

University of Idaho
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
2016-2017 Meeting #26, Tuesday, April 25, 2017

Present: Anderson (Mike), Anderson (Miranda), Barbour, Boschetti, Brandt, Brewick, Brown, Caplan, Chung, Crowley (w/o vote), Fisher, Folwell, Godfrey (Coeur d'Alene), Hrdlicka, Johnson, Markuson, Nicotra, Payant, Sixtos, Vella, Wiencek (w/o vote), Wilson, Wright. **Absent:** Adekanmbi, Cannon (Boise), Donohoe, Foster, Morrison, Payant, Pregitzer. **Guests:** 9

Minutes: The Chair called meeting #26 to order at 3:32. A motion (Folwell/Vella) to accept the minutes from the April 18th meeting passed without objection.

Chair's Report: Chair Brandt explained that today's meeting will be suspended promptly at 4:40 to go into executive session to consider nominations for the Faculty Secretary position. Time permitting, the Senate will come back into session to finish the agenda. Chair Brandt announced that the party for Don Crowley will be at 6:00 at her house on May 2nd after the UFM. She will be sending around an electronic signup sheet although she encouraged people to attend even if they do not signup. The UFM is next Tuesday at 3:00 (Pacific). The Senate will meet on May 9th at the regular time although it will adjourn early to allow for the new Senate to conduct the election of officers for next year.

Provost's Report: Provost Wiencek announced that Professor Jerry McMurtry had accepted the offer to be the Dean of the College of Graduate Studies. The Provost felt the pool of internal candidates was strong. He noted he had reached out to the other candidates to determine other ways that they might become engaged in campus activities. Provost Wiencek announced that the last candidate for the Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives was here today and he encouraged faculty to provide feedback on the candidates. The Provost also commented that tonight was the University Awards for Excellence, which is a great opportunity to celebrate what is best about our University.

FS-17-072 (UCC-17-029)—Engineering: New Critical Infrastructure Certificate: The Chair recognized Professor Haney who joined us from the Idaho Falls campus to discuss this new certificate. Professor Haney explained that this interdisciplinary certificate was designed to encourage highly skilled engineers to become better versed in cyber security. The Idaho National Laboratory had expressed an interest in the creation of this program. The certificate will be offered at the Masters level in Idaho Falls. The certificate was approved without objection.

Deadlines for Curriculum Changes: Chair Brandt introduced Professor Patricia Hart (Chair of UCC) to report on changes in curriculum deadlines. Professor Hart explained that the Registrar's Office was concerned about the ability to process all curriculum changes under the current deadlines. The Registrar's office proposed moving the deadline for all curriculum changes up to May 1st of the year before the changes would go into effect. This would significantly lengthen the time before curriculum changes would go into effect. Professor Hart explained that this proposal would make the UI an outlier in terms of how long it takes most other Universities to put curriculum changes into effect. After consultation with the Registrar's Office, UCC has arrived at what they believe to be a reasonable compromise. Proposals for new programs (termed schedule C changes) would remain at May 1st. However, changes for the most typical curriculum changes (schedule A & B changes) would move to October 1st. This does constitute a compression of the time departments will have to get their curriculum proposals to UCC at the start of the academic year; but it provides significantly more time than the proposed May 1st. Professor Hart noted that Registrar, Heather Chermak, is creating a workgroup to review the curriculum approval process and identify areas where improvements can be made.

Chair Brandt observed that it was important for Senators to communicate with college faculty and administrators to ensure that proposals get to UCC in the appropriate timeframe. A Senator asked for clarification on the new deadlines. Professor Hart stated that the deadline for departments to submit schedule A & B changes to UCC will now be October 1st. Schedule C changes will be due on May 1st at the end of the previous academic year. [N.B. The list of schedules A, B, & C can be downloaded from the [Registrar's website](#).]

Teaching and Advising Committee-Plus/Minus Grades: Chair Brandt introduced Professor Cheryl Wilhelmsen, Chair of Teaching & Advising Committee (TEAC), to discuss the long simmering proposal for a plus/minus grading system. Professor Wilhelmsen noted that a survey of faculty last spring demonstrated that most faculty approved a plus/minus system. This spring TEAC sent out a survey to students. Unlike faculty, students did not favor adopting a plus/minus system. The survey showed that approximately 2/3 of those students surveyed “somewhat or strongly disagreed” with switching to a plus/minus system. Nine Hundred and Twenty (920) students completed the survey. TEAC has not had an opportunity to discuss the results of the survey, thus are not prepared to make any recommendations at this time. A Senator wondered how this survey would affect any proposals for a plus/minus system. Professor Wilhelmsen stated that the committee wanted to consider student opinion before they discussed a policy change. Many students felt that their GPA would be harmed by moving to a plus/minus system. A Senator suggested that a high percentage of students responding had a high GPA and perhaps that affected the outcome. Another Senator noted that there was not much evidence that a plus/minus system affected grade inflation. Professor Stephan Flores (next year's chair of TEAC) commented that next year's committee would have to consider the extent to which student opinion should affect university policy on this matter. A Senator asked whether the survey took into consideration the possibility of an A+? Professor Wilhelmsen stated that a possibility of an A+ was not considered. Another Senator stated that we should consider what an “A” means and it is hard to believe one can be better than perfect. The Chair expressed surprise at the results of the student survey since the law school has been using a plus/minus system for a long time. She noted that a focus group of law students was overwhelmingly in favor of plus/minus grading. Several Senators commented that a small change in GPA could make a significant difference in gaining admission to law or graduate school. The discussion ended with no clear recommendation except that next year's committee would once again consider this issue.

Sabbatical Leave Committee - 2018-19 Sabbatical Approval: The list of sabbaticals beginning fall 2018 passed without objection.

Graduate Student Committee Appointments 2017-2020: The Senate was presented with the list of graduate student appointments to senate committees. This list passed unanimously.

Classroom Space Resolution: Chair Brandt invited Professor Kenton Bird to present a proposed resolution on classroom space. Professor Bird stated that his concern about the loss of classroom space emerged out of his attempts as Director of General Education to schedule ISEM 301's. After discussing his concerns with Senate Leadership, a meeting with Registrar Heather Chermak and Ted Unzicker was set up. At this meeting, Ms. Chermak presented a spreadsheet (see classroom space report in Senate packet) that showed a net loss of 46 general-use classrooms containing 1416 seats since 2008. Given this information, he proposed the resolution contained on the Senate agenda. The gist of the resolution is to “impose a moratorium on conversion of general-use classrooms to non-instructional purposes until such space can be replaced in comparable configurations.” The resolution also asks the Facilities Scheduling Policy Committee to protect and enhance instructional spaces. In response to a question about why the classroom spaces had been lost, Professor Bird commented that there were many valid reasons but the

overall loss had constituted a death by a thousand cuts. There was a question about why departments controlled some classroom spaces? Ms. Chermak commented that she was not completely sure why this occurred, except that it was rooted in our history. Professor Bird suggested that perhaps some of these department controlled classrooms could be returned to general usage in the hours that the department is not using the room. Provost Wiencek stated that these are the kinds of issues being discussed in Cabinet meetings and expressed his general support for the resolution. A motion (Folwell/Miranda Anderson) to support the resolution as offered passed without objection.

Faculty Compensation Task Force: Chair Brandt turned the floor over to Vice Chair Hrdlicka to discuss developments with the Faculty Compensation Task Force. Professor Hrdlicka explained that the task force had met twelve times. The task force has been charged with working with the Director of Human Resources and the Vice President for Finance to develop a market based compensation system for faculty. The task force had representatives from all colleges. The task force informed itself on the progress made by the staff compensation task force and then sought to establish a framework for creating a parallel system for faculty.

Along the way, the task force learned about CIP codes, the Carnegie classification system, and the availability of suitable databases. The task force sought to reach a consensus on the following:

- What our peer group should be
- What salary database to use
- What the overall salary target should be
- How should we use CIP codes
- How often should we reevaluate our peer groups and salary target

Eventually the task force agreed on the following recommendations:

- The UI should use a market group that encompasses all Carnegie R-I, R-II, and R-III institutions. This represents all U.S. public and private doctorate granting institutions.
- The UI salary goal should be the market average of the above institutions.
- We should annually reevaluate our progress towards achieving the above goal.
- In cooperation with relevant parties, Human Resources should determine a six-digit CIP code for all faculty members. This also should be reevaluated as appropriate.
- In cooperation with relevant parties, Human Resources will assign a market rate for every faculty member based on CUPA-HR as a primary database and the Oklahoma State Survey as a secondary source. Whenever possible this market rate should be based on the six-digit CIP code.

Professor Hrdlicka explained that CIP codes stand for Classification of Instructional Programs. These are nationally standardized codes. The UI currently assigns these codes to programs, but not to individual faculty members. The difference between the two-digit, the four-digit, and the six-digit codes corresponds to levels of specialization. There was a strong preference on the task force to use the higher degree of specialization to classify faculty when possible. The CIP code will be determined through negotiation and dialog between the faculty member and relevant administrators. One problem is that the higher level of specialization (six digit code) comes with a decreased number of respondents (or data points) in the salary surveys.

Faculty Secretary Note: At this point, the Senate paused the discussion of the recommendations of the Faculty Compensation Task Force and went into Executive Session to receive recommendations from the Senate search committee for the soon to be vacant Faculty Secretary position (see FSH 1570-C-4).

Minutes were not taken during the Executive Session. After the session, the Senate returned to discussing the recommendations of the task force.

Faculty Compensation Task Force (cont.): Professor Hrdlicka resumed the conversation over the task force recommendations by reviewing the two major data sources. As a source of data, CUPA-HR contains salary information for all the Carnegie levels we wish to use. It contains very good coverage at the four-digit CIP Code level, but poor coverage at the six-digit level. CUPA-HR has a high level of functionality and is subscription based. The Oklahoma State database contains only information for R-I and R-II institutions. It has a higher number of respondents at the six-digit CIP code level, but not a great deal of functionality.

Professor Hrdlicka explained that the task force had spent the last two meetings discussing a model to determine target salaries. The task force has reached agreement on a model that focuses on rank and longevity. The model will probably have a merit component, although how that will be determined has not been resolved. The model under discussion assumes that half of salaries will be below market and half above. It also seeks to bring in assistant professor at a point fairly close to market, as this will help make the UI more competitive. Thus, the salary progression of an assistant professor to reach their market target will be fairly flat. Similar assumptions are built into the model for associate professors. At the full professor level, the model does not assume that a faculty member will be that close to market initially, but the salary progression will eventually take the person well past the market target.

Professor Hrdlicka summarized the recent discussions of the task force as considering a distribution model that will initially focus on those furthest away from their market target. The task force also prefers to keep the current salary bumps for promotion. One Senator suggested that the task force should resist the temptation to overthink this process. In contrast, another Senator expressed a hope that more thought would go into how to reward merit. Professor Hrdlicka expressed the view that our promotion process tends to ensure that the vast number of faculty are solid performers, although there may be a small group of faculty who don't meet expectations and a small group of faculty who might be characterized as "hyper-performers". He felt that in order to avoid losing "hyper-performers" we should build a merit element in the system, which would be determined by department chairs and deans.

Adjournment: After more discussion of how we might determine merit and to what extent that can be determined, the Chair noted that the meeting was past its normal adjournment time and had lost its quorum. If possible, the conversation could be continued at the next meeting. With a quorum no longer present, the meeting adjourned at 5:11.

Respectfully submitted,

Don Crowley, Faculty Secretary and
Secretary to the Faculty Senate