University of Idaho
2015-2016 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #7

3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, October 13, 2015
Brink Hall Faculty-Staff Lounge & Scopia

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2015-16 Faculty Senate Meeting #6, October 6, 2015 (vote)

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.

VI. Committee Reports.

   Committee on Committees: (Brandt)
   FS-16-008: FSH 3720 – Sabbatical Leave (vote)
   FS-16-009: FSH 1640.74 - Sabbatical Leave Committee and 1640.90 – General Education Assessment Committee (vote)
   Committee Appointments (vote)

VII. Special Orders.

   • Conflicts of Interest/Consulting (McIver/Inge)(intro)

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Randall Teal, Chair 2015-2016, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2015-2016 FS Meeting #6
               FS-16-008&009
               Committee Vacancies
University of Idaho
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
2015-2016 Meeting #6, Tuesday, October 6, 2015

Present: Adams, Anderson, Barbour, Boschetti, Brandt, Brewick, Brown, Caplan, Couture (Boise), Crowley (w/o vote), Flores, Folwell, Foster, Godfrey (Coeur d’Alene), Hiromoto (Idaho Falls), Hrdlicka, Jeffery, LaPrath, Latrell, Mahoney, Nicotra, Royer, Stoll, Teal, Wiencek (w/o vote), Wolf. Absent: Chung, Murphy, Perret, St. Claire. Guests: 8

Chair Teal called meeting #6 of the Faculty Senate to order at 3:30. A motion (Wolf/Stoll) to approve the minutes from meeting #5 on September 29th was approved without objection. The Chair also noted that while we could see Senators at the off-campus sites we continue to have background noise problems leading to a need to mute them.

Chair’s Report: The Chair announced that Clark Stevens from the New West Land Company will be on campus for a presentation next Monday (October 12th). His presentation will appeal to a broad range of disciplines particularly those interested in conservation, sustainability, and land use design.

Provost’s Report: Provost Wiencek stated that the Spread Pay Task Force has been assembled although they haven’t yet had a meeting. He emphasized that the task force is starting with no preconceived outcomes. The Provost is assembling a rather large Strategic Plan Committee due to the need for broad input. This committee will be broken into sub-groups and will make use of technology to be more productive. The State Board is expecting a plan by April.

There are several searches getting started:

- Dean Larry Stauffer has agreed to chair a search to replace Mario Reyes as Dean of the College of Business.
- The Provost will chair the search committee to replace Vice President of Research & Economic Development, Jack McIver.

The Provost also noted that Cori Mantle-Bromley had just announced her plans to step down as Dean of Education this summer. Dean Mantle-Bromley has just completed a successful fundraising effort for the new education building. The Provost thanked her for her leadership and she received a round of applause from the Senate.

Provost Wiencek suggested the need to begin working on a more transparent and consistent budget process. We do need to move this along by the end of the year so that we can embed our strategic plan with the budget process. He is concerned that it is not clear to faculty how to ask for resources.

The Provost also reported on some results related to the HERI Faculty Survey. The results are posted on the IRA website. There is a lot of data to look at. Provost Wiencek highlighted results that suggest that faculty are satisfied with their job security and the sense that their teaching and research are valued. However, the data also indicates that “there is room for the
administration to improve communication about policy and other institutional business in a way that is more transparent, open and inclusive of faculty concerns.” He hopes that faculty/staff believe that things are moving in the right direction.

The Provost also commented on the relationship between the goals of bringing up salaries and growing enrollment. If our goal is to bring up faculty salaries to 100% of market then what type of enrollment increases are needed? Our salaries are currently around 16% below market. To bring us up to market would take approximately $20 million. If we returned to a 20:1 student to faculty ratio we could accommodate an additional 2,156 students. This would result in around $15 million in additional revenue. We were around 20:1 in 2004 and have dropped to 16:1 since. He also noted that part of the enrollment decline can be attributed to the decline in WUE students, although this decline has not resulted in a decline in overall revenue. The Provost suggested that growing our enrollment while increasing our student to faculty ratio points to a way forward. However, he cautioned against assuming that any specific decisions have been made about how we go about meeting this challenge. As a concluding comment, the Provost suggested that we might want to have a conversation about whether all faculty need to be on the same teaching/research tenure-track. Should we have some faculty who have a full-time teaching focus? A Senator asked whether he was talking about clinical faculty or instructor positions with a path to tenure. The Provost stated that he just wanted to start the discussion and we should consider these issues as we discuss the strategic plan. Another Senator wondered about the effect on workloads of increasing students in some areas. The Provost stated that we can’t control where students might want to major, but if we need to add capacity in certain areas we would have to determine ways to do this.

A different Senator suggested that we didn’t have excess capacity, rather we had shifted capacity by emphasizing the generation of research revenue. The Provost reiterated that what we needed to do was have a discussion focused on what our best use of resources will be. This discussion of different career paths doesn’t need to occur right away, but we do need to have it.

A final question asked about the decline of WUE students and the relationship of that to revenue. Vice President for Finance Brian Foisy commented that the previous administration had worried about the amount of revenue that was being lost by discounting tuition to out-of-state students. He suggested that they had found the “tipping” point where a decline in out-of-states students had not resulted in a decline in revenue.

**Health Fair:** The Chair introduced Senator Brian Mahoney to discuss the Health Fair to be held Wednesday October 14th from 1-5 at the Student Recreation Center. There will be health screenings from 7-11, flu shots from 1-5. He will also be doing a CPR demonstration. The Fair is open to students, faculty & staff, employee dependents, and retiree’s. There will also be free soft tacos.

**Other Announcements:**

- The Chair reminded everyone of the Teaching and Advising brainstorming session (aka Think Tank) scheduled for next Tuesday (October 13th) at 1:45 in the Doceo Center (basement of the Pitman Center).
• Senator Hrdlicka asked people to fill out the survey emailed to them from the Benefits Advisory Group. The survey will be analyzed to determine what health benefits we want in future years.

• Senator Adams announced that next week will be the Annual Bellwood Lecture sponsored by the College of Law. This year’s speaker will be Judge Juan Guzmán from Chile. Judge Guzmán has received numerous human rights awards for his decisions seeking to hold Augusto Pinochet accountable for human rights violations. His lecture will be on Wednesday October 14th at 3:00 pm in the International Ballroom of the Bruce Pitman Center. On Tuesday the 13th the film “The Judge and the General” will be shown in the Law School Courtroom at 3:30. It was noted that this is the time that Senate meets. One Senator suggested a Senate fieldtrip.

FS-16-004 (UCC-16-001b): Education Specialist Degree: Professor Paul Gathercoal presented this proposal. The Ed.S. degree in Curriculum and Instruction was inadvertently omitted from the list of online degrees submitted to UCC last year. The College of Education requests the inclusion of this degree on the list of 100% online degrees. The proposal passed unanimously.

FS-16-007: Fall 2015/Spring 2016 Exam Schedule: Dwaine Hubbard from the Registrar’s Office presented the exam schedule and noted that it had been adjusted to try to minimize the number of times a student might end up with 3 exams on the same day. The Faculty Secretary thanked the Registrar’s Office for responding to this concern. The exam schedule was unanimously approved by the Senate.

University-wide Work Related Employee Training: The Chair introduced the newly arrived Vice President for Finance Brian Foisy along with Human Resources Executive Director Greg Walters and Elissa Keim. They have been invited to the Senate to discuss recommendations for training for employee’s, supervisors and managers. Mr. Foisy explained that this proposal was not an administrative “Dilbert” proposal. Rather it was a proposal that had bubbled up from Staff Council and other sources. The University doesn’t really offer any supervisor training and people are just expected to know what they need to do. The importance of such training can be seen by observing the University’s frequently long and convoluted hiring process. If we are to move away from a hiring process with multiple sign-offs, we need to make sure that supervisors are well trained and understand the legal environment within which they act. The proposal recommends that supervisors take a variety of required work training modules. When all of these modules are developed the required time commitment will be 3.5 hours. This proposal defines supervisor fairly broadly. So if a person supervises any employees, including student employee’s they will be required to complete the modules. This could impact as many as 1,000 individuals on campus. New supervisors will have 90 days to complete the training while continuing supervisors will have 4 months. There will also be a “refresh” period every three years. There are also some all-employee modules which everyone will be required to complete. These will add 1.75 hours to the required training. This would be thirty minutes less for all those who have completed the “Our Inclusive Workplace” module. The largest time burden that a supervisor, new to the University, would be required to spend on these modules is estimated to be about 5.5 hours.
Several Senators expressed strong support for the development of this type of training. A Senator suggested that the most opportune time for a new employee to take these modules would be at the new employee orientation. It was pointed out that this orientation is now online. In a similar vein it was suggested that a recently hired person might have the opportunity to complete some of these before they actually arrived. Vice President Foisy responded that this was a good suggestion although there may be some logistical problems involving issues like passwords.

There was a question as to whether TA’s would be considered employees and also whether some of the module’s intended for supervisors might be open to all employees in a group gathering. In response to the first question, it was stated that since an employee was defined as anyone receiving compensation, then TA’s would be considered employees. Several Senators suggested that having materials available online related to the modules would be valuable.

A Senator asked whether any employee, even someone hired for a short time in the summer, would be required to do the training. Foisy responded that the legal issues are the same and thus we can get in as much difficulty with a temporary employee.

The Chair asked if there was a way to streamline some of the requirements based on supervisor level, perhaps tier levels. For example, many faculty are assigned TAs by their unit thus becoming a supervisor by default, but they were not involved in the actual hiring/selecting. Several Senators noted concerns with how one tracks whether an employee completes a task assigned such as an I-9, especially when the supervisor does not have access to this information. Foisy responded that these were good suggestions and would be looked into.

Finally, there was an extended discussion of whether managing large numbers of student employees (like intramurals) might create some problems. While it was acknowledged that there might be some ways to streamline this, the general point of emphasis was that any person engaged in hiring or supervising would need to take these training modules. This conversation will be carried on with Staff Council and further tweaking of the timing and availability of the modules will probably occur. Foisy thanked Senate for their time and valuable input.

**Adjournment:** At 4:43 a motion (Mahoney/Wolf) to adjourn passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Don Crowley, Faculty Secretary
and Secretary to the Faculty Senate
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SABBATICAL LEAVE

PREAMBLE: This section describes the terms of eligibility for sabbatical leave for UI faculty. The policy is derived from, and incorporates all of, the State Board of Education, Governing Policies and Procedures, II-G. 3 b. This section was an original part of the 1979 Handbook and has been changed in only editorial ways since. Except where explicitly noted, the text is as of July 1996. Further information is available from the current chair of the Sabbatical Leave Evaluation Committee. [ed. 6-09]

CONTENTS:

A. General Policy
B. Purpose
C. Period of Leave and Salary
D. Restrictions on Service and Salary
E. Annual Job Description
F. Changes in Sabbatical
G. Return
H. Application for Leave
I. Rating System
J. Procedure for Rating
K. Criteria Used in Evaluating Proposals

A. GENERAL POLICY. Members of the UI faculty [see 1520 II-1] with tenure at the time of sabbatical leave, and the rank of senior instructor or above, or the equivalent of such rank, may be granted sabbatical leave after six full academic years of service at UI or after six full academic years have elapsed since the faculty member’s most recent sabbatical leave at UI. Sabbatical leave is granted on the basis of application by the faculty member and recommendation by the Sabbatical Leave Evaluation Committee (SLEC) [see 1640.74] and upon approval by the Faculty Senate and the president or designee. Sabbatical leave applications by faculty members in the Cooperative Extension System (CES) are handled separately: conditions of leave for these faculty members are established and funding is provided by the CES and their applications are evaluated by a committee of the CES. [ed. 7-01, 7-02, 6-09]

B. PURPOSE. The primary purpose of a sabbatical leave is to enhance the faculty member’s value to UI. Specifically, a sabbatical leave is to be used for one or more of the following purposes:

B-1. Research, scholarship, or study intended to result in publication or invention.

B-2. Refresher courses or a program of study, work, or travel designed to keep the faculty member abreast of the latest developments in his or her area of specialization.

B-3. Work toward an advanced degree.

C. PERIOD OF LEAVE AND SALARY. A sabbatical leave is for either one-half academic or fiscal year at full pay or a full academic or fiscal year at half pay, depending on the type of appointment held by the faculty member. Note that those on full year sabbaticals must arrange for full year life insurance and disability benefits if so interested. [See APM 55.42] [ed. 1-11]

D. RESTRICTIONS ON SERVICE AND SALARY. The decision as to the acceptability of a proposal will not be based on whether additional remuneration may be received, but rather on the probability that the faculty member will enhance his or her value to UI. Teaching elsewhere or working in research laboratories of industry or government may be approved if such activities can be expected to contribute significantly to the acquisition of useful ideas and practices. In no case will leave be granted primarily for the purpose of augmenting the person’s income. The benefit to UI must be
E. ANNUAL JOB DESCRIPTION. The faculty member is expected to note sabbatical purpose and goals on the annual faculty job description. Performance evaluation will reflect the faculty member’s purpose and goals while on sabbatical.

F. CHANGES IN SABBATICAL. If a faculty member must change the purpose, place, or time of the sabbatical leave, he or she must submit a written request, with recommendation from the dean and unit administrator, to the SLEC for approval. This request must state the rationale for the changes and document how the sabbatical leave plan will reflect these changes. Upon approval by the SLEC, any changes will be sent to the provost. [ed. 8-11]

G. RETURN. The faculty member is expected either to return to the active service of UI for at least one academic year after completion of the leave or to repay the money received from UI while on leave, unless the president approves a waiver of this requirement. Within six weeks after returning, the faculty member must submit to the provost’s office and to the faculty member’s dean and unit administrator, SLEC chair, a complete report in PDF format of his or her activities while on leave. This report will be available to be distributed by the SLEC chair to members of the SLEC, the provost, the faculty secretary, and the faculty member’s dean and unit administrator. [rev. 7-97, 7-02, 7-13, 12-15, ed. 8-11]

H. APPLICATION FOR LEAVE. An application is submitted to the SLEC with recommendation from the unit administrator and dean. Any SLEC member who submits an application for consideration must recuse themselves from reviewing all applications for that application period. The SLEC evaluates the proposal in accordance with subsections I, J, and K, below. Therefore, the application should present the merit of the proposed leave clearly and convincingly and should be prepared with the care and thoroughness of a paper submitted for publication. The application should consist of the following [rev. 7-97, 12-15, ed. 7-02, ed. 8-11]:

H-1. Cover Page. Include a title indicative of the proposed sabbatical activity, the period of requested leave, name and rank of the applicant, and signatures of the administrators approving the application.


H-3. Description of Proposed Sabbatical. Major headings should include a detailed statement of what the applicant plans to do while on sabbatical, the objectives and significance of the proposed activities, the value of these activities to the applicant’s UI obligations, the feasibility and methods of accomplishing the objectives, and the applicant’s qualifications pertinent to the proposed activities. This section should consist of not more than four single-spaced typewritten pages. [rev. 7-97]

H-4. Curriculum Vitae. Include a standard University of Idaho curriculum vitae.

H-5. Appendix. Evaluation of the proposal by college dean and unit chair, letters of acceptance from persons with whom the applicant plans to work, itinerary, and other supportive documentation should be appended to the application. [ed. 7-98, 7-02, ed. 8-11]

I. RATING SYSTEM. The application will be rated by the SLEC according to the following system:

I-1. Merit and feasibility of the proposal, 60 percent. [rev. 7-97]

I-2. Applicant’s record or potential for research, teaching, service and/or other pertinent activity, 25 percent. [add. 7-97]

I-3. Length of service to UI, up to 15 percent. Each year of service, counting from the faculty member’s initial appointment or from his or her most recent sabbatical leave, whichever is later, is assigned a weight of one point, limited to a maximum of 15. [ren. and rev. 7-97]

J. PROCEDURE FOR RATING. To give sufficient time for planning of sabbatical leaves, applications must be
submitted at least 10-17 months before the beginning of the academic year during which the leave is to be taken. The SLEC meets in April of each year to consider applications received by March 31 for the academic year beginning 17 months later. The committee rates the applications according to the rating system specified in I and makes recommendations to the Provost who notifies applicants of the university’s preliminary approval or disapproval. In this round of sabbatical applications the provost notifies no more applicants than a number equal to 60 percent of the sabbatical leaves expected to be available for the year under consideration. Faculty members who do not apply for sabbatical leave by March 31 may apply on or before November 1 for the academic year beginning 10 months later. The SLEC meets in November to consider new applications (and reconsider resubmitted applications). The SLEC again makes recommendations to the provost who submits a list of those faculty members recommended by the SLEC and proposed by the provost in both April and November to Faculty Senate for final approval. If there is substantial change in an applicant’s plans, he or she must submit a new plan through the unit administrator, dean, and the SLEC for approval. If the new plan is not approved, the applicant may request leave without pay. [rev. 7-97, ed. 7-00, 6-09, ed. 8-11]

K. CRITERIA USED IN EVALUATING PROPOSALS.

K-1. Preparation, Thought, and Documentation: Organization of the proposal, originality of the idea, thoroughness, specificity, feasibility, preliminary work done on the project in addition to the planning, letters of appointment and acceptance, other documents supportive of the proposal, and the applicant’s plans for travel, if that is an integral feature of the proposal. [rev. and ren. 7-97]

K-2. Benefit to UI and to Applicant: Contribution to applicant’s knowledge and understanding, contribution to teaching or other assigned duties at UI, publications or other scholarly works resulting from the project, enhancement of professional status, recognition for UI, and contribution to special projects or to UI programs. [rev. and ren. 7-97]

K-3. Applicant’s Record of or Potential for Research, Teaching, Service and/or Other Pertinent Activity: Publications, performances, grants, postdoctoral fellowships, leaves, participation in relevant professional organizations, record of achievement on previous grants and leaves, evaluation by unit administrator and dean, and evidence of excellence in teaching, service, or other evidence of contribution to the university. [rev. and ren. 7-97; ed. 7-98, ed. 8-11]
SABBATICAL LEAVE EVALUATION FORM [rev. 7-97]

APPLICANT’S NAME ____________________________________________

SEMESTER(S) APPLIED FOR ____________________________________________

PURPOSE OF LEAVE ____________________________________________

I--VALUE OF PLAN (Maximum 60 points)

A. Preparation, Thought, and Documentation (where appropriate) (30 points)

(For preparation and thought, consider the following: organization of the proposal, originality of the idea, thoroughness, specificity, feasibility, and preliminary work begun on project beyond planning; for documentation consider the following: itinerary, letters of appointment, letters of acceptance, and other supportive documentation if applicable.)

Excellent 27-30; Good 22-26; Average 16-21; Poor 8-15; Unacceptable 0-7 Points __

B. Benefit to University and Individual (30 points)

(Consider the following: contribution to applicant’s knowledge and understanding, contribution to teaching or other assigned duties at university, publications or other scholarly works resulting from project, enhancement of professional status, recognition for university, contribution to special projects or programs within university.)

Excellent 27-30; Good 22-26; Average 16-21; Poor 8-15; Unacceptable 0-7 Points __

II. APPLICANT’S RECORD OR POTENTIAL FOR RESEARCH, TEACHING, SERVICE AND/OR OTHER PERTINENT ACTIVITY (Maximum 25 points) (25 points)

(Consider the following: publications, performances, grants, post-doctoral fellowships, leaves, participation in relevant organizations, record of achievement of previous grants and leaves, evaluation by unit administrator and dean, including their assessment of the proposal and annual evaluation forms, evidence of excellence in teaching, service, or other evidence of contributions to the university, as required by the applicant’s position description.) [ed. 8-11]

Excellent 23-25; Good 19-22; Average 13-18; Poor 8-12; Unacceptable 0-7 Points __

III--SERVICE (Maximum 15 points)

(One point awarded for each year of service to university since the last sabbatical leave to a maximum of 15 points.) Points __

EVALUATOR ____________________________________________

DATE ____________________________________________ Total Points __
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COMMITTEE DIRECTORY

PREAMBLE: This section contains statements of the function and structure of each university-level standing committee. The names of persons appointed to serve on each such committee are published at the beginning of each academic year by the Committee on Committees, and copies of this publication are available from the Office of the Faculty Secretary (208-885-6151). This section, dating to the 1979 edition of the Handbook, has been frequently revised as necessitated by the changing mission or membership of existing committees or the deletion of obsolete committees or the addition of new ones.

1640.74
SABBATICAL LEAVE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

A. FUNCTION. To review applications for sabbatical leave, to make recommendations to the Faculty Senate for approval and referral to the president, to review the reports of those returning from sabbatical leave, and to evaluate annually the results of the program. [See also 3720.] [ed. 7-00, 7-09]

B. STRUCTURE. Five faculty members (with at least one representative each from the humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences) and vice provost of academic affairs, or designee (w/o vote). A member selected to serve on this committee who is planning on applying for a sabbatical shall recuse themselves from participating the semester in which they apply. [rev. 7-06, 2-09].

1640.90
General Education Assessment Committee

A. FUNCTION.

A-1. General Education Assessment Committee (GEAC) serves as the body for oversight of general education assessment. The Director of General Education and the Assistant Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, or designee, will provide coordination and leadership.

A-2. The GEAC meets to norm and score assessment artifacts, and to review assessment findings and make recommendations based on its findings to UCGE.

[Information on general education assessment can be accessed at the general education website: http://www.uidaho.edu/class/general-education]

B. STRUCTURE AND MEMBERSHIP. The committee is composed of nine members as follows: Director of General Education as Chair, Assistant Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, or designee, one UCGE member, two undergraduate students, and four-five members (faculty/staff, the majority of the members must be faculty) to include one with interdisciplinary experience and the remaining three selected to ensure a broad representation across the eight colleges that offer baccalaureate programs. All members, except students, serve on three year staggered terms. The Director of General Education is responsible for the selection of committee members.
Vacancies:

**Scientific Misconduct:** Sanford Eigenbrode

**GEAC:**
- Dir. Of General Education – Kenton Bird
- Dir. Inst. Res. & Assessment, or designee w/o vote – Dale Pietrzak
- UCGE Member – Diane Prorak (2016)
- Faculty/Staff – Beth Price (2016)
- Faculty/Staff (w/interdisciplinary exp.) – Dean Panttaja (2017)
- Faculty/Staff – Daniel Campbell (2017)
- Faculty/Staff – Helen Joyner (2018)
- Faculty/Staff – Katie Schiffelbein (2018)