University of Idaho
2017-2018 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #7

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

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2017-18 Faculty Senate Meeting #6, September 26, 2017 (vote)

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.
   • Consent Agenda (Brandt)
   • 7:30 a.m. Exams (Chermak)
   • Concealed Weapon Concerns (Dorschel)

VI. Committee Reports.
   • Borah (Daley-Laursen/Smith)

VII. Special Orders.

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 #6
Handouts
Present: Anderson (Miranda), Anderson (Mike), Arowojolu, Baird, Brandt (w/o vote), Brown, Bugingo, Cannon, Caplan, De Angelis, Ellison, Foster, Zhao (Idaho Falls), Grieb, Hrdlicka, Jeffery, Johnson, Kern (Coeur d’Alene), Leonor, Morgan, Morrison, Nicotra, Panttaja, Seamon, Tibbals, Vella, Watson, Wienczek (w/o vote). Absent: Barbour, Mahoney. Guests: 7

Call to Order and Minutes: The chair called the meeting to order at 3:30 and welcomed a new Senator, Joshua Leonor, who represents the Student Bar Association. A Senator suggested a clarification to the minutes as follows: On page 2, third full paragraph, numbered list. Change #3 to read “Because the CIP Codes appear to be tied to majors and/or programs and not directly to faculty responsibilities – how is research reflected in the CIP Code Process.” This change was accepted by the secretary as a friendly amendment. A motion (Baird/Morrison) to approve the minutes as clarified was approved unanimously with two abstentions.

Chair’s Report:
- On October 6th Campus-wide meeting regarding staff market-based compensation will be held. Information about the meeting is available here: [http://www.uidaho.edu/news/news-articles/faculty-staff-news/2017-september/091117-marketbasedcompensation](http://www.uidaho.edu/news/news-articles/faculty-staff-news/2017-september/091117-marketbasedcompensation)
- Sabbatical Applications due on October 27, 2017. Information is available here: [http://www.uidaho.edu/provost/faculty/leave](http://www.uidaho.edu/provost/faculty/leave).
- Honorary degree nominations for the May 2018 commencement ceremony are due by November 15, 2017 [http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/4930.html](http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/4930.html)
- Faculty and staff are encouraged to join the faculty and staff Facebook group for regular information on university news and events ([https://www.facebook.com/groups/uidahoemployees](https://www.facebook.com/groups/uidahoemployees)). In Facebook search for UI Faculty and Staff News and Events.

The chair noted that the packet for the meeting came out comparatively late. The packet typically is not sent out until all the supporting documents for the meeting are available. He encouraged senators to go to the Faculty Senate webpage which is updated regularly as material and information on the upcoming senate meeting becomes available. He recognized the extraordinary efforts of Anna Thompson in maintaining the website and in getting timely information to senators.

Provost’s Report: The Provost reported that the university is exploring the possibility of using Academic Analytics ([https://www.academicanalytics.com/](https://www.academicanalytics.com/)) as part of the efforts to assess progress on our strategic plan and provide accurate data for accreditation and future program prioritization processes. The company recently demonstrated its product to a small group of administrators, faculty and staff. The product may be able to provide important data in our efforts to move toward an R1 research institution and will benchmark our information against data from other institutions.

The Provost noted that he recently attended an interesting session of a Symposium on open and reproducible science sponsored by The Center for Modeling Complex Interactions, and thanked CMCI and Professor Berna Devezer (CBE) for organizing and hosting the symposium.

The Faculty Compensation Taskforce met with the Provost to iron out details necessary to launch the new market compensation system. Estimates of base market compensation for clinical, research and library faculty are in process. The university has a long way to go to meet our market compensation goals. We need to get started with the upcoming mid-year compensation and with next year’s CEC (change in
employee compensation). We may not get everyone’s market rate documented perfectly, but we anticipate that we will have a very good first pass at these assignments.

A memo from the University Budget and Finance Committee (UBFC) recommended priorities from last spring has been published. The committee is in the process of launching and revising its process for this year.

Finally, the Provost reported that within academic affairs, his direct reports are discussing the program prioritization reallocation and how it should be apportioned among the various units. Anyone in academic affairs is invited to provide input on how the allocation should be apportioned. Input should be provided by September 29, 2017 through Sli.do https://app.sli.do/event/7r0wijzh/ask.

A senator noted that the university recently worked with Elsevier to develop some data regarding our research activities and asked whether the university would follow up on that effort. The Provost indicated that the Elsevier product is very expensive compared to Academic Analytics, but we are far from purchasing anything. As we get a better understanding of needs and software capabilities, we can assess which tools we might want to purchase. The Provost also noted that the decision of whether to invest in a tool such as Academic Analytics should be driven by faculty and academic leaders (especially department chairs and deans). He encouraged faculty senate to work with faculty and deans on whether the university should invest in such a tool.

Jeanne Stevenson, Vice Provost for Faculty provided an overview of her responsibilities in her newly created position. She will be focused on hiring and retaining faculty to assist the UI to achieve its goals in research, teaching, outreach and service. Examples of her work during the summer include:

- Developing programs for new faculty and department administrators. As part of new faculty orientation, she has worked to expand partnerships with departments and colleges to expand new faculty orientation within each college.
- Developing a workshop series for new department chairs emphasizing the activities they need to get involved in during their first three months (students learning outcomes, new program assessment, faculty responsibilities and budgeting).
- Facilitating the university's leadership academy for faculty and staff who are interested in pursuing university leadership positions.
- Providing assistance to department administrators and faculty through informal conversations to discuss processes.
- Facilitating a workshop series for department chairs throughout the academic year. So far focus of the chair series has been on program assessment strategies, dialogue between the three vice provosts and chairs, and a presentation by Vice Provost Cher Hendricks about program development and design. She is identifying topics for spring semester.
- Developing support for long-term associate professors who have an interest in promotion to full professor.
- Partnering with committees and Faculty Senate to clarify policies affecting faculty. One example is working with the Sabbatical Leave Application Committee to revise the sabbatical leave policy to make it more straightforward and clear for faculty.

Brandi Terwilliger, Director of Human Resources, updated Senate on forthcoming changes to the health insurance. Open enrollment will be from October 16 through November 7, 2017. The changes are minor and will be detailed in the new benefits booklet, which will be distributed to employees in the near future. Human Resources is also launching an enhanced portal to enroll in benefits. There will be a single sign-on for enrollment, which will take four steps. The enrollment website will include a side-by-side comparison
that employees may view while they are enrolling (rather than having to open another webpage to see the comparison). Human Resources is hoping to have the enrollment interface customized so employees will be able to see what plan is best for them based on their actual expenditures. On October 2, 2017 there will be an all-day forum in which employees can meet with individual vendors to ask questions about coverage and benefits. After the forum, there will be open meetings, which will be recorded and zoomed to off-site employees. The recordings will be available on the benefits website.

A senator asked what the feedback has been on Willamette Dental, a relatively new option for dental insurance. Director Terwilliger indicated that the feedback has been positive. Human Resources thought Willamette was going to have increased rates for this year, but the rates were negotiated down. The plan has approximately 30 participants.

Another senator asked whether flu shots will be available at the benefits vendor forum. Director Terwilliger affirmed that flu shots will be available for employees and adult dependents. They will be administered in a separate location. Employees do not need to have their medical card with them. Flu shots will also be available to any other location that has asked for them.

**Student Code Taskforce.** Liz Brandt, Faculty Secretary, Jim Craig, Associate General Counsel, Blaine Eckles, Dean of Students, and Erin Agidius, Director of the Office of Civil Rights and Investigations presented proposed revisions to FSH 2400 regarding student disciplinary procedures and FSH 1640.83 regarding the university committee governing student discipline. The proposal was a collaborative effort involving the Dean of Students Office, the Office of General Counsel, Faculty Secretary, faculty and students. The proposal provides for a greatly enhanced investigation process, including a non-confrontational and extensive exchange of information prior to a decision or a hearing. The proposal combines the current Student Disciplinary Review Board and the Student Appeals Committee into one committee. The members of this committee, called the Student Conduct Board, will form a pool of faculty, staff and students from which hearing and appellate panels will be formed. In light of the expanded investigative process, the proposal limits who may speak at hearings. It also provides that a trained, professional hearing officer may be available to conduct the hearing for a panel, serve as a member of a panel, or serve as the sole person hearing a case. The proposal provides for a single appeal.

A senator expressed concern that some students may not be in a position to do an effective job articulating their arguments in the investigation process. Craig responded that there will be several opportunities to clarify. The student receives the report and can respond to same, and at the hearing, members of the panel will be able to ask questions through the chair. He also stressed that students would be entitled to have an advisor assist them through the process and be present at the hearing, although only the student may speak at the hearing. In rare situations, the chair of the panel may ask additional persons to speak before the board. Another senator asked whether the proposal is consistent with recent Title IX guidance. Director Agidius stated that the proposal is in compliance with current Title IX guidance.

Another senator pointed out that the proposal does not define who the investigator is. Craig answered that the investigator could differ from case-to-case. In Title IX cases, a trained Title IX investigator from the Office of Civil Rights and Investigations would handle the cases. In cases involving violations of housing rules, a housing investigator would handle the cases. The Dean of Students Office also has investigators. The suggestion was made to include a general definition of “investigator” in the proposal. Dean Eckles responded that if a student is concerned about the objectivity of a particular investigator, the student may challenge an investigator for bias. A senator questioned whether there is a potential conflict in the code because both the investigator and the Student Conduct Administrator are employees within the Dean of Students Office. Faculty Secretary Brandt explained that under our current system the same situation exists.
A senator asked who would determine whether a hearing officer is involved in a given case and whether the hearing officer would decide the case or play a role on the panel. Mr. Craig responded that the decision would be made by the Dean of Students.

A senator pointed out that the flow chart gives the impression that every case goes to appeal. Mr. Craig pointed out that the State Board of Education has adopted new rules that require the university to provide for an appeal in every case. However, at each step in the process, the case could be resolved by mutual agreement. Furthermore, the Student Conduct Administrator can decide that there is not enough information to proceed with the disciplinary action.

Regarding the revisions to the committee name and structure, Brandt pointed out that the proposal had been approved by the Committee on Committees (ConC). ConC requested that a provision be included requiring that the Student Conduct Board members treat hearings and appeals as confidential and refrain from sharing information among committee members who might be serving in other capacities in the same case.

A motion to adjourn (Panttaja/Vella) was made and the meeting was adjourned at 4:57 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Liz Brandt, Faculty Secretary &
Secretary to the Faculty Senate
Consent Agenda
David O. Renz, Ph.D.

What is a Consent Agenda?

A consent agenda is a practice by which the mundane and non-controversial board action items are organized apart from the rest of the agenda and approved as a group. This includes all of the business items that require formal board approval and yet, because they are not controversial, there is no need for board discussion before taking a vote. Items may be on a consent agenda only if all board members agree; if even one member considers a specific item to need discussion, it must be removed and placed on the regular agenda for the board meeting.

Why are Consent Agendas Used?

Consent agendas are used to save board meeting time and to help ensure that board meetings focus on substantive topics that are worth discussion. Through the “bundling” process, the entire set of items of business that are not worth board meeting time can be voted on in one action versus taking the time to vote on each individual item.

When Should Consent Agendas Be Used?

Consent agendas should be used when there are a number of non-controversial business items on which the board needs to vote. Complete information must be provided in advance of the meeting to all board members, so that each knows what is being proposed and has the opportunity to consider whether the item truly is non-controversial. The key here is “non-controversial,” and the definition of non-controversial may vary from organization to organization. Consent agenda items often are matters that a bylaw or some other rule or regulation requires to be formally approved by the board, yet there is no value added by engaging the board in discussion about the item (e.g., a routine lease renewal for a facility already included in the approved agency budget). Consent agendas are not to be used to hide actions that will be controversial -- to do so breaches the trust of the board and undermines the value of this practice.

Where Should Consent Agendas be Placed within the Overall Meeting Agenda?

The consent agenda typically appears very near the beginning of the regular meeting. This allows any item removed from the consent agenda to be placed onto the overall agenda for discussion and action later in the meeting. As with all formal board action, a quorum must be present to in order for action on the consent agenda items to be legitimate and binding.
Who Should Use Consent Agendas?

Consent agendas are used by both non-profit and for-profit organizations whose boards are trying to use members' time efficiently and that have much routine business to approve. It is especially common to see the boards of governmental entities such as libraries and educational institutions use consent agendas because of the volume of routine business that they are required by law and regulation to approve.

How Can Consent Agendas be Used Effectively?

The key to success is to provide all consent agenda information to board members well in advance of the meeting. It is essential that board members have ample time prior to a meeting to become familiar with each item on the consent agenda. That way, if a member or members have a concern about any item(s) that they believe need further discussion, then they will ask for the item(s) to be removed from the consent agenda and addressed separately.

At the time in the regular agenda when there is to be action on the consent agenda, the chair will first inquire whether there are any items that need to be removed from the consent agenda. If any member wishes an item to be removed, it must be removed and placed on the regular agenda. Immediately following the opportunity to remove any items for separate discussion, the consent agenda is moved and approved as a set. (For example: "I move the consent agenda." Another member: "I second the motion.")

It may be useful to those who plan the overall meeting agenda and the consent agenda (usually the board chair and/or executive director) to have guidelines, developed in consultation with the board, to clarify which types of items might be appropriate for the consent agenda.

When Should a Consent Agenda Not Be Used?

The consent agenda practice should not be used unless all members of the board understand and agree to its use. This approach places more responsibility upon members to prepare prior to the meeting. Obviously, if members do not read the information on the consent agenda prior to the meeting, they cannot responsibly agree to the inclusion of any particular item on the consent agenda. The worst outcome would be to take action on a matter of significant programmatic or legal importance without truly having the board's informed consent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam Days</td>
<td>Monday - Friday</td>
<td>Monday - Friday</td>
<td>Monday - Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Time One</td>
<td>7:30 - 9:30</td>
<td>8:00 - 10:00</td>
<td>7:30 - 9:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Time Two</td>
<td>10:00 - 12:00</td>
<td>10:15 - 12:15</td>
<td>9:45 - 11:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Time Three</td>
<td>12:30 - 2:30</td>
<td>12:45 - 2:45</td>
<td>12:00 - 2:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Time Four</td>
<td>3:00 - 5:00</td>
<td>3:00 - 5:00</td>
<td>2:15 - 4:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Time Five</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:30 - 6:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Time Six</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:45 - 8:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Finals</td>
<td>7:00 - 9:00 (M-TR)</td>
<td>7:00 - 9:00 (M-TR)</td>
<td>9:00 - 11:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts</td>
<td>5:00 - 7:00 (TR, F)</td>
<td>5:00 - 7:00 (TR, F)</td>
<td>No Specific Time. The student and instructor would have to identify an alternative time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizational Chart for Public Safety & Security

Threat Assessment & Management Team
- Includes representatives from Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, MPD, and HRS
- Develops fact-based assessments of individuals that may present a threat to the university community
- Collaborates with university community to develop preventative measures, including plans and protocols for responding to credible threats.

Safety & Security Collaboration
- Risk Planning
- Unit Emergency Response Planning
- Active Shooter Response Training
- NetLearning
  - >3,000 courses/year
- Tailored, live training to UI community
  - >300 courses/year

Clery Act Compliance
- Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act
- Key Requirements
  - Annual Security Report
  - Public Crime Log
  - Issue Timely Warnings & Emergency Notifications

Recent Initiatives
- Emergency Response Framework
- Security Camera Enterprise
- Culture of Safety
  - ORED / Infrastructure Collaborative effort
- Vandal Alert Intercept
  - Mobile device enrollment
SYMPOSIUM
70TH ANNUAL | UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO

OCTOBER 16-17, 2017

OCTOBER 16
7:00 pm
KEYNOTE ADDRESS
Nobel Laureate Shirin Ebadi
“The Role of Women in World Peace”
Pitman International Ballroom

OCTOBER 17
12:30 pm
Professor LeRoy Ashby
“The Life and Times of William Edgar Borah”
(co-facilitated with the Renfrew Colloquium)
Pitman International Ballroom

7:00 pm
Professor Scott Shapiro
“The Internationalists: How a Radical Plan to Outlaw War Remade the World.”
Pitman International Ballroom

www.uidaho.edu/borah

The symposium honors the legacy of former US Senator from Idaho, William Edgar Borah (1864-1940) by considering the causes of war and the conditions necessary for peace in an international context.

In 1907 Borah was elected to the U.S. Senate where he served until his death in 1940. Known for his public speaking skills and his independent and often controversial positions on political issues, he was a strong advocate for peace, disarmament and the major proponent for the outlawry of war.
Faculty Senate Briefing  
3 October 2017

Purpose: To honor the legacy of Senator William Edgar Borah and to promote understanding of the causes of war, the conditions necessary for peace, and the international arena.

Founded: 1929, via agreement between lawyer Salmon O. Levinson and the Idaho State Board of Education.

First program: 1938, when First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt visited campus.

Annual programming since 1948.

Planning: Six faculty, four students, and two staff members with ex-oficio support from the Martin Institute.

NOTABLE SPEAKERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Former Heads of State</th>
<th>Nobel Peace Prize Recipients</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Borah 70th Annual Symposium, 16-17 October 2017

Shirin Ebadi is the keynote speaker, lecturing on “The Role of Women in World Peace,” on Monday, Oct. 16, 7 p.m., in the International Ballroom in the Bruce M. Pitman Center. A former chief magistrate of 26th Divisional Court in Tehran, after the Islamic Revolution Ebadi became a defense lawyer for many controversial political and human rights cases in Iran, winning the 2003 Nobel Peace Prize for her work. Her invitation was conceived in part as an homage to the first Borah program featuring Eleanor Roosevelt, one of the most well-known campaigners for peace and human rights of the Twentieth Century.

LeRoy Ashby will also speak. Regents professor emeritus at Washington State University and biographer of William E. Borah, Ashby will present the “The Life and Times of William Edgar Borah” at 12:30 p.m. Tuesday in the International Ballroom. This talk is via a partnership with the Renfrew Colloquium.

Scott Shapiro concludes the symposium on Tuesday night at 7 p.m. in the International Ballroom, He recently published “The Internationalists: How a Radical Plan to Outlaw War Remade the World” with colleague Oona Hathaway (September 2017), which offers a history of international law as it has evolved from the 17th century through the present; it details the work of both Borah and Levinson in the service of world peace.