Present: Anderson (Miranda), Anderson (Mike), Arowojolu, Baird, Barbour (Twin Falls), Brandt (w/o vote), Brown, Bugingo, Cannon (Boise), Caplan, De Angelis, Ellison, Foster, Grieb, Hrdlicka, Jeffrey, McIntosh for Johnson (w/o vote), Kern (Coeur d’Alene), Leonor, Mahoney, Morrison, Nicotra, Panttaja, Seamon, Tibbals, Vella, Watson, Wiencek (w/o vote). Absent: Johnson, Morgan, Zhao. Guests: 9

Call to Order and Minutes: The chair called the meeting to order at 3:31. A motion (Seamon/Mahoney) to approve the minutes passed with three abstentions.

Chair’s Report:

- Faculty Senate nominations for the University-level Promotion Committee are due to Mary Stout (mstout@uidaho.edu) by October 27. Details regarding the nomination process and the nomination form are available in the documents supporting Senate meeting #9 on October 17, 2017.
- Annual benefits enrollment began October 16 and runs through November 7.
- Sabbatical applications are due by October 27.
- President Staben will give the State of the University address on November 10 at 2-3:30 pm, International Ballroom, Pitman Center.

The chair also explained that the normal order of the agenda was changed to move the Provost’s Report to the end of the meeting. This change was made to ensure that senate has time for to consider time-sensitive policy matters while still allowing discussion with the Provost about the restructuring of the university’s advising and retention programs.

FS-18-009- FSH 6880 - Campus Recreation. A motion (Foster/Morrison) was made to remove FSH 6880 regarding campus recreation from the Faculty-Staff Handbook (FSH). Brian Mahoney, a member of Senate and Associate Director of Campus Recreation presented the proposal. He explained that the current policy dates to before the building of the Student Recreation Center (SRC) and contained many irrelevant and out-of-date provisions. The staff at campus recreation believes the contents of the policy was largely informational and contained on the campus recreation website. They pointed out that every time information about services changes, both the website and the FSH provision must be updated.

Several senators stated that they did not believe the information in the policy was purely informational. They also found the recreation website difficult to navigate and unhelpful. The suggestion was made that information for faculty and staff regarding use of campus recreation facilities and participation in programs should be in one coherent and accessible place. A senator commented that the FSH has historically contained both policies and information. Concern was expressed that recreational opportunities for faculty and staff are an employment benefit that might be eliminated if not included in the FSH. The faculty secretary stated that including information in the FSH did not prevent the revision of policies regarding benefits. In addition, she pointed out that the FSH was sometimes inconsistent with current approaches such as in this case. She also gave background on the long-term effort to remove informational and procedural matters from the FSH to the Administrative Procedures Manual (APM). A senator pointed out that the money to fund the SRC came from a bond issue that was approved based on the representation that the proceeds would be used for campus recreation. If the campus recreation policy is removed from the FSH, he expressed concern that it would also remove accountability on the maintenance of campus recreation opportunities. The provost pointed out that the proceeds from the bond have already been spent for the purpose that was intended. Another senator added that there are
tight financial controls at UI that prevent funds from being spent for purposes for which they were not intended. Mahoney added that he has started providing comprehensive information about campus recreation to all new faculty and staff at the time they begin employment at the university.

A number of senators expressed support for the idea of moving FSH 6880 to the APM rather than eliminating it altogether. A motion (Grieb/Vella) to postpone the vote on eliminating FSH 6880 was made and passed unanimously.

University Curriculum Committee Report. Registrar Heather Chermak and Associate Registrar Dwaine Hubbard presented the report which involved three revisions to academic regulations in the catalog and changes to the final exam schedule. The chair asked the registrar to present each regulation separately.

**FS-18-005: Regulation F:** The registrar explained that the changes to Regulation F regarding incomplete grades was to simplify the language and update it according to current processes. There was no discussion of these revisions.

**FS-18-006: Regulation J:** Similarly, the revisions to regulation J regarding concurrent and subsequent baccalaureate degrees simplifies and updates the policy language. A senator asked whether the regulation should address how a student would return to the university to pursue a new major within the same degree. After some discussion, the registrar indicated that her office would consider how to address this issue. There was no further discussion of this revision.

**FS-18-007: Regulation O:** The registrar explained that the revisions to Regulation O extend the deadline for graduation applications from the last day of the semester before graduation to the 10th day of the semester in which the student will graduate. It was moved (Tibbals/Panttaja) that the proposed language be revised as follows:

> **O-3. Application for Graduation.** Degree candidates must submit an Application for Graduation to their college. Students should submit applications no later than the semester in which they will be completing their degree requirements. If two degrees are to be received concurrently, separate applications must be filed with the dean(s) of the college(s) concerned. The graduation, binding and microfilming fees will be posted on the student’s account once the graduation application has been approved fully processed (See Fees and Expenses). The deadline for filing Applications for Graduation without a late service charge is the 10th day of the semester in which the student will be graduating.

The motion to amend proposed Regulation O was approved. There was no further discussion on Regulation O.

The chair proceeded to a vote on all three regulations as amended. They passed unanimously.

The registrar next presented the revised final exam schedule coming as a seconded motion from UCC. She stated that the registrar’s office had considered several options for the exam schedule, including those offered by Senate in its discussion at Meeting #7 on October 3, 2017. The registrar proposes that fall 2018 exams begin at 8:00 am, that the break between exams be 15 minutes, and that exams for classes during the day end at 5:00 pm. Evening classes and rescheduled exams will begin after 5:00. The proposed schedule was approved unanimously with three abstentions.

**FS-18-010 and FS-18-011: Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation Form and Policy.** Marty Ytreberg presented revisions to FSH 3320 and the accompanying form, regarding annual performance evaluation
of faculty proposed by the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC). The chair explained that revisions to the form were approved by senate on a pilot basis in 2015-16, and a stop-gap revision to the policy was approved in 2016-17 to facilitate the pilot, and survey (by FAC) results were presented to senate end of 2017 semester which supported the narrative form. [Meeting #25, 2015-16, April 12 2016; Meeting #7, 2016-17, October 4, 2017;Meeting #27, 2016-17, May 9, 2017]. Ytreberg added that FAC has proposed some additional changes to the evaluation form as well as revisions to the policy to simplify it and bring it into line with the form.

Questions:

- **A senator asked why the form uses the terminology “met or exceeded expectations” rather than simply “met expectations”?** Ytreberg responded that members of FAC wanted to clarify that the “yes” evaluation would apply regardless of whether a faculty member met or exceeded expectations. Another senator commented that the “met or exceeded” language was appropriate to encourage high levels of performance.

- **A senator asked how the changes in the policy will affect merit-based raises?** Typically, the State Board of Education (SBOE) has required employees to “meet expectations” as a condition of receiving regular increases in employee compensation and has characterized these increases as “merit” increases. Ytreberg explained that if a faculty member receives an overall evaluation of “meets expectations”, the faculty member would be eligible for increased salary as part of the regular change in employee compensation. Chair Hrdlicka added that the concept of merit pay will change as the institution moves toward a market compensation approach. Under this approach, meeting expectations will not trigger merit pay. Rather merit pay will most likely be reserved for exceptional performance. The provost elaborated that the market salary forming the basis for each faculty member’s target salary will reflect cost of living increases. Merit increases will reflect performance above and beyond meeting expectations. The faculty secretary also clarified that language regarding salary was eliminated from FSH 3320 in 2009 when it was moved to FSH 3420.

- **A senator asked whether the narrative boxes on the annual evaluation form would have character limits?** Ytreberg explained that in the Word document the table with boxes did not have limits and would grow in size as they were filled.

- **This senator also asked what the difference was between the narrative overall evaluation and the commentary on continuing progress toward promotion and tenure?** Ytreberg responded that FAC intended the overall narrative to differ from the continued progress narrative. He pointed out that the performance evaluation relates to a single year of performance, measures the faculty member’s performance against the annual position description, and is retrospective in nature. In contrast, review for promotion and tenure examines the cumulative performance of the faculty member. The narrative in the continuing progress box on the performance evaluation is intended to be more comprehensive and forward-looking in nature. He pointed out that a faculty member could meet expectations in a particular year, but may not be making adequate progress toward tenure or promotion because of prior unsuccessful year(s) or because the faculty member’s future plans may not satisfy expectations.

- **Several senators expressed concern that the presence of the continuing progress box on the annual evaluation form might give the annual evaluation too big a role in the promotion and tenure process**. Ytreberg and the faculty secretary commented that the annual evaluation process is an administrative process that informs the tenure and promotion process whereas the tenure and promotion process is a faculty-driven process. The faculty secretary pointed out that the commentary on the annual evaluation form helps ensure that the administrative evaluation process and the faculty-driven promotion and tenure process are connected. Ytreberg suggested that questions concerning how the overall performance and continuing progress narratives
should be completed and the role they would have in tenure and promotion are training issues for unit administrators and deans. This process should be seen as a warning system and a way to open up dialog with the unit administrator to address problem areas so the faculty member can succeed.

- Another senator suggested reversing the order of the box for overall performance and progress toward promotion and tenure. Ytreberg responded that the intent was to include the four responsibility areas and the overall performance all in one table and then to include a forward looking comment on progress which could also cover whatever period of time the administrator feels is important, thinking into the future.

- A senator followed up asking whether the role of annual evaluations in tenure and promotion is clearly delineated in the tenure and promotion policy? Ytreberg and the faculty secretary both responded that they believed the tenure and promotion policy was clear in describing that annual evaluations are only one category of evidence in the tenure or promotion packet.

- A senator asked whether, if the policy is adopted, the form would be required or whether it could be modified by an administrator or faculty member? Ytreberg responded that the form would be required and could not be modified.

- A senator asked whether FAC had considered the impact of adopting what was essentially a pass/fail rating? Ytreberg responded that the SBOE requires that the university adopt a standard to determine whether employees receive annual change in employee compensation. Another senator commented that the narrative would help ensure that evaluations are not pass/fail.

- Regarding the policy changes, a senator asked Ytreberg to comment on the fact that the revision proposes a single process for both tenured/tenure-track and non-tenured faculty. Ytreberg responded that the only difference between the existing policy regarding these two groups of faculty and the proposal is whether a review committee was created if the faculty member did not meet expectations. FAC concluded that both tenured and non-tenured faculty could benefit from mentoring and from review of their performance.

Provost’s Report. The provost began by commenting on the ironic timeliness of the Common Read presentation on the evening before on the book Mistakes Were Made But Not By Me. He reflected that his announcement of the management realignment in advising was released too abruptly and without enough direct conversation and collaboration. He stressed his commitment to the institution and expressed his regrets that the announcement has caused confusion and has upset a number of employees. He voiced regret for not having had better communication with advising staff and associate deans, which could have minimized the upset. Nonetheless, he believes that the need of the university to address enrollment and retention required decisiveness. He pointed out that while overall enrollment has increased, aspects of the university’s enrollment statistics are not encouraging. He stressed that we must change our current practices to move the institution forward and increase our resources. The provost emphasized the difficulty of the current fiscal environment and pointed out that our sister institution in Washington has just announced a $30 million budget cut -- $10 million during each of the next three years. He stressed that his intent is that this not happen here at UI. If we do not take decisive action now, we may find ourselves in the same situation.

The provost emphasized that his goal is to implement best practices for retention. To do so, we must have a more coordinated recruitment and retention program. He does not intend for the changes to disrupt successful efforts. In that regard, he specifically mentioned the ambassador program in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and the high touch advising approach of the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences. Instead, he would like to put in place a structure that will allow these successful programs to be implemented across the institution. He stressed that we must pay attention to our overall success rather than focusing on individual gains in colleges and units that are made without a corresponding
overall gain for the institution. His vision is that we implement an advising system that enables us to communicate and implement best practices across all the colleges. He believes that we can increase retention to the high 80% or even to 90%.

Finally, the provost stressed that the SBOE is moving to outcomes based funding for higher education. This means that SBOE will be allocating funds based on graduation rates, not on enrollment. The board is concerned about whether the different state institutions are implementing best practices for advising.

A senator thanked the provost for moving the university toward centralized advising. He expressed the view that polls of students have historically been critical of advising at the university and that the current ASUI leadership ran for election on a platform seeking centralized advising. Another senator thanked the provost for clarifying the current changes. She expressed concern that the role of faculty in the advising changes was unclear. She pointed out that in some colleges faculty are deeply involved in advising. The role of these faculty advisors, described in the roll out memo as “mentors”, is unclear. The provost responded that working out these relationships will be part of our implementation of the new process. He expressed his strong conviction that the current changes are not intended to reduce the role of faculty in advising. He suggested that faculty can be included in training and support that will be offered to advisors. Moreover, he emphasized that research on student success at college indicates that one of the most important factors is the development of strong relationships with faculty. He also commented that advising is central to the faculty’s responsibility to direct how the curriculum is carried out. There are many potential models for how faculty carry out that role. In the end, a professional staffing team will augment and support faculty. The provost stressed the theme that the university must provide better and more consistent support to professional advisors and must foster collaborative relationships with faculty to meet the differing needs of each academic program. Implementation of best practices will take time.

A senator suggested that the university should undertake a cost benefit analysis to determine whether further investment in advising is warranted compared to other types of investments.

A senator asked whether the university plans to conduct searches for the new management positions that have opened in advising. He explained that an assistant dean with a clinical faculty position had been told that his position would be eliminated and that he would need to apply for a staff position. The provost indicated that these were not new positions but rather reflected reorganization of current positions. He stated that advisors were being invited to express interest in the re-organized positions. Formal searches would not be conducted as these positions simply reflect a re-assignment of responsibilities.

The chair commented that much of the anxiety exists because faculty members knew nothing of the reorganization in advance. From their perspective, the changes seemed hasty and possibly ill conceived. He suggested that in order to relieve anxiety and stem some of the confusion around the change, the provost should sponsor an open forum to present a coherent vision about the advising changes. The provost affirmed that he intends to do so and suggested that senate leadership identify some time after the current advising period ends, but before fall break for such a forum. He also noted that he was working on a memo that would go out in the next day or so to address and recognize the upset this caused.

The time for the meeting having expired, a motion to adjourn (Morrison/Bugingo) was made and the meeting was adjourned at 5:11.

Respectfully Submitted,

Liz Brandt, Faculty Secretary &
Secretary to the Faculty Senate