Chair Brandt called meeting #6 to order at 3:31. A motion (Morrison/Brewick) to approve the minutes for the September 20, 2016 meeting passed unanimously.

Chair’s Report: Chair Brandt announced that President Staben will give the State of the University Address on October 5th at 2:30 in the International Ballroom of the Pitman Center. Chair Brandt noted that Senate Leadership had received some questions regarding animal control on campus. She noted that President Staben has appointed a task force to examine our policies on this matter and expected to receive a report early in October. We will be inviting someone from the task force to give a report.

With reference to the Senate’s discussion last week on the planned pilot of the narrative faculty evaluation form, Chair Brandt noted that Dean Pregitzer would like to bring to the floor a motion requiring the use of the narrative form this year. Since this motion did not get on the published agenda, she requested a motion to put this proposal in the special order section of the agenda for this week with the understanding that the proposal would not be voted on until next week. A motion (Caplan/Foster) to amend this week’s agenda to allow Senator Pregitzer to present his motion passed unanimously.

Provost’s Report: Provost Wiencek commented briefly on the leadership retreat held last week. There was a good discussion about the evolution in processes that have been discussed here at the Senate. The Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Committee will be getting started. There was also a discussion about the program prioritization process and the new UBFC process and how these things linked together. There was also a discussion at the retreat on the Chronicle survey and the Provost commented that the President will be discussing this survey in his presidential address next week. The search for the College of Science dean has just begun and he hopes to have on campus interviews in January. Provost Wiencek thanked all those who participated in the Envision Idaho Events last weekend. He thought it had been a well-attended and successful event.

Athletics: Chair Brandt invited Athletic Director Rob Spear to discuss the move to the Big Sky Conference in football and its financial impact. Dr. Spear noted that the University of Idaho is the first institution to move from the FBS (football bowl subdivision) to the FCS (football championship subdivision). The main difference is that the FBS allows 85 scholarships in football while the FCS only allows 63 football scholarships. The move presents us with some difficult issues. We were concerned that the move might allow student athletes to immediately leave the program. The NCAA did not allow student/athletes to automatically transfer without following regular transfer rules. Dr. Spear commented that we were also concerned about whether the UI football program would have an APR (Athletic Progress Rate) problem caused by athletes leaving the program due to the change to the FCS. The NCAA stated that if the UI could document that an athlete left the program due to the conference change, this would not be held against the UI in computing the APR.

There are still problems regarding how to get the football program down to 63 scholarships. We must get to 63 scholarships by 2018, if we are to be eligible for the FCS playoffs. We hope to accomplish this reduction through attrition and by having a smaller recruiting class. Dr. Spear also discussed the problems in scheduling since FCS schools can only play eleven games while FBS schools can play twelve. Since we already had our schedule planned through 2021, he has had to cancel and/or move games. He is close to having our schedule reset for 2018. Dr. Spear noted that we will continue to schedule some larger schools, because this was financially necessary.
The move did lead to some dissatisfaction among a minority of our boosters. A small group has removed their support resulting in a loss of about $200,000. He hopes that with success, this support will come back. Dr. Spear summarized the fiscal impact of the conference change. The lost revenue includes:

- $1 million in lost conference revenue
- $500,000 in reduced game guarantee’s
- $250,000 in reduction in NCAA revenue
- $200,000 in lost donor support
- lost revenue in ticket sales

He does expect the program to save $400,000 in reduced travel costs, and $375,000 in scholarship savings. Thus, the conference change will result in a loss of approximately a million dollars.

A Senator noted that this sounds pretty negative and wondered what the benefits of the change were? Dr. Spear thought the change would better align us geographically and help in creating better rivalries. We also expect to be very competitive at this level. It would have taken a $5 million investment to try to be competitive at the FBS level.

A Senator asked whether this change affected other sports. Dr. Spear explained that our other sports are already in the Big Sky. The exceptions are swimming and diving, because the Big Sky doesn’t sponsor these two sports. He did express a concern that the move (due to the loss in revenues) could impact some of the non-revenue sports. A Senator wondered that given our success in other sports, might we be better off without emphasizing football? Dr. Spear stated that it would be difficult to find a conference to be in without football, and that donors care the most about football. A question was asked as to why we could not get into the Mountain West Conference? Dr. Spear stated that the lack of a significant media market, the size of our stadium for football, and the lack of a basketball arena, all contributed to making us less attractive to the Mountain West.

Asked why we made this move if it was going to result in a loss of $1 million in revenue, Dr. Spear noted that after the Sun Belt made a decision to not renew our membership we had a choice between going independent in football or, moving to the Big Sky. Going independent would have put our players and coaches in a bad position. We did try this in 2013, but scheduling and finding teams that we can compete with becomes extremely difficult. If we find a conference opportunity at the FBS level that makes sense, we would explore it. Ultimately, he believes that we won’t be the only school that makes a move of this sort. Dr. Spear expressed confidence that this move will put our athletic programs in a position to be successful in the future.

FS-17-006—FSH 3050—Faculty Position Description Form. Chair Brandt introduced Professor Brian Ellison (Political Science) as Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee to discuss the position description form.

This form was approved by the Faculty Senate at the end of the year. The Senate sent the form back to Faculty Affairs to ensure that this is the version of the form that we wish to make the permanent form. After reviewing it, FAC has unanimously decided to approve the form for future years. There was some discussion about the usability of the form and it was pointed out that the Word version is quite easy to work with if the faculty member “right clicks” on the bar graph. It was clarified that the percentages are for the entire year and not for each semester.

A Senator asked about the location of the check box for interdisciplinary activities and whether it needed to be moved up (before the signature line for the faculty member). Professor Ellison noted that it was a faculty centered form and the faculty member needed to take responsibility to check the box indicating that they had interdisciplinary responsibilities. There was also a short discussion of the degree of detail that needed to go into the description of activities in each category. The general discussion suggested that the amount of detail might vary by faculty member, but this was the opportunity for that faculty member to outline his or her plans for the year. There was also a discussion about why the form was for the calendar year, rather than the academic year. This has frequently been discussed, but appears to be associated with the annual evaluation and CEC (change in employee compensation) process occurring during the spring semester.

There was a discussion of whether this was a pilot form for this year or not. The Faculty Secretary stated that the way it was passed last spring was as a pilot form. However, by passing this today to make this form the permanent form it should give incentive to departments to use this version this year. The Chair pointed out that there really
aren’t any substantive differences between this form and the previous form and people should be encouraged to go ahead and use the new form. A Senator wondered whether there shouldn’t be more structure to help standardize the form. Professor Ellison pointed out that there are rules within each department that provides the structure, but that these rules differ across departments and colleges. The new position form passed by a vote of 16-4-3.

**Special Orders – Faculty Annual Evaluation Form:** Chair Brandt recognized Dean Kurt Pregitzer (CNR) for the purpose of bringing a motion to the Senate regarding the annual evaluation. Senator Pregitzer noted that as the deans’ representative to the Senate he was bringing this motion from Provost Council. The purpose of the motion is to require all faculty to use the new narrative form this year. The motion (Pregitzer/Boschetti) stated that “All faculty will be evaluated using the new annual evaluation form on a trial basis for this evaluation cycle.”

**Faculty Secretary Note:** When the narrative evaluation form was passed last year, the Senate intended to give faculty the choice of whether to use the old form or the new form and then study the results. This new motion (if passed) would require all faculty to use the new form for the year, but would not remove the need to study the results.

There were several questions about whether the trial period should be for a year or longer. It was agreed that this proposed motion would make the narrative evaluation the required form for a year and the Senate could consider a longer trial at a later point. A Senator asked about providing training for department chairs. The Provost stated that could be done and Chair Brandt noted that Vice Provost Stevenson would be providing training for department chairs in October on using both the new position description form and the new narrative evaluation form.

A Senator expressed concern that the new narrative form was not consistent with the existing rules in FSH. Chair Brandt stated that we would need to provide a temporary fix to the FSH to make the new form function with the existing rules.

Professor Crowley noted that he thought it would not be a good idea to change the FSH for a pilot form. What we needed to do was provide a temporary fix while trying the pilot narrative form. There was a brief discussion over the relative merits of numbers versus narrative in an evaluation. Chair Brandt reiterated that the Senate had an extended discussion of this last year and the decision was made to try the narrative form on a trial basis.

**Adjournment:** Chair Brandt requested Senators to go back to their colleges and discuss this motion before voting on it next week. While anxiously anticipating more discussion on this issue next week, the Senate entertained a motion (Panttaja/Brown) to adjourn. This motion passed unanimously at 4:43.

Respectfully submitted,

Don Crowley, Faculty Secretary &
Secretary to the Faculty Senate