input into these issues. Please plan to attend one of these meetings if you wish to provide input. On the Moscow campus, three sessions will be held in Janssen Engineering Building (JEB) 111*.

- 11/12, Thursday from 3pm to 4pm
- 11/18, Wednesday from 3:30pm to 4:30pm
- 11/19, Thursday from 4pm to 5pm

Another open session for off-campus faculty will be held on Wednesday 11/18 from 1:30 to 2:30pm PST (2:30 to 3:30 MST) between Engineering Physics Building 205 (Moscow) and the following off-campus locations. (Moscow faculty may attend this one as well)

- Boise, IWC 162
- Coeur d’ Alene, Harbor Center 145C
- Idaho Falls, TAB 350A

* Enter JEB at the entrance across from the new IRIC building construction site; JEB 111 is immediately to your right, across from the JEB auditorium.
Open Sessions for Long-Term Contingent Faculty  
Faculty Senate Task Force

We’re members of a task force created by Faculty Senate to develop a list of issues concerning the employment of long-term contingent faculty and a recommendation of how to address these issues. As such, we’re talking with several groups of employees within the university about the working conditions of these faculty, trying to understand the issues around such employment.

We are hosting several open sessions for faculty to comment, both on the Moscow campus and off. To help frame the conversation, we have prepared some questions. But feel free to go beyond these questions in providing your input.

Questions

1. How long and in what capacity have faculty worked as a temporary faculty at UI?

2. What employee benefits do these faculty have? What are your thoughts with regard to health and sick leave benefits, retirement savings plan, life insurance, etc.?

3. Are these faculty eligible for professional development opportunities such as the Leadership Academy, teaching and research awards, and seed grants? If not, do you think they should have these benefits, given they would be competing with tenure-track faculty?
4. How do you believe temporary faculty are treated by the institution, by their superiors, and by their colleagues?

5. What else do you believe prevents them from doing the best job possible?

6. Any thoughts on how the situation might be improved?

7. If we had to separate teachers into those that teach “recreationally” and those that teach for a living, what would be that dividing line?
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS AND SALARY DETERMINATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS AND PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS

PREAMBLE: This section contains those policies and their attendant procedures for those periodic reviews of performance that affect faculty members and academic administrators. Policies concerning performance evaluation were part of the original 1979 Handbook, but were completely rewritten in July 2002 and further refined in 2003. In July 2007 Form 1 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 Form 1 was again revised to include a Disclosure of Conflicts statement to comply with FSH 6240. In 2009 this section was again revised to reflect recent changes to the faculty position description and evaluation forms to better integrate faculty interdisciplinary activities. In July 2010 B was added and FSH 1420 E-6 was incorporated into D to consolidate the evaluation process into one policy. In July 2014 changes were incorporated to ensure all faculty go through a review by their peers. Further information may be obtained from the Provost’s Office (208-885-6448). [ed. 7-03, rev. 7-07, 1-08, 7-09, 7-10, 7-14]

CONTENTS:
A. Annual Performance Evaluation and Salary Determination for Faculty Members
B. Performance Below Expectations of Non-tenured Faculty Members
C. Performance Below Expectations of Tenured Faculty Members
D. Performance Evaluation of Academic Administrators
E. Sequence of Evaluation of Faculty Members and Administrators.

A. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND SALARY DETERMINATION FOR FACULTY MEMBERS.

A-1. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION. Annual evaluation of the performance of each member of the faculty is primarily the responsibility of the faculty member and her/his unit administrator. Each unit will develop criteria in its bylaws for third-year and periodic review of its faculty (FSH 1520 II Section 1). The committee for all reviews will be defined in unit bylaws and will include tenure-track faculty (see FSH 3560 E-2 c). The materials listed in FSH 3560 E-2 a and b are critical and used by review committees when considering progress towards promotion (FSH 3560) and/or tenure (FSH 3520). The provost is responsible for preparing supplementary instructions each year, including the schedule for completion of the successive steps. The form to be used, “Annual Performance Evaluation Form 1: Evaluation of Faculty,” is appended to this section. Personnel on international assignment see FSH 3380 C. [rev. 7-03, 7-09, 7-14, ed. 7-10]

a. Forms Distributed. Supplies of the form to be used in the evaluation process are procured by deans and unit administrators. The immediate administrative officer is responsible for ensuring that each faculty member receives the proper form together with a copy of the supplementary instructions. [rev. 7-01]

b. Performance levels for each criterion are described as follows: [ed. 7-10]
   i. Exceptional Performance (5) is extraordinary performance well beyond that required relative to the position description.
   ii. Above Expectations (4) represents performance that is better than expected relative to the position description. [ed. 7-09, 7-10]
   iii. Meets Expectations (3) is the performance expected of a faculty member relative to the position description.
   iv. Below Expectations (2) denotes performance that is less than expected of a faculty member relative to the position description and means improvement is necessary. A rating of below expectations in one or more criteria triggers procedures outlined in 3320 B or C. [rev. 7-09, 7-10]
v. Unacceptable Performance (1) is performance that is not acceptable relative to the position description and/or is inconsistent with the conditions for continued employment with the institution. Failure to meet these standards in any of the following ways will result in a rating of unacceptable performance: [rev. 7-09]
   a) received a “1” rating the previous period but did not make the improvements required;
   b) consistently violated one or more of the institution’s standards for meeting the expectations of the position; or
   c) violated one or more standards of conduct as specified in the Faculty-Staff Handbook.

c. Annual Report of Efforts and Accomplishments by Faculty Member. Each faculty member shall provide his or her unit administrator with the following materials for use in the annual performance evaluation:
   (1) Current Curriculum Vitae
   (2) UI Faculty Position Description for Annual Performance Review
   (3) Written detailed summary report of faculty activity for the period of the annual performance review that compares accomplishments to expectations in the Position Description for the period under review [rev. 7-09]
   (4) Other materials necessary to document efforts and accomplishments for the period under review. [add. 7-01, ed. 7-10]

d. Evaluation of Faculty by Unit Administrators. Unit administrators evaluate their faculty members. The performance of each faculty member during the review period is judged on the basis of the position description(s) in effect during that period. In the case of a faculty member holding joint appointments and/or involved in interdisciplinary activities, as described in the position description, in two or more academic or administrative units, it is the responsibility of the administrator in the faculty member’s primary academic discipline to solicit and consider relevant information on job performance from other administrators with responsibility for the faculty member’s work. [See also 3080 E-3.] [rev. 7-09, ed. 7-10]

Ratings are determined by comparing the faculty member’s performance to the position description. The results of the student evaluation of teaching are carefully weighed and used as a factor in this evaluation. For each area of responsibility, the unit administrator shall describe the basis for her/his evaluation in assessing the faculty member’s performance. The ratings and narrative are entered as indicated on the form. The annual evaluation score for a faculty member in Form 1 relates to the faculty member’s performance evaluation relative to his/her position description. The overall unit average is provided to the faculty member upon request so that each faculty member can gauge his/her performance relative to other faculty members within the unit. After the unit administrator has completed ratings and narratives for all faculty for the review period, he or she shall provide the following items to each reviewed individual as they become available: [rev. 7-03, 7-09]
   (1) a copy of the individual’s annual evaluation form and narrative [rev. 7-09]
   (2) if requested, comparative information to help assess performance evaluation and numerical ratings, including, but not limited to: [rev. 7-09]
      (a) Frequency distribution for overall ratings for the unit
      (b) Frequency distribution for overall ratings for the college [rev. 7-97, ren. and rev. 7-01]

e. Self-Evaluation and Conference. Each faculty member is given an opportunity to use the evaluation form (FSH 3320 Form 1) to make an evaluation of his or her own performance. The unit administrator shall provide each faculty member with the opportunity to meet to discuss the unit administrator’s evaluation. (Suitable alternate arrangements are made for off-campus personnel.) The purpose of this meeting is to review and discuss the administrator’s evaluation and the self-evaluation, if any. The unit administrator explains his or her ratings and narrative providing a formative assessment on progress towards tenure, promotion, and/or continued satisfactory performance related to the faculty member’s performance during the year and any revisions in professional goals and objectives for the coming year. The faculty member and the unit administrator work to identify strategies to help the faculty member improve performance. The ratings may be modified as a result of the discussion. At the conclusion of the review process, each faculty member shall sign
the evaluation form indicating that she/he has had the opportunity to read the evaluation report and to discuss it with the unit administrator. If the faculty member disagrees with the contents of the review, he/she shall be permitted to append a report to the unit administrator’s evaluation, detailing the nature of the dissent. A copy of the administrator’s final evaluation is given to the faculty member. [ren. and rev. 7-01, rev. 7-09, ed. 7-10]

f. College-Level Action. Copies of the performance evaluation materials forwarded by the unit administrator to the appropriate dean(s), for evaluation at the college(s) level, shall include: [rev. 7-09]

- a narrative evaluation on progress towards tenure, promotion, and/or continued satisfactory performance, [rev. 7-09]
- any evaluative comments provided by interdisciplinary/center administrators or from those administrators of faculty holding joint appointments, and [rev. 7-09]
- the evaluation form, [rev. 7-09]

If the unit fails to attach the narrative evaluation and evaluative comments, the college will return the materials to the unit. [add. 7-09, rev. 7-10]

If the faculty member files a dissent, the unit shall provide a copy to the dean. The dean shall arrange a meeting with the unit administrator and the faculty member to attempt to resolve the relevant issues. The dean enters an evaluation in the space provided on the evaluation form. A copy of that form is given to the faculty member and the original is forwarded to the Provost's Office for permanent filing [see FSH 1470 and APM 65.02]. A copy of the evaluation form is retained in the college office. If the dean concurs with the overall evaluation and rating of the faculty member by the unit administrator, no additional signature is required from the faculty member. [rev. 7-09, 7-10]

If there are any differences in any rating between the unit administrator and college dean, the dean shall attach a narrative stating the reasons for these differences, and a second and subsequent signature by the faculty member, acknowledging receipt of the dean’s evaluation and rating, is required. The college shall forward the original evaluation form and narrative to the Provost's Office for permanent filing. If the college fails to attach the narrative, the provost will return the form to the college. A copy of the evaluation form is retained in the college office. If the faculty member disagrees with the Dean’s evaluation and the disagreement cannot be resolved at the college level, either party may choose to refer the matter to the University Ombuds (FSH 3820). If the matter remains unresolved at the college level, the Provost shall be notified of the disagreement. [ren. and rev. 7-01, rev. 12-06, 7-09, 7-10]

A-2. SALARY DETERMINATION. This process is carried out at the departmental and higher levels of academic administration. [see FSH 3420.] [rev. 7-09]

B. PERFORMANCE BELOW EXPECTATIONS OF NON-TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS. [add. 7-10]

B-1. If the unit administrator determines that a non-tenured faculty member is performing below expectations, the unit administrator should consider the variety of possible causes, other than inadequate effort on the faculty member’s part, that might be responsible for the performance. (see FSH 3190) [ed. 7-09, rev. 7-10]

B-2. FIRST ANNUAL OCCURRENCE.

a. In the event that a non-tenured faculty member receives an annual evaluation concluding that he or she has performed below expectations (2 or lower) within one or more areas of responsibility, the unit administrator will, at the same time he or she delivers the performance evaluation, offer to meet with the faculty member to identify the reasons for the performance below expectations. At this meeting, the faculty member and the unit
administrator will review the current Position Description and examine strategies that would permit the faculty member to improve his or her performance. [rev. 7-09, 7-10]

b. In the event that a non-tenured faculty member receives an annual evaluation concluding that he or she has performed below expectations (2 or below) in the overall score, the unit administrator will, at the same time he or she delivers the performance evaluation, offer to meet with the faculty member to identify the reasons for evaluating the performance as below expectations. At this meeting, the unit administrator will appoint a mentoring committee by selecting three individuals from a list of five faculty members nominated by the faculty member, or if the faculty member makes no nominations, will appoint three faculty members of her/his choosing. The mentoring committee’s purpose is to help the faculty member improve performance. The members of the committee need not be drawn from the same unit as the faculty member. The faculty member or unit administrator may request that the University Ombuds attend meetings of the mentoring committee and faculty member. [ed. 12-06, rev. 7-09, 7-10]

B-3. TWO CONSECUTIVE ANNUAL ASSESSMENTS OF BELOW EXPECTATIONS. In the event of two consecutive annual evaluations concluding that the non-tenured faculty member has performed below expectations overall or within one or more areas of responsibility (2 or lower) the unit administrator will, at the same time he or she delivers the performance evaluation, arrange a meeting of the faculty member, the unit administrator and, in the unit administrator’s discretion, the Dean of the College. The faculty member or the unit administrator may request that the University Ombuds attend the meeting. [ed. 12-06, rev. 7-10]

The intent of the meeting is to review:

a. the current position description and revise it if necessary to address the issues identified during the discussion. [ed. 7-09]

b. the strategies implemented in the previous year and to identify why the strategies did not result in the faculty member meeting expectations. The parties should re-examine strategies that would permit the faculty member to improve his or her performance. [ed. 7-09]

C. PERFORMANCE BELOW EXPECTATIONS OF TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS. Tenured faculty will follow the same process as described in B-1 through B-3 above. In addition, to identify and address specific problems early on, a tenured faculty member may be subject to a review as described in C-1 and C-2 below. The purpose of C-1 and C-2 is to assist the faculty member with getting back on track.

C-1. ANNUAL ASSESSMENT OF BELOW EXPECTATIONS. In the event a tenured faculty member receives an annual evaluation of below expectations, the procedures described in B-1 through B-3 above will apply. In the event of an overall score of 1, the provost may determine that further review of the faculty member’s performance is required. This review will be conducted in accordance with the procedures prescribed in 3320 C-2. [ren. and ed. 7-09]

C-2. THREE CONSECUTIVE ANNUAL EVALUATION ASSESSMENTS OF BELOW EXPECTATIONS. In the event of three consecutive annual evaluations below expectations overall or within one or more areas of responsibility, or a pattern of below expectations evaluations over five years (a summary score of 2 or lower), the Dean shall initiate a formal peer review. [rev. 7-09, ren. 7-10]

a. Composition of the Review Committee. The Review Committee will consist of six (6) members, appointed as follows:

(1) The Faculty member will submit to the unit administrator a list of the names of three faculty members from within the unit and three tenured faculty members from outside of the unit. The unit administrator will submit a similar list to the faculty member. From the list given to the faculty member, he/she will select one person from inside of the unit and one from outside the unit. From the list given to the unit administrator, he/she will select one person from inside of the unit and one from outside the unit.

(2) The committee members will select as chair another faculty member from within the unit.
b. Timing of the Review. The review and recommendation(s) will be completed within sixty days of the annual evaluation.

c. The Review. The purpose of the review is to assess the level of performance of the faculty member and the unit administrator’s evaluation of that performance. To that end, the committee shall assess the reasonableness of the previous evaluations and the appropriateness of the development plans, as well as any material submitted by the faculty member and the unit.

The faculty member and chair will provide the following materials to the committee:
- Updated Curriculum Vitae of the faculty member
- Position Descriptions for the past four years
- Annual evaluation materials submitted by the faculty member for the past three years
- Annual Evaluations of the faculty member by the unit head and the Dean for the past three years
- Student and peer evaluations (if any) of teaching for the past four years
- A self-evaluation of teaching
- A self-assessment summary of what the faculty member has learned and achieved during the past four (4) years, including contributions to the department, university, state, nation, and field (about 2 pages).

The faculty member may submit any additional information he or she desires, and the committee may request additional materials as it deems necessary.

d. Responses to Committee Report. The faculty member, chair, and dean will receive the report and will have fifteen days from the report’s date to submit written responses to the review committee. The review committee will send the report and all responses to the provost.

e. Provost. The Provost will be responsible for determining the appropriate resolution, which may include:

   [rev. 7-09]
   1) continuing the status quo;
   2) mentoring to address area(s) of concern;
   3) termination for cause;
   4) consideration of other recommended resolution(s). [1-4 add. 7-09]

D. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS. [ed. 7-09, ren. 7-10]

D-1. EVALUATION BY FACULTY MEMBERS. Opportunity is provided for an annual performance evaluation of college deans, assistant and associate deans, and administrators of academic departments and other intracollege units by the faculty members of the respective units. The provost sends each faculty member an appropriate number of copies of the form, “Annual Faculty Evaluation of Academic Administrators” [form 2 appended to this section] to be used for evaluation of the unit or center administrator, one to be used for evaluation of the dean, and one to be used for evaluation of each assistant or associate dean in the college. [ren. & ed. 7-10, 10-10]

D-2. EVALUATION OF UNIT AND CENTER ADMINISTRATORS AND ASSISTANT AND ASSOCIATE DEANS. The review and evaluation of unit and center administrators, and assistant and associate deans, require consideration of their responsibilities as faculty members and as administrators as defined by percentage allocations in the Annual Position Description. All administrators are entitled to a review and evaluation of their performance as faculty members. Further, all administrators are entitled to a review of their performance as administrators. (Forms to be used in the evaluation of administrators are found in Form 1 and 2. [rev. 7-99, ed. 3-07, rev. & ren. 7-10 (incorporated 1420 E-6 into this entire section D-2 through D-4)]
1. Evaluation as a Faculty Member.

   a. Annual Evaluation. The annual evaluation of an administrator’s performance as a faculty member shall be conducted by the dean of the college in accordance with the provisions of FSH 3320 A above.

   b. Third Year Review. If the administrator is untenured, there shall be a third-year review in accordance with the procedures outlined in FSH 3520 G-4.

2. Evaluation as an Administrator.

   a. Annual Evaluation. The dean shall conduct an annual evaluation of each administrator’s performance in accordance with the responsibilities specified in FSH 1420 E-1 and in the Annual Position Description. The dean and administrator will negotiate the administrator’s Annual Position Description on the basis of the unit’s needs, and make it available to the faculty for annual evaluation purposes. The administrator will present his or her annual goals for the unit at the beginning of the review year and report on his/her effectiveness in meeting last year’s goals. Annual goals should be based on the unit action plan, needs of the unit, and discussion with the dean. The dean will make a conscientious effort to solicit input from unit faculty through evaluation form 2. [rev. 7-99, ed. 6-09, 10-10]

   Unit faculty must send completed copies of form 2 directly to the dean. The dean furnishes the administrator a summary of the faculty evaluations in such a way that the confidentiality of individual evaluations is preserved. The dean may arrange a conference with the administrator to discuss the summary. After these steps have been completed, the dean shall destroy the individual faculty members’ evaluations and shall file the written summary in the dean’s office. The dean then submits a summary of conclusions and recommendations resulting from the review to the provost, who in turn makes his or her review and forwards recommendations to the president. The dean will then provide feedback to faculty who have submitted form 2, as appropriate. [ed. 10-10]

D-3. EVALUATION OF DEANS. The provost shall conduct an annual evaluation of each dean's performance in accordance with the dean’s responsibilities specified in FSH 1420 D-2 and in the Annual Position Description. The provost and dean will negotiate the Annual Position Description for the dean on the basis of the college’s needs and make it available to the faculty for annual evaluation purposes. The dean will present his or her annual goals for the college at the beginning of the review year and report on his or her effectiveness in meeting last year’s goals. Annual goals should be based on the college’s action plan, needs of the college, and discussion with the provost. The provost will make a conscientious effort to solicit input from college faculty through evaluation form 2. [ed. 10-10]

College faculty will send completed copies of form 2 directly to the provost. The provost will summarize the faculty responses and share that summary with the dean. In preparing and conveying that summary, the provost has the responsibility to ensure that faculty comments are confidential. This includes, but is not limited to, avoiding the use of any phrases that can identify the faculty member making the comments. The provost may arrange a conference with the dean to discuss the summary. After these steps have been completed, the provost shall destroy individual faculty members’ evaluations and file the written summary in the Office of Academic Affairs. The provost must then submit a summary of conclusions and recommendations resulting from the review to the president. The provost will then provide feedback to faculty who have submitted form 2, as appropriate. [ed. 10-10]

D-4. PERIODIC REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATORS. Each administrator is formally reviewed at least six months before the end of each appointment term, or, if there is not a fixed appointment term, at least every five years. The Provost appoints an ad hoc review committee to include faculty, department chairs, and experienced...
administrators of other units. The periodic review will be conducted at the request of the Provost and Executive Vice President and in accordance with the mechanisms of formal review, which must provide for the following:

1. Opportunity for the dean, center administrator, or unit administrator to prepare a report/portfolio summarizing his or her administrative achievements for the period, including annual reviews; [rev. and ren. 7-99]

2. Opportunity for all faculty and staff of the college/unit to participate in the review;

3. Solicitation of input by the committee from appropriate constituencies of the college/unit. Confidentiality of all individual evaluations will be ensured; [add. 7-99]

4. Preparation by the review committee of a written report summarizing the findings and recommendations of the review, which will be forwarded to the Provost and the dean/center or unit administrator; [ed. and ren. 7-99]

5. The provost will submit the written report along with any additional comments and recommendations to the president and provide appropriate feedback to the administrator. [rev. and ren. 7-99]

a. Additional Review. The provost and/or college dean may initiate a review at any time he or she determines a review is needed. The dean shall submit to the provost a summary of conclusions and recommendations resulting from this additional review. If the review is conducted by the provost, he or she shall submit a summary of conclusions and recommendations to the president.

The faculty of the unit may also initiate, by majority vote, a formal review (as outlined above) of the unit administrator. The tenured faculty of a college may also initiate, by majority vote, a formal review (as outlined above) of the college dean.

E. SEQUENCE OF EVALUATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS AND ADMINISTRATORS. The provost prepares the schedule for completion of steps in the performance evaluation and salary determination process each year. The schedule will ensure that faculty members’ evaluations of unit or center administrators and assistant and associate deans have been received by the dean before the administrators’ recommendations on salary, promotion, and tenure are made known to the faculty and, similarly, that faculty members’ evaluations of deans have been received by the provost before the deans’ recommendations on salary, promotion, and tenure are made known to the faculty. Likewise, the summaries of faculty evaluations of unit or center administrators, assistant and associate deans, and deans will be communicated to the persons evaluated after their recommendations on faculty salary, promotion, and tenure have been transmitted to the provost. [ren. & rev. 7-10]

(Forms on next few pages)

*NOTE: In October of 2010 it was determined that elimination of Form 2A was possible with minor edits to Form 1 (addition of reference FSH 1420 E to box 4). As such, Form 1 may be used in lieu of Form 2A by administrators, if desired. Given this change, form 2B becomes Form 2 (see the UI Policy website for redline versions or contact the Faculty Secretary's Office or Provost's Office for further clarification).