University of Idaho
2017-2018 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #10

3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, October 24, 2017
Brink Hall Faculty-Staff Lounge & Zoom

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2017-18 Faculty Senate Meeting #9, October 17, 2017 (vote)

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Other Announcements and Communications.

V. Special Orders.
   • FS-18-008: FSH 6880 – Campus Recreation (Mahoney) (vote)

VI. Committee Reports.
   • University Curriculum Committee (Hubbard/Chermak) (vote)
     o FS-18-005 (UCC-18-007a): Regulation F
     o FS-18-006 (UCC-18-007c): Regulation J
     o FS-18-007 (UCC-18-007d): Regulation O
     o FS-18-009 (UCC-18-021): Final Exam
   • Faculty Affairs (Ytreberg) (introduction)
     o FS-18-010: FSH 3320 – Annual Performance Evaluation Form
     o FS-18-011: FSH 3320 – Annual Performance Evaluation Policy

VII. Provost’s Report.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Patrick Hrdlicka, Chair 2017-2018, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2017-2018 FS Meeting #9
Handouts
University of Idaho  
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
2017-2018 Meeting #9, Tuesday, October 17, 2017

Present: Anderson (Mike), Anderson (Miranda), Arowojolu, Barbour (Twin Falls), Brandt (w/o vote), Brown, Bugingo, Tenuto for Cannon (w/o vote) (Boise), Caplan, Hormel for De Angelis (w/o vote), Foster, Ellison, Grieb, Hrdlicka, Jeffrey, Johnson, Orr for Kern (w/o vote) (Coeur d’Alene), Leonor, Mahoney, Morgan, Morrison, Nicotra, Panttaja, Seamon, Tibbals, Vella, Watson, Wiencek (w/o vote), Zhao. Absent: Baird, Cannon (Boise), De Angelis, Kern (Coeur d’Alene) Guests: 8

Call to Order and Minutes: The chair called the meeting to order at 3:30. A motion (Johnson/Seamon) to approve the minutes unanimously passed.

Chair’s Report:
- Annual benefits enrollment began October 16 and runs through November 7.
- Sabbatical applications are due by October 27.
- On Monday October 16 faculty and staff received an email from University Communications and Marketing (UCM) with a link to a survey of UI employees to assess the effectiveness of internal communication. The chair encouraged senate members to complete the survey.
- UCM gave university leaders a sneak peek at UI’s new marketing and branding campaign during the Presidential Leadership Breakfast on October 17. Chair Hrdlicka reported that the presentation was very impressive. Senate leadership will extend an invitation to Stefany Bales from UCM to give a presentation to Senate later in the year.
- UCM has developed a new webpage on the Faculty-Staff site to make it easier for employees to find the links for how they can participate in philanthropic and charitable activity at UI: http://www.uidaho.edu/faculty-staff/employee-giving
- In order to streamline operations in the Faculty Secretary Office, the meeting agenda will be sent out on Monday afternoon. The draft agenda will be available on the website by Friday afternoon and will be updated as material and handouts become available.
- The chair called on Secretary Brandt who briefed senators on the progress of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) in updating the forms and process for annual performance evaluations. The revised form and policy will come to senate soon. In the meantime, the draft form is being used by Vice Provost Jeanne Stevenson in workshops with unit administrators in preparation for the annual evaluation process. Brandt stressed that this is not intended to truncate the senate governance process but is, rather, an effort to ease the transition to the new form and policy.

Provost’s Report:
- The College of Natural Resources celebrated the 100th anniversary of the college with a very successful event last week.
- The Borah Symposium was also a very successful event. The Provost particularly commented on the insightful participation of students in the question and answer period at Monday evening’s lecture. He conveyed his thanks to the organizers particularly to the co-chairs Professors Bill Smith and Steven Daley-Laursen.
- The College of Education, Health and Human Services (CEHHS) sponsored a presentation about an experimental school called One Stone – a high school focused on providing project-based learning for students. The innovative learning process at the school is student-led with a guiding hand from teachers and administrators. He invited others to follow up with the CEHHS for more information.
- The Vandal Student Success Initiative continues to be rolled out. The initiative is currently focused on providing high quality support our students.
• 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 included in the packet for this meeting. The provost reminded senators that they must make nominations even if one of their college representatives has been asked to continue service on the committee this year. Chair Hrdlicka encouraged senators to be certain to include off campus faculty colleagues from their college in the nomination process.

A senator asked the provost to comment on the centralization of advising. The provost responded that he is in the process of communicating with deans regarding the possibility of centralizing some advising functions. Our current advising structure is not consistent with best practices for ensuring student success. Details on how advising may be re-organized will be forthcoming. The senator followed up by stating that the initial reaction of his colleagues was concern. His college has developed a strong connection with stakeholders through which they engage in substantial student recruitment. He did not want to see these successful initiatives undermined. The provost responded that the intention is not to move any advising staff or disrupt relationships. The changes will be behind the scenes in the organization. He stressed that expectations and approaches are still being finalized.

A senator asked if the fall enrollment numbers were available. The provost responded that UI’s enrollment will be over 12,000 reflecting another year of enrollment growth. We continue to work on first year freshman student enrollment which is slightly down this year. The drivers of increase in enrollment were the continued growth of dual credit enrollment and international student enrollment. Once the final enrollment report is finalized and submitted, we will begin a deeper analysis of the data.

Starfish/Strategic Enrollment Management. Dean Kahler, Vice Provost for Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) began by introducing senators to important initiatives pending in his area. SEM received a grant through Vandal Ideas Project for the I Go Program. Through this program the division has placed a peer mentor in three different high schools in Idaho—Caldwell, Skyview and Nampa – to advise high school students as they make decisions about whether and where to pursue post-secondary education. The program is fully up and running. So far the feedback from principals at the schools has been very positive.

SEM is also working with the UI’s recruitment team. Bobbi Gerry was hired four months ago as the Assistant Vice Provost for SEM. UI has a good recruitment team in place with recruiters in California, Seattle, Coeur d’Alene, the main UI campus and southern Idaho. SEM has launched a plan to visit every high school in the state. They had over 1000 RSVPs including both students and guests for the fall recruitment event held on October 14. The event had strong faculty and staff participation. Preliminary reviews of the event are very good.

Navitas, the UI’s international student recruitment partner, has kicked into gear to bring more international students to campus. They report that the UI is being received very well by students in their process. Not only was the first year of the Navitas program successful, but enrollment of additional international students increased, as did enrollment in the American Language and Culture Program.

SEM is working aggressively on retention. Vice Provost Kahler estimated that if UI increases its retention of students from the freshman to sophomore year by one percent, we would receive $250,000 in additional tuition revenue. He pointed out that retention is also important to recruitment because prospective students and parents want to know that UI supports student success. The Student Success Center has opened in the Commons. Student success services are also available in each of the colleges.

Career services is also linked to student success. 150 employers were present for last week’s career fair. 1268 students attended; this level of student participation was lower than hoped. SEM is looking at ways to engage students in career development and convince them to speak to employers earlier in their college careers.
SEM is implementing VandalSTAR – a student success software powered by Starfish. The UI name was selected by ASUI. The software allows the institution to serve students once they have been admitted to the university. It is designed to identify students who are exhibiting behaviors (such as cutting classes) or whose academic performance signals that they may be at risk. The software would allow us to collaboratively intervene with the students to identify problems and to proactively access support services. The software will allow advisors and faculty to monitor a student’s progress. Vice Provost Kahler has met with the ASUI President and received positive feedback and support from students. He plans to follow up on the software implementation. This software will allow us to evaluate intervention strategies and evaluate the ROI and determine if we are impacting students. Phase one of the initiative will roll out in January. Two implementation teams – a technical team and a functional team – are meeting every two weeks to further the implementation process.

A senator asked who would have access to information through VandalSTAR. Vice Provost Kahler responded that a variety of different people will have different levels of access. Students will have access to their own data. Faculty will have access to information necessary for their mentoring role. Advisors and administrators will have different types of access. The access levels are determined by UI through a process that is analogous to Banner access levels. SEM will control the level of access granted to different categories of users.

A senator asked whether information in VandalSTAR will be pulled from BBLearn and expressed concern that not all faculty use BBLearn. Kahler responded that some information will likely be pulled from BBLearn. He stressed that there will be a variety of different inputs. Provost Wiencek added that we have an opportunity to more fully implement BBLearn. He acknowledged that some faculty have good reasons for not using BBLearn and that these barriers need to be addressed.

A senator commented that the RFP committee did not recommend the Starfish platform and wanted to know how the decision was made to go with this particular software. Kahler stated that an RFP committee including a faculty member met and reviewed a number of different products during the spring semester last year. The committee made its recommendation in late spring. Provost Wiencek explained that he and President Staben selected Starfish because they were both familiar with the system. The senator also asked about the cost of the software. Kahler did not have the cost information immediately available. However, he believes UI will see significant returns on its investment and emphasized that other schools have seen such significant returns.

Another senator commented that the implementation of VandalSTAR raises significant issues for some faculty. She expressed concern that the decision to implement the software was made without adequate faculty input. In her opinion and those of her colleagues, the decision to implement VandalSTAR was made without consulting faculty experts who study the long-term repercussions of labelling people as risks. RFP committee members gave this input and identified problems that may particularly impact students of color, students from low income backgrounds and women. These concerns were not addressed. If students know they are being identified as “at risk” by every advisor on campus they may be deterred from trying and may not be able to improve their performance.

Throughout the ensuing discussion, senators expressed concern about the process by which the software was adopted and pointed out that technology changes have potential to make changes that are not always positive.

Kahler responded that we already use data but we aren’t using it effectively. For example, we have access to student admission test scores but aren’t using that information when we advise students. Our students have needs and could benefit from mentoring or advising yet our approach to supporting them is hit or miss. Both the institution and our students are suffering from this lack of effectiveness. VandalSTAR is not intended to slap a label on the students and cause them to be unsuccessful. The senator followed up by indicating that data about test scores was an example of the potential problem with the system. The test scores may be old information and yet they might form the basis for labeling a student as a poor student. She pointed out that we have all worked with students for whom test scores were not predictive of college academic success. Her view was that relying on such data interferes with the true key to student success – personal advising
relationships between students and faculty. She was troubled that we overrode the decision of the RFP committee which contained sociological experts.

A senator asked for clarification on the cost savings of investing in retention. Kahler responded that he calculated the number by determining the tuition revenue from one percent of the freshman class and then assuming that if retained they would stay at UI for the full four years.

A senator asked how many and what types of schools are using Starfish. Kahler responded that a variety of schools use Starfish or a similar product. In addition, some schools have developed internal software platforms. Student success platforms are common enough that the State Board of Education recently assumed that such software was deployed at each institution in Idaho and asked for information about which platform the schools were using.

The provost elaborated that UI has long used a student success platform. Previously the university used a product called Mapworks. The software was originally deployed to allow residence life counselors to track and support student success. UI originally made plans to expand its use of Mapworks. However, the company was sold and the platform developed problems. Expanded use could not be implemented. Last year the UI discontinued its license and initiated the RFP process that led to the adoption of Starfish. He emphasized that although he and President Staben pushed the implementation of the particular product in which UI has invested, the process included many people in the student support arena who believed that we should continue and expand our use of a software platform that could marshal data to support student success.

A senator stressed that students he knew were supportive of the implementation of VandalSTAR and viewed the software as a tool that would support their success at the university. Another senator pointed out that when a student receives early warning grades under a current system they can be deluged with emails that can be difficult to manage even though supportive. He believed that consolidating our efforts to support students would be helpful and that VandalSTAR could be implemented without alienating students.

A senator asked if Kahler could give examples of how the software will change the student experience? He responded that each student’s experience would be customized to the student’s needs. He gave the example of a hypothetical student who receives low early warning grades in three of five classes through the 4th week early warning system. The student’s professors also have reported that the student has not been regularly attending morning classes. Through VandalSTAR the attendance and grading information would be collected into a single system and, thus, the cumulative assessment would be available. An advisor could analyze the information and reach out to the student by email or text to arrange a meeting. At the meeting, the student explains that he must work late because he is short on funds. Through VandalSTAR the advisor can directly connect student with a financial aid advisor to see if more financial aid or campus employment might be possible. The senator responded that this example sounded just like the kind of general advising that happens now. She pointed out that many advisors would call financial aid for the student. She pushed for information on exactly what difference VandalSTAR will make in the process? Kahler elaborated that VandalSTAR will provide one unified system containing all the data in a single place. Faculty members can add notes so others working with the student can see what advice has been given. The system will prompt the advisor to follow up and will prompt the student to complete the advised actions. The scheduling of appointments will be automated.

A senator asked who is anticipated to be the primary user of the system – advisors, administrators, others? Kahler explained that different constituencies would be the primary users at different points in the process and depending on the issues confronting a particular student.

A senator asked how student privacy would be protected. He pointed out that sometimes a student’s academic performance is affected by a disability. The student may not choose to identify her or his disability to faculty and advisors. Kahler indicated that information will be available in the system on a need to know basis similar
to Banner access. The implementation teams are looking at these sorts of issues and at what the recommendations for best practices are. UI will likely tailor information access to meet our specific situation but will base decisions on best practices.

A senator, referring to the example previously given regarding the intersection between success and financial aid, asked whether there is a safety valve to advise students that it is not in their interest to continue. He was concerned that we should not advise students to seek more financial aid when they are not likely to succeed. Kahler responded that strict federal regulations require us to advise students about the risks of financial aid. Our responsibility is to advise students to consider other options, if we believe they will not succeed. We also have a disqualification process, which is a safety valve to dismiss students who may not be taking things seriously.

Another senator asked whether UI has the capacity and staffing to respond appropriately when students are identified by the system as “at risk” since the new system may well identify more students for support. Some expertise and time investment beyond what we have seen in our current advisors may be required. The Provost and VP Kahler stated that the UI has a good advisor to student ratio. The current advisors are being trained in the new system and should be able to handle the demands.

A senator questioned why it was necessary to link VandalSTAR to BBLearn. She believes that some faculty will be hesitant to enter information in BBLearn, if it is going to be used in this way. She also asked whether the university has examined the risk of data breach as so much student information would be available in one place. Kahler responded that the security of the system has been evaluated. All of the external software platforms used by the university including BBLearn and Banner must meet certain standards for security. He also responded to the first part of the question stating that data in BBLearn can be helpful in identifying students who are struggling. Decisions have not yet been made regarding what data to gather from BBLearn. The provost suggested that the grade center in BBLearn could be tailored to include an “at risk” column that a professor could check. Only the data in this column would be mined for use in VandalSTAR.

**Distance Education.** The chair moved the discussion to the topic of distance education. Vice Provost Kahler introduced Bobbi Gerry, Assistant Vice Provost for Strategic Enrollment Management, and Bob Hails, Director for Distance and Extended Education Initiatives. Gerry is responsible for distance and extended education including dual credit and Independent Study Idaho. Director Hails will provide leadership for the design, delivery and assessment of distance education programs. Gerry and Hails have been familiarizing themselves with UI’s distance and extended education programs. They plan to work collaboratively with the colleges within the existing decentralized framework. Hails will be developing a plan/framework to support distance education at UI. Right now he is assessing our current programs and identifying opportunities for improvement. He is reaching out to the deans to introduce himself and discuss programs and needs. He has a number of ideas about where the university should improve, but wants to vet these against the college needs and expectations. Once a plan is developed, Hails will move aggressively.

As part of his assessment process, Hails is identifying gaps in our online curriculum that prevent students from completing an online program. Once these gaps are filled, he plans to approach students who withdrew from UI and did not finish their degrees to determine whether they would be interested in finishing online. Assistant Vice Provost Gerry added that the university is also working on how to better identify and track online students so we send them supportive and relevant communications. We also must address issues such as how we proctor online assessment, and how we provide academic support to online students.

A senator stated that in her view UI has needed an e-campus so we can centralize information and access for online students. Hails responded that the e-campus idea is on his list of possible improvements for UI’s distance education programs. Our website is extremely frustrating for distance students. Assistant Vice Provost Gerry commented that she attempted to map out how an online student would discover the amount of tuition they might owe. She struggled until she finally made phone calls to get the information she needed. UI needs a
central platform where online students can get everything they need. The system should mimic the environment in which domestic students are involved. The senator cautioned that she does not want to lose the variety of unique programs as part of an effort to centralize. She pointed out that e-campus or similar software can help, but student experiences are ultimately determined by their learning experience. When administrators get in the way, no one wins! Gerry responded that SEM wants to provide the platform and tools. Colleges can deliver the programs the way they determine is best. SEM is in conversations with the Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives and Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning to ensure that our faculty are prepared and supported in their distance education efforts.

The chair announced that the remaining two agenda items (consideration of the campus recreation policy and the report of the Ombuds) could be postponed to a future meeting to allow additional questions for Vice Provost Kahler about the implementation of VandalSTAR.

A senator asked whether there are faculty on the VandalSTAR implementation committees. Kahler responded that there are a variety of individuals on the committees including faculty, although the names escaped him in the moment. Both the Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives and the Vice Provost for Faculty are involved with the implementation. The chair recognized Vice Provost Cher Hendricks who was at the meeting as a guest. She explained that she is an advocate for implementing VandalSTAR. At her prior institution faculty were frustrated because they had to navigate too many systems to advise students. She commented that there would be growing pains as we implement the system, but that it would be a valuable tool for student success.

A senator suggested that if more faculty were added to the implementation team, Vice Provost Kahler should also consider adding more students.

The time for the meeting having expired, a motion to adjourn (Johnson/Mahoney) was made and the meeting was adjourned at 4:59.

Respectfully Submitted,

Liz Brandt, Faculty Secretary &
Secretary to the Faculty Senate
POLICY COVER SHEET

(See Faculty Staff Handbook 1460 for instructions at UI policy website: www.webs.uidaho.edu/uipolicy)

Faculty/Staff Handbook [FSH] □ Addition □ Revision* □ Deletion* □ Emergency

Minor Amendment □

Chapter & Title: Chapter 6, FSH 6880, Campus Recreation


Minor Amendment □

Chapter & Title: _______________________________________________

All policies must be reviewed, approved and returned by a policy sponsor, with a cover sheet attached to apm@uidaho.edu or fsh@uidaho.edu respectively.

*Note: If revision/deletion request original document from apm@uidaho.edu or fsh@uidaho.edu, all changes must be made using “track changes.”

Originator(s): Brian Mahoney 10-13-2017

(Please see FSH 1460 C)

Name Date

Telephone & Email: 208.885.6064 briannm@uidaho.edu

Policy Sponsor: Greg Tatham 10-13-2017
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Name Date

Telephone & Email: 208.885.2233 gtatham@uidaho.edu

Reviewed by General Counsel ___Yes _XX No Name & Date: ____________

I. Policy/Procedure Statement: Briefly explain the purpose/reason of proposed addition, revision, and/or deletion to the Faculty/Staff Handbook or the Administrative Procedures Manual.

Current policy is not only outdated (prior to the SRC opening in 2002), the information provided is not policy or procedure. All current Campus Recreation information can already be found on the Campus Recreation Website http://www.uidaho.edu/current-students/campus-recreation. As this is not policy or a procedure and is only informational, we are requesting that the entire section, FSH6880 be removed from the FSH.

II. Fiscal Impact: What fiscal impact, if any, will this addition, revision, or deletion have? None

III. Related Policies/Procedures: Describe other policies or procedures existing that are related or similar to this proposed change. None

IV. Effective Date: This policy shall be effective on July 1, or January 1, whichever arrives first after final approval (see FSH 1460 D) unless otherwise specified in the policy.

If not a minor amendment forward to: ____________________________________________

Track #: __________________________

Date Rec.: __________________________

Posted: t-sheet __________________________

h/c __________________________

web __________________________

Register: __________________________

(Office Use Only)
PREAMBLE: This section outlines recreational opportunities for students, faculty, staff, and the general public offered by Campus Recreation. In January 2017 an outdated section on Swim Center use was removed. Unless otherwise noted, the text is as of July 1996. For further information, call 208-885-6381.  

**A.** Campus Recreation provides students, faculty, staff, and to a limited extent the general public with recreation opportunities. Activities provide opportunities for:

A-1. Spending leisure time in structured or unstructured sport and recreational activities.

A-2. Meeting and participating with others who have similar recreational interests.

A-3. Increasing interest in sport and recreational activities that can continue throughout the participant's lifetime.

A-4. Developing group spirit and identity by participating together in play situations.

A-5. Improving fitness and, consequently, enjoying a healthier body and a more alert mind.

**B.** Campus Recreation administers the following functional areas:

B-1. **Intramural Sports.** The intramural sports program consists of structured activities that involve organized competition (men's, women's, and co-rec) in individual, dual, and team sports among residence halls, fraternities, sororities, off-campus student groups, and faculty-staff. Program direction, selection of activities, and development of operational policies are provided by the student managers of groups participating in intramural sports.

B-2. **Informal Recreation.** The informal recreation program consists of unstructured activities in which facilities, supervision, and equipment are provided but for which there are few organized events.

B-3. **Fitness.** Campus Recreation provides opportunities for individuals to acquire new activity skills, improve skills, gain knowledge and insight, and improve fitness through self-directed activities and non-credit classes for university students, faculty, and staff.

B-4. **Special Events.** Special event programs provide opportunities to participate in organized recreation and sport events. The program meets needs and interests that are not met through competitive intramural sports programs or other recreation programs.  

B-5. **Swim Center.** The Swim Center program provides:

a. Opportunities to improve fitness through self-directed and staff-directed activities.

b. Recreational swimming and aquatic play opportunities during leisure time.

c. Structured fun and competitive special events.

d. Noncredit instructional classes to improve swimming, safety, and rescue skills.

B-6. **Locker Room Services.** Locker room services provide locker and shower room facilities and attendants, towel and locker service, and equipment checkout for physical education classes and general recreational use.

B-7. **Summer Session Recreation.** The summer session recreation program provides special leisure-time opportunities for students and employees.
B-8. Sport Clubs. In cooperation with the ASUI Recreation Advisory Board and the Director of the Student Union/Student Activities the Campus Recreation unit manages the University of Idaho Sports Club Program.

C. USE OF RECREATIONAL FACILITIES. Access to the Memorial Gymnasium and the Physical Education Building for recreational use is as follows:

C-1. UI Students. Full or part-time undergraduate and graduate students may use recreational facilities free of charge (valid UI identification card required).

C-2. Faculty and Staff. Faculty and staff members on regular appointment, as well as retired personnel, may use recreational facilities free of charge (valid UI identification card required).

C-3. Irregular Help. UI employees not on regular appointment may use recreational facilities through the fee-based facility pass program.

C-4. Special Programs. Persons attending UI-sponsored programs such as workshops, seminars, and short courses, may use recreational facilities with a special-programs activity pass available from the specific program director or coordinator.

C-5. University Guests. UI departments may purchase passes that can be used by their guests for access to recreational facilities.

C-6. Personal Guests. Friends and relatives may use recreational facilities as guests of students or employees. Guests must be accompanied by their UI host while using facilities. One-day guest passes may be purchased at the Campus Recreation Office during regular office hours. Guest passes are not transferable and are good only on the dates specified.

C-7. General Public. Persons not connected with UI may use recreational facilities on a regular basis through the fee-based facility pass program. Some restrictions apply to children.

C-8. Spouses. The spouse of a UI student or faculty or staff member may use recreational facilities on a regular basis through the fee-based facility pass program.

C-9. Children and Youth. Children and youth, whether of a UI-related family or not, may use recreational facilities under the following conditions:

a. All children must have a facility pass or guest pass.

b. Children under the age of 18 must be accompanied and supervised by their parents or guardians who are participating in the same activity.

c. Use of the weight room is limited to individuals who are 18 years old or older.
1. Make the following changes to Regulation F:

F-1. A grade of "Incomplete" is assigned only when the student has been in attendance and has done passing work up to a time within three weeks of the close of the semester, or within one week of the close of the summer session. It may be assigned only upon agreement of the student and course instructor when extenuating circumstances make it impossible for the student to complete course requirements on time (Extenuating circumstances include serious illness, car accidents, death of a family member, etc. It does not include lateness due to procrastination, the student's desire to do extra work to raise his/her grade, allowing a student to retake the course, etc.). Graduate students on probation, see College of Graduate Studies section on Probation, Disqualification, and Reinstatement. If a grade of "Incomplete" is submitted, the instructor will assign a reversion grade in the event the missing work is not completed. The instructor must also specify to the student the conditions and requirements for completing the deficient work, as well as any deadline shorter than the maximum time period allowed in F-2. At the end of each semester, the Registrar's Office will send an Incomplete Grade Report (IGR) to departmental administrators detailing every I grade submitted by their faculty that semester and the conditions for student completion.

F-2. Completion of "Incomplete" Grades. Final grades for incompletes received in the Fall semester or Intersession, must be assigned by the last day of the following Summer semester. Final grades for incompletes received in the Spring semester or Summer Session, must be assigned by the last day of the following Fall semester. When a student has completed the deficient work, the instructor will assign a final grade. An incomplete that is not completed within the time limit specified above would automatically be changed to the reversion grade assigned by the instructor at the time the incomplete was submitted. Instructors may assign a final grade anytime within the time period specified above. In the event the instructor leaves the university, the departmental administrator may assign the final grade. An incomplete remains on the student's permanent record and is accompanied by the final grade (i.e. I/A, I/B, I/C).

F-3. "Incomplete" Grades on Record at End of Final Term. A student cannot graduate with a grade of "Incomplete" on his or her record. At the end of the term in which the student will graduate, a grade of "Incomplete" in any UI course on that degree level (undergraduate, graduate, law, etc.) reverts to the grade that the instructor had specified on the on-line grade roster (see F-1). Reverted grades are included in the computation of the student's cumulative grade-point average at graduation. Nonetheless, a student who has graduated may make up the incomplete work within the usual time limit in an effort to raise the grade on the permanent record.
Office of the Registrar
Proposed Catalog Changes
Effective Summer 2018

1. Make the following changes to Regulation J:

J-7. **Second Concurrent and Subsequent Baccalaureate Degrees.**

J-7-a. **Concurrent Degrees.** Students may concurrently pursue two different majors leading to two different baccalaureate degrees (e.g., B.A. and B.S.Ed.) from UI by working to fulfill the general university requirements for one degree and the departmental and college subject-matter requirements for each. For exceptions to this regulation, see general studies part 4. Students who plan to pursue two degrees concurrently should develop a schedule of studies that combines the degree requirements and present it to the dean(s) of the college(s) concerned as early as possible, preferably before the end of the junior year. A student may concurrently pursue degrees in one or more colleges. For exceptions to this rule, see general studies in part 4. In addition to the university requirements students must fulfill the departmental and college requirements for all degrees.

J-7-b. **Subsequent Degrees.** Students who have earned a baccalaureate degree at UI and who wish to complete the requirements for a subsequent degree of different major and receive a second baccalaureate degree must earn at least 1615 credits as an undergraduate student after completion of the previous baccalaureate degree in UI courses other than those offered by independent study after the receipt of the first degree and fulfill the university, departmental and college subject-matter requirements for the second degree. (See B-9.) Students may return to UI and earn a second degree carrying the same name as one previously granted by UI so long as the requirements for a different major are satisfied and the students earn at least 16 credits as an undergraduate student in UI courses other than those offered by independent study after the receipt of the first degree. For exceptions to this regulation, see general studies in part 4. This regulation does not apply to students who were concurrently pursuing two different degrees under regulation J-7-a or to students who were concurrently pursuing two different majors under regulation J-8.

J-7-c. Students who have a baccalaureate degree from another recognized institution and who wish to earn another baccalaureate degree at UI, must earn a minimum of 32 credits as an undergraduate student in upper-division UI courses other than those offered by independent study after the receipt of the first degree and fulfill the departmental and college subject-matter requirements for the degree.

J-8. **Degree with Double Major.** Students may complete two different majors (curricula) offered under a particular baccalaureate degree and have both majors shown on their academic records and diplomas, e.g., Bachelor of Arts with majors in history and political science. In addition to the university requirements, students must fulfill the departmental and college requirements for all majors. Each of the majors must lead to the same degree. When majors leading to different degrees are involved, see the requirements applicable to the awarding of a second concurrent baccalaureate degree (J-7-a).
1. Make the following changes to Regulation O:

**O-3. Application for Degrees Graduation.** In the semester prior to the completion of degree requirements, candidates for degrees must pay the graduation fee (graduate students may also need to pay a binding and microfilming fee) and file an application with the dean of the college through which the degree is offered. **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 application must be filed with the dean after the graduation, binding, and microfilming fees have been paid at the Student Accounts/Cashiers Office will be posted on the student's account once the graduation application has been approved (See "Fees and Expenses"). The deadline for filing applications for degree Applications for Graduation without a late service charge, is the final day of the Fall semester for degrees to be awarded in May, and the final day of the Spring semester for degrees to be awarded in August or December 10th day of the semester in which the student will be graduating.
Fall Final Examination Schedule
December 10-14, 2018

Regular classrooms will be used for the exam unless the instructors make special arrangements through the Registrar’s Office. In order to avoid conflicts, rooms must be reserved in the Registrar’s Office for “common final” exams. Instructors will announce to their classes rooms to be used for all sectioned classes having common final exams. Instructors may deviate from the approved schedule only upon recommendation of the college dean and prior approval of the Provost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Regular Class Meeting Day of the Week</th>
<th>Class Start Time</th>
<th>Final Exam Day</th>
<th>Final Exam Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>7:30 AM</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>8:00 AM - 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>8:00 AM - 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>9:30 AM</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>8:00 AM - 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10:15 AM - 12:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>11:30 AM</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>10:15 AM - 12:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>12:30 PM</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>12:45 PM - 2:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>1:30 PM</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>12:45 PM - 2:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>2:30 PM</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>3:00 PM - 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>3:00 PM - 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>4:30 PM</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>3:00 PM - 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>8:00 AM - 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>9:30 AM</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>8:00 AM - 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10:15 AM - 12:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>12:30 PM</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>10:15 AM - 12:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>12:45 PM - 2:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>3:00 PM - 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>7:30 AM</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>8:00 AM - 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>8:00 AM - 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>9:30 AM</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>8:00 AM - 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>10:15 AM - 12:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>11:30 AM</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>10:15 AM - 12:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>12:30 PM</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>12:45 PM - 2:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>1:30 PM</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>12:45 PM - 2:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>2:30 PM</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>12:45 PM - 2:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>3:00 PM - 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>4:30 PM</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>3:00 PM - 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Common final exam** periods are from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday.
- **Students with more than two finals in one day may have the excess final(s) rescheduled.** The **conflict exam** periods are from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. on Thursday and Friday. A student must make arrangements with the department and the instructor of the course to schedule the final exam in one of the conflict exam periods.
- **Evening classes, those starting at 5:00 p.m. or later, will have the final examinations during the final exam week at the regular class time.**
- For online classes that have in person finals, the final examination will be on the Saturday following the final examination week in the Fall semester. In the Spring semester these in person finals will be held on the Saturday prior to the final examination week.
- **Non-Standard time patterns will use the final exam start time in the day/time pattern of the earlier hour.** For example, a Tuesday section with an 8:30 a.m. start time would use the 8:00 a.m. final exam time for Tuesday.
- If a class meeting day and time is not found in the final examination schedule above, the instructor of the class is responsible for contacting the Office of the Registrar to identify the appropriate day and time for the final examination.
### Spring Final Examination Schedule
**May 6-10, 2019**

Regular classrooms will be used for the exam unless the instructors make special arrangements through the Registrar’s Office. In order to avoid conflicts, rooms must be reserved in the Registrar’s Office for “common final” exams. Instructors will announce to their classes rooms to be used for all sectioned classes having common final exams. **Instructors may deviate from the approved schedule only upon recommendation of the college dean and prior approval of the Provost.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Regular Class Meeting Day of the Week</th>
<th>Class Start Time</th>
<th>Final Exam Day</th>
<th>Final Exam Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>7:30 AM</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>8:00 AM - 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>8:00 AM - 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>9:30 AM</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>8:00 AM - 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>10:15 AM - 12:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>11:30 AM</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10:15 AM - 12:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>12:30 PM</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>12:45 PM - 2:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>1:30 PM</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>12:45 PM - 2:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>2:30 PM</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>3:00 PM - 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>3:00 PM - 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>4:30 PM</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>3:00 PM - 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>8:00 AM - 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>9:30 AM</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>8:00 AM - 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>10:15 AM - 12:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>12:30 PM</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10:15 AM - 12:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>12:45 PM - 2:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>12:45 PM - 2:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>7:30 AM</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>8:00 AM - 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>8:00 AM - 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>9:30 AM</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>8:00 AM - 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>10:15 AM - 12:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>11:30 AM</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10:15 AM - 12:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>12:30 PM</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>12:45 PM - 2:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>1:30 PM</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>12:45 PM - 2:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>2:30 PM</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>12:45 PM - 2:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>3:00 PM - 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>4:30 PM</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>3:00 PM - 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>8:00 AM - 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>9:30 AM</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>8:00 AM - 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>10:15 AM - 12:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>12:30 PM</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10:15 AM - 12:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>1:30 PM</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>12:45 PM - 2:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>2:30 PM</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>3:00 PM - 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>3:00 PM - 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>4:30 PM</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>3:00 PM - 5:00 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Common final exam** periods are from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday.
- Students with more than two finals in one day may have the excess final(s) rescheduled. The **conflict exam** periods are from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. on Thursday and Friday. A student must make arrangements with the department and the instructor of the course to schedule the final exam in one of the conflict exam periods.
- Evening classes, those starting at 5:00 p.m. or later, will have the final examinations during the final exam week at the regular class time.
- For online classes that have in person finals, the final examination will be on the Saturday following the final examination week in the Fall semester. In the Spring semester these in person finals will be held on the Saturday prior to the final examination week.
- Non-Standard time patterns will use the final exam start time in the day/time pattern of the earlier hour. For example, a Tuesday section with an 8:30 a.m. start time would use the 8:00 a.m. final exam time for Tuesday.
- If a class meeting day and time is not found in the final examination schedule above, the instructor of the class is responsible for contacting the Office of the Registrar to identify the appropriate day and time for the final examination.
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I. **Policy/Procedure Statement:** Briefly explain the purpose/reason of proposed addition, revision, and/or deletion to the Faculty/Staff Handbook or the Administrative Procedures Manual.

Remove pilot form language. Remove all references to the numerical score and clarify the narrative evaluation process. Clarify the consequences of not meeting expectations for multiple years.

II. **Fiscal Impact:** What fiscal impact, if any, will this addition, revision, or deletion have?

None

III. **Related Policies/Procedures:** Describe other policies or procedures existing that are related or similar to this proposed change.

None

IV. **Effective Date:** This policy shall be effective on July 1, or January 1, whichever arrives first after final approval (see FSH 1460 D) unless otherwise specified in the policy.
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# FACULTY ANNUAL EVALUATION

**ENTER CALENDAR YEAR** for review period: ____

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>PD %</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Met or Exceeded Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship and Creative Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach and Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Service and Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall faculty member met or exceeded the expectations defined in the position description**

**Commentary on Faculty Performance**

Commentary/recommendations on progress toward tenure, promotion, and/or continued satisfactory performance.

☐ Faculty member is making progress on the goals defined in the position description, and contributes positively to life and learning at the University of Idaho.

☐ Faculty member is not meeting University of Idaho performance expectations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Administrator Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Administrator (joint appointments [if applicable])</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Interdisciplinary/Center Administrator Comments Attached** (if applicable). The unit administrator is responsible to solicit, discuss and consider evaluative comments from those interdisciplinary/center administrators listed in the faculty narrative. All solicited comments are to be attached to this form.  

- **Faculty Comments Attached** (optional). The faculty member is allowed to include comments that respond to the administrator’s evaluation.  

- **Dean’s Comments Attached** (optional). If there is any significant difference in the commentary, recommendations, or evaluation overall between the department chair and college dean, the dean shall include a narrative stating the reasons for these differences. The form with attachments must be returned to the faculty member for a second signature.  

| Second Faculty Signature (if applicable) | Date |

### Disclosure of Conflicts

- If you have a conflict to disclose then you also will need to complete Form FSH 6240A.  
- If there is any change in your circumstance that may give rise to potential conflicts or eliminate potential conflicts previously disclosed, then you will need to complete Form FSH 6240A within 30 days of the change.  
- Disclose outside employment for compensation of more than 20 hours/week by completing FORM 6240B  

- **I DO NOT** have any conflicts of interest, conflicts of commitment or apparent conflicts, according to FSH 6240, to report.  
- **I DO** have any conflicts of interest, conflicts of commitment or apparent conflicts, according to FSH 6240, to report.  
  - I have submitted FSH 6240A and a plan to manage each conflict or apparent conflict to my unit administrator.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Notes

1. Faculty Staff Handbook section 3320  
2. Faculty Staff Handbook section 1565 C-1  
3. Faculty Staff Handbook section 1565 C-2  
4. Faculty Staff Handbook section 1565 C-3  
5. Faculty Staff Handbook section 1565 C-4, 1420E  
6. “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.” FSH 3320 A1 e, f  
7. Faculty Staff Handbook section 3050 B-2, 3320 A-1 d, 3520 E-1, G-3, G-4c, and 3560 C,E-2d  
8. If there is a disagreement, see Faculty Staff Handbook section 3320 A-1 f  
9. Faculty Staff Handbook section 6240
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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. In January 2017 a temporary fix to this policy was put in place to allow for a pilot narrative evaluation process for 2016 and ensure that existing policy would apply. 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, 1-17]

CONTENTS:

A. Annual Performance Evaluation and Salary Determination for Faculty Members
B. Faculty Performance Below that does not Meet Expectations of 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 the chair of the unit administrator. Each unit will develop criteria in its bylaws for three-year and periodic reviews of the faculty (FSH 1520 H 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 tenure (FSH 3520). The provost is responsible for preparing supplementary instructions each year, including the schedule for completion of the annual performance evaluation. Personnel on international assignment see FSH 3580 C. [rev. 7-03, 7-09, 7-14, ed. 7-10, 1-17]

a. Forms Distributed. The Annual Performance Evaluation Form is available below. The form may not be altered without following the appropriate governance process (see FSH 1460). The immediate administrative officer/unit administrator is responsible for ensuring that each faculty member uses the proper form together with a copy of the supplementary instructions as provided by the Provost Office. [rev. 7-01, 1-17]

Approach during Pilot Study: While the pilot narrative Annual Performance Evaluation form is being used, the specific references to performance and ratings found in this section are not in effect. Checking the “not meeting expectations” box on the pilot form triggers section B-4 for non-tenured faculty and section C for tenured faculty. The evaluator must document the areas of concern that warrant checking the “not meeting expectations” box in the narrative review. If there are areas of concern that warrant attention, but do not rise to the level of “not meeting expectations” these too should be documented in the written narrative. [add. 1-17]
b. Performance levels for each criterion are described below, as follows: The narrative in the evaluation form shall provide evidence to support the evaluation. [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. 2-10, 7-10]

iii. Meets Expectations (3) represents performance that Meet or Exceeds Expectations is the satisfactory performance expected of a faculty member relative to the position description. Narrative in the evaluation should document whether performance meets expectations, but also whether the faculty member’s performance is better than expected or extraordinary relative to the performance evaluation position description.

iv. Performance that does not Meet Below Expectations (2) denotes performance that is less than expected of a faculty member relative to the position description and means improvement is necessary. Narrative in the evaluation should document whether the faculty member’s performance is so far below expectations that it is not acceptable relative to the position description and/or inconsistent with the conditions for continued employment with the institution. An evaluation of not meeting rating of below expectations in one or more criteria triggers procedures outlined in 3320 B as C. [rev. 7-09, 7-10]

v. Unacceptable Performance (1) is performance that is not acceptable relative to the position description and/or 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. 2-10b]

(1) received a “C” rating the previous period but did not make the improvements required;

(2) consistently violated one or more of the institution’s standards for meeting the expectations of the position;

(3) 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 preparing for 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.

This report may be in the form of a self-evaluation using the annual evaluation form included in this policy proposed annual employment evaluation. [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 in their unit. 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. This results of the student and peer evaluation of teaching are carefully weighted 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 and must be included as indicated on the form. The annual evaluation score for a faculty member in form & relates to the faculty members’s annual evaluation relative to his/her position description. The overall unit average is provided to the faculty member upon request so that each
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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
college dean disagrees with the unit administrator’s evaluation, the dean shall attach a narrative stating the reasons for
these differences/disagreement. A copy of the dean’s narrative, if any, shall be provided to the faculty member
before the evaluation is forwarded to the provost’s office, 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 completed evaluation form, faculty member’s report, if any, and dean’s narrative, if any
and narrative to the Provost’s Office for permanent filing. If the college fails to attach the narrative
evaluation does not include appropriate narrative evaluation or if the faculty member’s report and/or dean’s
narrative are not attached, the provost will shall 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. FACULTY PERFORMANCE BELOW THAT DOES NOT MEET 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 not meeting
expectations, the unit administrator should consider the variety of possible causes, other than inadequate effect on
the faculty member’s part, that might be responsible for the performance, wantons for and explanations of the
performance. [see FSH 3190] [ed. 7-09, rev. 7-10]

The unit administrator, in consultation with the faculty member, should address the possible causes of the problem,
should suggest appropriate resources and encourage the employee to seek such help. Faculty members and unit
administrators may obtain referral information and advice from the University Ombuds and Human Resources.
[ed. 12-06, 7-09, 7-14, rev. 7-16]

C-1. ANNUAL ASSESSMENT OF BELOW EXPECTATIONS: B-2. PROVOST INVOLVEMENT. In the
event of an overall score of evaluation of below does not meet expectations, the provost may, in consultation with
the dean and unit administrator, determine that further review of the faculty member’s performance is required.
This review shall shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures prescribed in 3320 C-10. [ren. and ed. 7-
09, rev. 7-16]

B-23. FIRST ANNUAL OCCURRENCE.

a. In the event that a non-tenured faculty member receives an annual evaluation concluding that he or she
has not met expectations overall or in one or more areas of responsibility, the unit administrator shall shall at the same time let or she deliver 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 shall shall review the faculty member’s current
Position Description and examine strategies that would permit the faculty member to improve his or her
performance. The faculty member may request that a mentoring committee be selected [see C-10 below] [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 not met expectations overall or in one or more areas of responsibility, the unit administrator shall shall at the same time let or she deliver the performance evaluation, offer to meet with the faculty member to identify the reasons for evaluating the performance as below expectations. At this meeting,
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The unit administrator will shall 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 shall appoint three faculty members of her/his/her's administrator's 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 members. [ed. 12-06, rev. 7-06, 2-10]

B-34. Two consecutive annual assessments of below expectations second consecutive occurrence. 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 shall, 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 college dean. 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 support of improved performance by the faculty member to improve his or her performance. [ed. 7-09]

C-34. Performance below expectations of tenured faculty members. Tenured faculty will follow the same process as described in B-34 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. [add. 7-16]

C-34-1. Annual assessment of below expectations/Provost involvement. In the event of an overall score of evaluation of below does not meet expectations, the present may in consultation with the dean and unit administrator, 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-34-5. [ed. and ed. 7-09, rev. 7-16]

C-34-5. Three consecutive annual evaluation assessments of below expectations/occurrences within five years. In the event of three consecutive annual evaluations of does not meet expectations within a five year period, either below expectations overall or within one or more areas of responsibility, or a pattern of below expectations evaluations over five years in 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 shall consist of six at least four (6) members, appointed as follows:
   (1) The nomiated faculty member may submit to the unit administrator a list of the names of three faculty members from within the unit and three at least one tenured faculty members from outside of the unit. If the faculty member is tenured or on the tenure track, faculty on the committee should be tenured faculty unless no tenured faculty are available. The unit administrator shall submit a similar list to the faculty member. From the list given to the faculty members, he/she shall select one person from inside of the unit and one from outside the unit. From the list given to the unit administrator, he/she shall select one person from inside the unit and one from outside the unit. He/she shall appoint the committee, including at least two names from the faculty member’s list.
   (2) The committee members shall select as chair another faculty member from within the unit.
   (3) The Ombuds or liaison designee shall be an ex-officio member of the committee. [ed. 12-06]
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b. Report and Timing of the Review. The committee report includes the review and possible recommendation(s), and will shall be completed within sixty days of the annual evaluation.

The faculty member and chair the unit administrator shall provide the following materials for the period under review to the committee:

1) Updated Curriculum Vitae of the faculty member,
2) Position Descriptions, for the past four years
3) Annual evaluation materials submitted by the faculty member for the past three years
4) Annual Evaluations of the faculty member by the unit head and the Dean, for the past three years
5) Student and peer evaluations (if any) of teaching,
6) A summary of the strategies put in place to assist the faculty member, for the past four years
7) A self-assessment of each area of the faculty member’s responsibility teaching
8) A self-assessment summary of each area of the faculty member’s responsibility and what the faculty member has learned and achieved during the past four years; the period under review, 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 committee chair shall submit the report to the faculty member, chair, and dean, shall receive the report and shall Each recipient shall have fifteen days from the report’s date to submit written responses to the review committee. The review committee chair shall send the report and all responses to the provost.

e. Provost. The provost shall 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 5520 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).
Why?

Enrollment – Current structure not working as well as we need

Board Direction
• Complete College America – Game Changers: Meta-majors, Degree Maps, Retention, Time to Degree, Graduation Rate

Career Path for Advisors

Starfish
• Consistency of Interaction, Service and Reporting
• Accountability

Hobson’s (or Other) CRM
• Consistency of use and entry

Retention
• Will improve student outcomes (retention, graduation rate, job placement)
• There are opportunities for gains – estimate $2 million in short run
Role of Faculty and Staff

- Professional advisors – program progression and registration (partner to faculty)
- **Mentoring remains key faculty role** but augmented with staff
- Recruiting and retention – **everyone’s responsibility**, driven by one unified strategic voice

**University movement toward:**

- Consistent management of contemporary advising and retention strategies
- Consistent service to students with General Advisor/Primary Advisor roles – irrespective of current College resources and operational protocols
- Ability to conduct evaluation of recruiting/retention initiatives and have university level data on effectiveness and ROI
- Campus wide implementation of initiatives such as Starfish Student Success System can be uniformly implemented
Aligned Management of Advising and Recruitment at the University of Idaho

Advising staff impacted:
• All advising staff will be managed under SEM
• Advising staff will continue to be physically present in colleges and centers
• There will be some movement of key personnel to more centralized positions with larger responsibility

Recruitment staff impacted
• Recruitment outreach staff will be managed by the Admissions Office
• All search/outreach will be conducted by recruitment staff
• Development of inquiries to enrolled students is entire campus responsibility

Resource impact
• Nominally 1/3 of current advising staff and 4/5 of current recruiting staff are funded from central funds already
• No funding shifts this year
• Staff will occupy same offices/space