University of Idaho
2017-2018 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #13

3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, November 14, 2017
Brink Hall Faculty-Staff Lounge & Zoom

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   - Minutes of the 2017-18 Faculty Senate Meeting #12, November 7, 2017 (vote)

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.

VI. Committee Reports.
   - Committee on Committees (Anderson)(vote)
     o FS-18-014 – FSH 1640.41 – Faculty-Staff Policy Group
     o FS-18-016 – FSH 1640.87 – Teaching and Advising Committee
   - Teaching and Advising (Caplan)(vote)
     o FS-18-018 – FSH 2700 – Student Evaluation of Teaching

VII. Special Orders.
   - 2017 Great Colleges to Work For Survey (Pietrzak)(FYI)

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 #12
Handouts
University of Idaho
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
2017-2018 Meeting #12, Tuesday, Nov. 7, 2017

Present: Anderson (Mike), Anderson (Miranda), Arowojolu, Baird, Bird for Brandt (w/o vote), Brown, Cannon (Boise, attending in Moscow), Caplan, De Angelis, Ellison, Foster, Grieb, Hrdlicka, Jeffery, Johnson, Kern (CDA), Leonor, Mahoney, Morgan, Morrison, Nicotra, Panttaja, Seamon, Tibbals, Vella, Watson, Wiencek (w/o vote), Zhao (Idaho Falls) Absent: Barbour, Brandt (w/o vote), Bugingo. Guests: 11

Call to order and minutes: The chair called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m., noting that this was the third-to-last meeting of the fall semester. He introduced former senator Kenton Bird, who took minutes in the absence of Faculty Secretary Liz Brandt. A motion (Morrison/Tibbals) to approve the minutes of the Oct. 31 meeting was approved with three abstentions.

Chair’s Report. The chair announced a number of important dates in the next month:
- November 10 – State of the University Address by President Staben, 2:00-3:30 p.m., International Ballroom, Pitman Center
- November 11 – Veteran’s Appreciation Dinner, 5:30 pm, International Ballroom, Pitman Center
- November 15 - Honorary Degree Nominations for Spring 2018
- November 29 – Fall UFM meeting – 3:00-4:30, Vandal Ballroom, Pitman Center
- December 1 – Preference forms for University Committee Service are due.

In addition to those events announced by the chair, it was later mentioned that the annual observance of Veterans Day will take place at 11 a.m. Friday, November 10, on the steps of Memorial Gymnasium.

The chair then turned to the topic of compensation for post-doctoral fellows. He reported on a meeting with Wes Matthews, executive director of Human Resources, about progress in identifying discipline-specific market rates for post-docs. In November of 2016, due to impending changes to the federal Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) for exempt employees, the university instituted a minimum salary for post-docs that met the FLSA salary test for exempt employees. Because these changes to FLSA did not materialize, the university will utilize market-based data and the new UI salary test ($37,440) to inform future post-doc salary determinations.

In response to a question from a senator about how much post-docs should be paid, the chair said that the market levels are discipline-specific and will be determined by units that hire post-docs in consultation with the Office of Human Resources. Another senator asked about funding for graduate teaching assistants. The chair reported that Jerry McMurtry, dean of the College of Graduate Studies, is conducting a compensation analysis in consultation with deans, chairs and Graduate Council. Dean McMurtry will be invited to a future Senate meeting, as more details are known. The chair noted that TA salaries will be discipline-specific and not uniform across the university.

The chair then invited Senator Mike Anderson, a member of the University Budget and Finance Committee (UBFC), to elaborate on a recent email from the committee calling for proposals for FY2019 and FY2020. UBFC will consider requests that are at least $100,000 in one-time money and/or $40,000 in permanent funding. The timeframe is as follows:
- Jan. 31: Proposals due.
- May 1: Proposals reviewed by the committee.
- Fall 2018: Funding decisions announced.
Prof. Anderson noted that the committee’s memo contains advice for those seeking to submit proposals in the next round, along with a list of previously funded proposals.

**Provost's Report.** Provost Wiencek announced that he had called a meeting on Nov. 9 to provide background and context for changes in the university’s advising and recruiting structure. Among those attending will be deans, associate deans, directors of student services, academic advisors and students. The provost said the goal was to help everyone involved better understand the enrollment challenges the reorganization intends to address. He described the meeting as a chance to “hit reset” and to signal that there is no rush to implement changes; instead, he wants to do what is in everyone’s best interests.

Meanwhile, the provost reported that his office is working with Human Resources to finalize a spreadsheet for deans to show market-based compensation for faculty. This document will show the differences between market and target salaries for faculty. Although the mid-year raises will not include a merit component, he indicated that the long-term approach will allow administrators to give merit-based raises, which are a high priority for faculty.

A senator praised the decision for a “reset” in the reorganization of advising. The provost responded that the immediate reaction to last month’s announcement arose from concerns about where advising staff would be located and to whom they would report. He believed that meeting face-to-face with administrators and advisors would enable a productive dialogue to allow the university to move forward with a more effective advising structure.

**Twin Larch.** The chair then introduced Prof. Mike McCollough of the College of Business and Economics who described efforts to establish a non-profit organization to take over ownership of Twin Larch Sanctuary. Twin Larch is eight miles from Moscow and was donated to the university for use by employees and/or students and university business, e.g., retreats, overnight stays, and student projects. The university intends to sell the property. (Prof. McCullough previously discussed this idea at the Oct. 3 Senate meeting.) He described the house and surrounding property as a potential resource to the university and community. Organizers are seeking faculty and staff volunteers to serve on an exploratory board. They face a deadline of Feb. 28, 2018, and hope to raise $30,000 to address some deferred maintenance issues. In response to a senator’s question, Prof. McCollough acknowledged that the road needs attention to make the house more accessible. Anyone interested should contact Prof. McCollough at mccollou@uidaho.edu.

**Ombuds Annual Report:** University Ombuds Barbara Beatty next presented a report showing an increase in the number of cases she saw in 2016-2017, partly due to more participation by students (21 percent of cases, up 7 percentage points from the previous year). She also identified the most common reasons for visits to the Ombuds Office and suggested ways the university could better address them. She noted that many employees, particularly staff, are reluctant to raise concerns to supervisors out of fear of retaliation. A senator asked if any of this information, the section on “Ombuds Observations and Comments” in particular, would be shared with the recently formed “Great Colleges to Work For” Cascaded Plan Workgroup, as it seems to align with many of the themes of the survey. Ms. Beatty stated that she would be willing to discuss this with the workgroup, if invited. In response to a senator’s question about comparisons to other institutions, Ms. Beatty said that nothing stands out about the UI; rather the concerns raised may reflect societal trends. She said the university is on the right track in updating its policies to better address workplace issues. She finished by saying that many seem to misunderstand the purpose of an ombuds, who does not advocate or take sides. Instead, she assists with conflicts and offers suggestions of how to better address them.
FS-18-012 – Sabbatical Leave Policy. The chair then introduced Prof. Erin James, chair of the Sabbatical Leave Evaluation Committee (SLEC). Prof. James explained that the committee began to examine the policy under former chair Jeff Dodge. The goals of the revision were:

- Clarify the application deadlines.
- Specify review procedures (including a statement that incomplete applications would not be considered).
- Eliminate the need for a separate report by faculty members after returning from leave; instead, providing that sabbatical activities be addressed in the faculty members’ annual performance review.
- Allowing a member of the committee who is concurrently applying for sabbatical to participate in SLEC’s evaluation of applications (except for recusing oneself from the meeting at which that application was considered). This provision will alleviate the need to find a substitute when a SLEC member’s application is before the committee.

A senator requested clarification of how the changes to this policy would affect a college’s own sabbatical leave guidelines. The provost quoted Faculty Secretary Liz Brandt pointing out that whenever the Faculty-Staff Handbook (FSH) conflicts with a college’s policy, the FSH wins. General Counsel Kent Nelson, in attendance, indicated his agreement with this observation, saying “The Senate makes the rules.” In response to another senator’s question, the chair indicated that this amendment deals only with FSH 3720 [Sabbatical Leave] and not with FSH 1640.74 [Function and Structure of the SLEC].

The Senate briefly discussed whether a tenured or tenure-track senior instructor would be eligible for a sabbatical. A senator noted that a former provost would not allow senior instructors to be considered for tenure, even though the FSH defines senior instructor as a tenure-eligible position. The SLEC’s recommendations do not address which faculty ranks are eligible for sabbatical; thus the current policy (limiting sabbaticals to tenured or tenure-track faculty, including senior instructors) remains in force. Prof. James noted that her committee discussed whether clinical faculty would be eligible for sabbatical. However, relying on the policy’s definition of the purpose of a sabbatical, chose not to expand the eligibility to include clinical ranks. Hearing no further discussion, the chair called the question on the seconded motion from the Sabbatical Leave Evaluation Committee. It passed with three abstentions.

FS-18-013 – FSH 1620 – University-level Committees. Prof. Miranda Anderson, vice chair of the Senate and chair of the Committee on Committees, presented proposed changes to university-level guidelines for committees [FSH 1620]. The first change affects appointments of students and staff to university-level committees. Under the change, Staff Council and the three student groups (ASUI, GPSA, SBA) would submit their appointees as informational items to the Committee on Committees, rather than as nominations that required the committee’s approval. As a seconded motion from the Committee on Committees, this change was approved unanimously.

FS-18-014 – FSH 1640.41 - Faculty-Staff Policy Group. This amendment would designate the Faculty Secretary/Policy Coordinator as chair of this newly formed committee. Prof. Anderson explained that Professor Brandt, the current holder of this position, proposed this change because her office is better able to coordinate issues coming before the policy group. The current policy indicates that the group would choose its own chair. A senator noted that this change potentially would lead to an imbalance in the ratio of faculty to staff on the committee (i.e., by making the Faculty Secretary chair, there could potentially be four faculty members as opposed to three staff). Because of this concern, a senator suggested referring this change back to the Faculty Secretary’s office. A motion to refer (Morgan/Tibbals) passed 17-5, with 3 abstentions. After the vote, a senator asked the chair to allow Staff Council an opportunity to review the amendment before it returns to the Senate.
FS-18-015 – Teacher Education Coordinating Committee. This change amends the committee’s membership, designates the director of teacher education as chair and reflects the College of Education’s new name: “College of Education, Health and Human Sciences.” As a seconded motion from the Committee on Committees, the changes passed unanimously with one abstention.

FS-18-008 rev – Campus Recreation. This was previously discussed at the Senate’s Oct. 24 meeting, at which Senator Brian Mahoney (associate director of Campus Recreation) proposed deletion of FSH 6880 governing Campus Recreation. In response, the Senate recommended that the section be moved to the Administrative Procedures Manual (APM) to keep a record of procedures affecting Campus Recreation. Senator Mahoney indicated that his office would address deficiencies in the program’s website raised by senators. He noted that the current policy was written before construction of the Student Recreation Center and contained outdated provisions. After additional discussion, the chair noted the late hour and called attention to his swirling gavel. A motion (Foster/Tibbals) to delete the relevant section from the FSH and insert the new language in the APM was approved with one dissenting vote and one abstention.

Adjournment: There being no other business to conduct, the chair called for a motion to adjourn, which Morrison gratefully made and Panttaja enthusiastically seconded. The motion carried unanimously and the chair gavelled the meeting to a close at 5:10 p.m., admonishing senators to “bring out your flashlights” in the dim light of the early evening.

Respectfully submitted,
Kenton Bird
Secretary pro tempore to Faculty Senate
Associate Professor of Journalism and Mass Media
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None.
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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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1640

COMMITTEE DIRECTORY

FSH 1640.41
FACULTY AND STAFF POLICY GROUP (FSPG)
[created July 2017]

A. FUNCTION.

A-1. To review non-academic policies and procedures (other than minor amendments, see FSH 1460 B-2) that affect both faculty and staff and that reside in the Faculty-Staff Handbook and/or Administrative Procedures Manual.

A-2. To ensure that both Faculty Affairs and Staff Council are informed, the chair of FSPG will communicate regularly with the chairs of Faculty Affairs and Staff Leadership.

A-3. To address and possibly resolve any perceived problems before forwarding proposed policies and procedures to Faculty Senate, the committee is encouraged to seek assistance from, or request meetings with the policy sponsor (see FSH 1460 B-6), general counsel, or others as necessary.

B. STRUCTURE. Three faculty, three staff, and the Faculty Secretary/Policy Coordinator, or his/her designee. A broad representation of faculty and staff across the university is expected and who are seen as leaders among their peers. A current member of Faculty Affairs and Staff Council is desirable, if possible. The chair of this committee will be the Faculty Secretary/Policy Coordinator (w/o vote) selected from one of the six voting members.
### POLICY COVER SHEET

*(See Faculty Staff Handbook 1460 for instructions at UI policy website: [www.webs.uidaho.edu/uipolicy](http://www.webs.uidaho.edu/uipolicy)*
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<thead>
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**Reviewed by General Counsel**
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<thead>
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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.

The revisions to the committee’s Functions and Structure are (1) to update to reflect changes to administrative and unit lines of reporting, oversight, and nomenclature; (2) to revise A-5 to state more clearly and to amend the committee’s role as not actually ‘hands on’ in its oversight of orientation activities but instead as parallel in function to the language of A-3; (3) to delete Function A-7 because this function has now been ‘centralized’ at the university with the advent of the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) and by University Advising Services (4) to revise A-9 to reflect current unit names/titles, and to re-number it now to A-8; and (5) to delete A-10 because the committee in current and recent practice has arranged to meet at a time that best suits its members.

**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.

Only the overlap in ‘functions’ that prompted deleting Functions A-7 and A-8, as explained above.

**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: ______________________________________
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1640.87
TEACHING AND ADVISING COMMITTEE

[Substantially revised in 7-05, 7-06, 11-17]

A. FUNCTION. This committee will serve in an advisory capacity to the Vice Provost of Academic AffairsInitiatives. The specific functions of this committee are: [rev. 211-1748]

A-1. To promote a faculty and administrative culture dedicated to the enhancement of teaching and advising.

A-2. To advise and assist in organizing university-wide forums, seminars, and capacity building programs that introduce new innovations or share proven ways to promote the enhancement of teaching and advising.

A-3. To review and make recommendations concerning policies and procedures, which affect teaching, advising, and the assessment of student learning outcomes.

A-4. To monitor the processes and content of Student Teaching Evaluations and Student Learning Outcomes, and to advise on the design/content of reports to the Vice Provost, Faculty Senate, Deans, Unit Leaders, and Faculty. [ed. 7-09]

A-5. To oversee review and make recommendations concerning the annual orientation activities for new faculty, which sets out among other things the role of, and expectations for, faculty and staff that teach, advise, and mentor students.

A-6. To publicize awards, review proposals, and select recipients for the Teaching and Advising Excellence Awards.

A-7. To maintain a Web presence dedicated to the enhancement of teaching, advising, and other student mentoring activities.

A-78. To serve as an advisory resource for the Registrar to address the prioritization of the classroom use, maintenance, and improvements.

A-89. To work in conjunction with Faculty Senate’s Information Technology Committee to advise the director of CTL/CETL and the Director of ITS on electronic hardware and software needs to support teaching, advising, and mentoring. [ed. 7-08, 7-09]

A-10. This committee traditionally meets on Thursdays at 3:30 p.m. [add. 7-08]

B. STRUCTURE. Six faculty members, some of whom have received university-level teaching and advising awards, an associate dean or college level advisor, a departmental staff advisor, the director of general education, an undergraduate or graduate student, non-voting members from the Office of Instructional Research Assessment Effectiveness and Accreditation, Academic Advising CenterUniversity Advising Services, and the Director of the Center for Excellence in Teaching & LearningVP for Academic Affairs, or designee. [rev. 7-08, ed. 8-12]
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TEAC approved to move ahead to implementing the intended ‘final’ form approved back in 2016. The transitional form is no longer needed and thus will be removed.

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

Institutional testing and assessment will redesign the website.

III. Related Policies/Procedures: Describe other policies or procedures existing that are related or similar to this proposed change.
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If not a minor amendment forward to: ____________________________________________

Policy Coordinator
Appr. & Date: __________________________________
[Office Use Only]

APM
F&A Appr.: ________
[Office Use Only]

FSH
Appr. ________
FC ________
GFM ________
Pres./Prov. ________
[Office Use Only]

Track # _____________
Date Rec.: ___________ 
Posted: t-sheet ___________
  h/c ___________
  web ___________
Register: _____________
(Office Use Only)
February 2016 – transitional student feedback form used alongside ‘current form’ in consideration of, and to minimally impact, faculty in the middle of the P&T process.

**Student feedback on an academic course and learning environment**

1. How often did you attend class or online learning environment? (Circle one)
   - Less than 60%
   - 60%+
   - 70%+
   - 80%+
   - 90%+

2. How many hours per week (outside of class) did you do work for this course? (Circle one)
   - Less than 2 hrs.
   - 2+ hrs.
   - 4+ hrs.
   - 6+ hrs.
   - 8+ hrs.

Please use the following scale to answer questions 3, 4 and 5.
SD – strongly disagree; D – disagree; N – neutral; A – agree; SA – strongly agree

3. The instructor expressed clear expectations for learning outcomes in this course.

4. Overall, the content and organization of this course contributed to your understanding of this subject.

5. Overall, the instructor’s delivery and efforts contributed to your understanding of the course material.

6. The instructor was helpful to me outside of class or online learning environment. (Circle one)
   - No
   - Yes
   - N/A (I did not seek help from the instructor outside of class)

Comments:
7. What were some positive aspects of the course that supported learning?

Comments:

8. What aspects and/or content of the course could be improved to better support learning?

Comments:

The items below ask for your evaluation of your experience in [Course Number] this semester. In each case the scale is 0 to 4, with 4 being the highest rating and 0 the lowest rating.

9. Clarity of instructor’s explanations.

10. Likelihood you would recommend this instructor to others.

11. Instructor’s ability to stimulate interest in the course topics.

12. Presentation of course material by the instructor.

13. Course’s value in gaining an understanding of the subject matter.

14. Appropriateness of level at which course material is covered.

15. Relevance of written assignments to course materials.

16. Overall, how would you rate the quality of this course?

17. Overall, how would you rate the instructor’s performance in teaching this course?
INITIAL REVIEW OF THE PROPOSED NEW TEACHING FORM

New Instructor and Course Items

ABSTRACT
These results suggest the new course and instructor items function as desired, and will provide reasonable continuity with previous items should implementation be pursued. If reporting trends which include old and new item results, conservatively adding about 0.4 points to each mean score obtained from the new instructor and course is suggested. As always, the need for ongoing review and continued research is encouraged.

Pietrzak, Dale
(dalepietrzak@uidaho.edu)
Director, IEA
Executive Review:

Review:
The initial review of the suggested changes to the student feedback on teaching and course was done using results from the Fall of 2016 and Spring of 2017 semesters. This represented 4,718 courses with responses from 33,186 students. Of these, 2,353 courses had 5 or more respondents (28,028 student responses). The numbers for each analysis may vary somewhat based on missing data (i.e., student not responding to items, etc.).

The examination was informed by the general philosophy of the nomological network [https://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/nomonet.php](https://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/nomonet.php). This is an established approach. It was enacted using one of many variations on Multitrait-Multimethod modeling approach [https://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/mtmmmat.php](https://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/mtmmmat.php). Additionally the model for alternate form reliability approach was also employed.

The findings suggest that the new form displays reasonable continuity with the old form. The new instructor and course scores are on average slightly lower than the old form. When reporting trends that include old and new form results, conservatively adding about 0.4 points to each mean score from the new form is suggested. However, the distributions of the scores allows the continued reporting using the same general process as was done previously. These data suggest there is little discriminative power of the course and instructor scores. There was support for reporting only courses with 5 or more respondents.

![Alternate Form Reliability Table]

Examination of the relationship of the instructor and course scores (old and new) to class size, number of respondents and response rate was examined. There was a slight decline in scores as class size increased (less than 2% shared variance), as was theoretically expected. There was a slight increase in scores as response rate increased (about 1% shared variance).
Examination of the instructor and course scores with instructor gender, citizenship and minority status found no relationship to gender or minority status. A slight decrease in scores was noted for instructors who were not US citizens (about 1.5% shared variance).

The examination of the relationship of undergraduate academic was undertaken. Course GPA, DFWI percent and Percent of A’s was used. Of the 1,827 courses with 5 or more responses examined there were small relationships in the theoretically expected direction for the instructor score with Course GPA (positive, 6.7% shared variance), percent A’s (positive, 5.9% shared variance) and DFWI percent (negative, 5.1% shared variance). Course scores saw similar relationships with Course GPA (positive, 5.1% shared variance), DFWI percent (negative, 4.2% shared variance) and percent A’s (positive, 4.3% shared variance. These were consistent with the relationships with the prior course and instructor items.

The relationships of the instructor items was examined across 11 additional items to clarify the construct being evaluated. This was done using correlation, exploratory factor analysis and multiple regression. There was 91% shared variance between the instructor item and instructor presentation, instructor recommendation to others, clarity of instructor explanations, clarity of instructor’s expectation, course value, and instructor’s ability to stimulate interest. The least influential items were how many hours the student work on the course outside of class, self-reported class attendance, and instructor helpfulness outside of class. There was relative consistency between this and the old instructor item.

The relationships of the course items was examined across 11 additional items to clarify the construct being evaluated. This was done using correlation, exploratory factor analysis and multiple regression. There was 89% shared variance between the course item and course’s value in gaining understanding of the subject matter, instructor presentation, appropriateness of level of presented material, and clarity of instructor expectations. The least influential items were how many hours the student worked on the course outside of class, self-reported class attendance, and instructor helpfulness outside of class. There was relative consistency between this and the old instructor item.

**Conclusion:**

These results suggest the new items function as desired and will provide reasonable continuity with previous items should implementation be desired. If reporting trends which include old and new item results conservatively adding about 0.4 points to each mean score obtained from the new instructor and course is suggested. As always, the need for ongoing review and continued research is encouraged. Additional information regarding this examination is available in a PowerPoint presentation.

*Dale Pietrzak, Ed.D., CCMHC, LPCMH*  
*Director, Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation*  
dalepietrzak@uidaho.edu