University of Idaho
2018-2019 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #8

3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, October 2, 2018
Paul Joyce Faculty-Staff Lounge & Zoom

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2018-19 Faculty Senate Meeting #7, September 18, 2018 (vote)

III. Consent Agenda.

IV. Chair’s Report.

V. Provost’s Report.

VI. Unfinished Business and General Orders.
   • Senate meeting time 2:30-4 pm

VII. Committee Reports.
   • Committee on Committees:
     o FS-19-007 - FSH 1640.42 – Faculty Affairs (Grieb)(vote)
   • Graduate Council: TA/RA Assistantship language in catalog (McMurtry)(FYI)

VIII. Special Orders.

IX. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

X. New Business.
   • FC-19-005 – FSH 4300 – Teacher Education (Brandt)(vote)

XI. Adjournment.

Professor Aaron Johnson, Chair 2018-2019, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2018-2019 FS Meeting #7
Class Conflict Numbers with Senate
Graduate Council – TA/RA catalog edits
FS-19-005 & 007
University of Idaho  
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
2018-2019 Meeting #7, Tuesday, September 18, 2018

Present: Benedum, Brandt (w/o vote), Cannon (Boise), Caplan, Chopin, DeAngelis, Dezzani, Foster, Grieb, Jeffrey, Johnson, Keim, Kern (Coeur d’Alene), Laggis, Lee, Lee-Painter, McKellar (Idaho Falls), Morgan, Raja, Seamon, Schwarzlaender, Tibbals, Vella, Watson, Wieneck (w/o vote). Absent: Ellison, Kirchmeier, Lambeth, Luckhart. Guests: 4

Call to Order and Minutes. The chair called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

A motion to approve the minutes (Tibbals/Keim) passed unanimously.

Chair’s Report:

- Chair noted the tragic passing of student Katherine Groggett who was killed in a traffic accident very recently. Katherine was a junior majoring in dietetics. The chair called for a moment of silence. Afterward, he encouraged faculty to support students who need counselling as they grieve Katherine’s death and to excuse students who want to attend her memorial service.
- The Bellwood Memorial Lecture speaker will be former U.S. Secretary for Homeland Security Michael Chertoff. Chertoff will speak on “Solving the Immigration Crisis” live in Boise at 5:00-6:30 on October 23 in the Pioneer Room at Jump, 1000 W. Myrtle St. He will speak on the same topic live in Moscow at 4:00-5:30 on October 24 in the International Ballroom at the Pitman Center.
- Sabbatical Applications for the 2019-2020 academic year are due on October 31.
- Honorary degree nominations for the May 2019 Commencement are due by November 15.
- Applications for Equipment and Infrastructure Support Award are due October 10.
- The Eastern Washington/North Idaho Fulbright Association will hold a happy hour from 4:00 to 6:00 pm on September 25 in the Idaho Commons Horizon-Aurora Rooms.
- President Staben will give the State of the University Address at 3:00 PDT on September 25 at the Pitman Center.

The chair encouraged senators to contact him if they would like him to highlight events and other matters in the Chair’s Report.

Provost Report: The provost also commented on the sad passing of Katherine Groggett. He noted that she had been the president of the Tri-Delta Sorority and active in the Moscow community. He cautioned the university community that the intersection at which the accident that took her life occurred (the entrance to the Clearwater Casino from U.S. Rte. 95 south of Lewiston) is particularly dangerous and urged caution by those in the vicinity.

The provost also noted that Yvonne Danich, a student who had been reported missing, was found and is safe.

College of Education Health and Human Services (CEHHS) is sponsoring a presentation by Harold G. Nelson on September 24 at 3:00 in the Administration Auditorium. The subject of the talk is “Design in the 21st Century: Intentional Change in an Unpredictable World.” Nelson is an architect and the former Nierenberg Distinguished Professor of Design at Carnegie-Mellon University.

Tomorrow morning is the fall Presidential Leadership Retreat. The provost noted that the president held a year-in-review retreat at the end of the Spring 2018 semester. During the summer university leadership reflected on the issues identified at the retreat and set goals for the coming year. Those goals will be presented and discussed at the upcoming retreat. One focus of the goals is student success. The next Vandal Ideas Projects (VIP) Program will roll out soon and is focused on retention and progression efforts. The university will continue
to address issues such as shared advising and VandalStar. There will be some student panels at the breakfast. The provost believes the university has made good progress and hopes to make further headway.

The provost apologized in advance that he will leave the meeting early as he is feeling a bit under the weather and must prepare for the upcoming retreat. Vice Provost Torrey Lawrence will take his place.

**FS-19-004 – FSH 4930 - Honorary Degrees:** The chair announced that the Commencement Committee decided to pull its report regarding honorary degrees. Further review of the commencement policy revealed additional issues that should be considered. The committee will report to the senate once it has had the opportunity to address the entire policy.

**University Budget and Finance Committee:** The University Budget and Finance Committee (UBFC) Report was given by Professor Philip Scruggs (the incoming chair of the committee) and Professor Darryl Woolley (the outgoing chair of the committee). Chair Johnson reminded senators about the role of the UBFC. The committee examines and evaluates requests for new funding. These requests are generally submitted during January. The committee finalizes its recommendations by May and submits its report to the university administration. The final report was circulated to senators in late August. The chair encouraged senators to participate in a dialog about the UBFC process. He reminded senators that the committee does not make final funding decisions.

Committee Chair Scruggs informed senators that the committee will have its first meeting later in September. He is currently working with the Provost, Vice President for Finance and Administration Brian Foisy, and University Budget Director Trina Mahoney to develop the committee’s agenda for the fall. Former chair Woolley noted that the past practice of the committee was to vote on every proposal individually. The committee is large and eight members constitute a quorum. Last year the committee established two categories for proposals -- recommended or not recommended.

A senator asked whether the committee considered the amount of funding requested as a factor in approving proposals. Woolley reminded the senator that the committee did not make funding allocations. He also indicated that the committee did not consider the size of each request as part of the evaluation other than to possibly consider whether the funding request appeared consistent with the proposed project. The senator followed up by asking what pros and cons the committee considered in evaluating the merits of the proposals. Woolley responded that in previous years, the UBFC had identified factors that negatively impacted the success of proposals. These factors were communicated at the time the request for proposals was disseminated to campus. In general, he indicated that the committee favored proposals that had a university wide impact and that were more closely aligned with the strategic plan.

A senator asked whether the UBFC process would be the same this year as in the past and whether Woolley or Scruggs had tips on how to prepare a successful proposal? Scruggs responded that the committee would be evaluating the process and making changes during the fall semester. The process, including any advice on submitting proposals will be communicated when the request for proposals is disseminated.

A senator asked whether ASUI students were included on the committee. The faculty secretary responded that ASUI students were appointed to the committee, but may not have actively participated in the committee’s work.

A senator asked how much money was eventually allocated to UBFC priorities. VP Foisy responded stating that the funding to respond to priorities comes from several sources. First, it is possible but not likely that the legislature might appropriate new, unrestricted funding for university priorities. Second, if enrollment increases, some of the increased tuition revenue would be available for university priorities. Finally the only other sources of funding are reallocations among the different colleges and vice presidential areas within the
The university has successfully matched legislative funding to priorities, the provost added that there will be significantly less work in future years. The funding process for completing the new PD will follow the processes currently employed by the university. The goal is that each PD on the system is implemented all PDs will be electronic. Changes to the responsibilities of the individual faculty member each completes a new PD, revisions will only be necessary once the new system goes online. The implementation of the new PD is a significant process and philosophical change for the institution. The faculty secretary commented that the UBFC process also helps ensure that all sectors of the institution have the opportunity to present funding proposals. Foisy pointed out that prior to this process the university funded proposals on a first come, first served basis through informal communications. If a project sponsor had the ear of the decision-maker, a proposal got funded and competing proposals were often relegated to obscurity. He commented that even if the only benefit of the UBFC process was to open the funding process up to the entire institution that would be a valuable contribution.

A senator asked about a particular line item in the report that did not have a funding amount. Woolley responded that in several instances, the committee grouped multiple, overlapping requests together. When this happened it was not always possible to provide a single amount as the combined proposals often requested both one time and continuing funding. He indicated that he would get the detail on the questioned item to the senator. A senator asked how the program prioritization process dovetails with the UBFC process. Foisy responded that the two processes are discreet, but emphasized that the university has chosen to link them by using the resources identified through program prioritization to fund high priority projects identified by the UBFC. The provost underscored this point emphasizing that from the beginning the administration has been clear that the funds made available through program prioritization would be used to fund UBFC priorities. Both Foisy and the provost commented that this transparent process of reallocation to high priority projects has been evaluated favorably by the university’s accreditors. The provost’s office has the responsibility of managing the PDs and administering the process for completion of PDs. As part of the process, he has met with both the faculty secretary and with Marty Ytreberg, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (which initiated the revision of the PD policy).

**New Faculty Position Description:** Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Torrey Lawrence presented information on the implementation of the new faculty position description (PD).

The implementation of the new PD is a significant process and philosophical change for the institution. He clarified that he does not intend his faculty senate presentation to be a training, but rather a broad overview of the changes that will be implemented. He reminded senators that faculty senate approved the new PD policy last spring. The provost’s office has the responsibility of managing the PDs and administering the process for completion of PDs. As part of the process, he has met with both the faculty secretary and with Marty Ytreberg, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (which initiated the revision of the PD policy).

There are several goals of the revised PD process. The first is to reduce workload by eliminating the need for annual PD meetings and revisions. On this score, Lawrence noted that the PD would be a bit extra work this year as the new system goes online, but will be significantly less work in future years. Once each faculty member completes a new PD, revisions will only be necessary when the faculty member has a substantial change in responsibilities. Second, the new policy is intended to move the university to an electronic system for maintaining and storing PDs. Right now, the university maintains 8,000-10,000 pages of PDs. Once the new system is implemented all PDs will be electronic. Finally, the third goal of the new PD system is to focus faculty PDs on the individual faculty member’s position, rather than his or her specific plans for a particular year.

The goal is that each full time faculty member (867 individuals) must complete a new position description before the end of the calendar year. The university is using its HR software, PeopleAdmin, to support the online PD. Both the unit administrator and the individual faculty member will be able to edit the PDs. The initial process for completing the new PD will follow the processes currently employed by units to revise the old PD.
form. Some will handle the PD by emails, others will schedule face-to-face meetings. Once the PD is revised and reviewed by the unit administrator and dean it will be returned to the faculty member, unit administrator and dean for electronic signatures.

The timeline for implementation is as follows: Unit administrators will work with new faculty to create PDs during September. The provost office will use the process of bringing new faculty on to troubleshoot the system. Once any kinks are worked out, the provost office will announce deadlines for the rest of the faculty with the goal of completing all PDs by year-end. However, Lawrence noted that there is some flexibility with the year-end time frame.

Lawrence identified several challenges. First, many faculty are unaware of the change. Second, some may find that navigating PeopleAdmin is a challenge. He noted that the software is relatively intuitive, but that faculty will need step-by-step directions the first time they access the system. The institution must navigate a culture shift in thinking of the PD as “about the position” and not “about the yearly plans of the particular person.” The university will have to ensure that the individual goal setting that formerly took place when finalizing the PD must now take place as part of the annual performance evaluation.

Lawrence indicated that administrative assistants were initially briefed on the new system in August. He also has met with associate deans. A meeting next Thursday with unit administrators and Affirmative Action Coordinators from the colleges will provide training. He plans to get a communication out to all faculty by the end of September with instructions and information.

The Provost’s website will contain email and telephone contacts for support in completing the new PD. In addition, the university has a PeopleAdmin expert on campus whose primary role is to support PeopleAdmin. She is very effective.

Finally, Lawrence noted that if faculty have been hired at the university since PeopleAdmin has been in place, the system will have a significant amount of information about them. More senior faculty may need to supply additional information. However, he stressed that the PD portion of the process contains only nine boxes to complete – the four percentage boxes, four areas of responsibility boxes, and one 500 word summary box.

A faculty member asked whether Lawrence had considered creating a set of templates for different types of faculty? Lawrence responded that he had considered this. However, his office does not have the capacity to create templates for the many types of faculty at UI. He worried that if he created a template for some groups of faculty but not all groups of faculty, problems might arise. His office intends to provide several examples of appropriate new PDs.

A senator thanked Lawrence for his presentation and asked if he could further clarify his statement that the new PD will be focused on the position and not the individual. She also asked for clarification of the connection between the new PD and the faculty annual performance evaluation. Lawrence responded that he did not mean to imply that each faculty member’s PD would not be unique to the faculty member. Rather the new PD should be focused on the faculty member’s general responsibilities. He suggested that faculty might think about their PD as the framework for hiring a new faculty member should they leave the institution. It should not contain the specific faculty goals for the year, but should, instead, be more general. Regarding the connection to the annual evaluation, Lawrence noted that the revisions last year in the evaluation policy de-emphasized the connection between the PD and the annual evaluation. The faculty secretary added that the percentages of responsibilities on the PD would still inform the evaluation. However, the specific goal-setting for the coming year should be part of the past year’s evaluation.

A senator questioned the notion that the faculty member’s PD should be viewed as similar to the position announcement for her or his replacement. He stated that his position is unique to him and would not be filled by a new hire should he leave the university. Lawrence acknowledged that the analogy only goes so far. Still he
indicated that the PD should not contain specific annual work plan information. The senator pointed out that PDs will have to be individualized because portions are governed by grant obligations and other unique responsibilities. Another senator noted that many faculty would have very similar PDs and suggested that units have conversations to ensure that the PD of faculty with similar responsibilities are aligned.

A senator commented that in the past the evaluation was retrospective and the PD was prospective. He suggested that it will be important to provide training and guidance if the annual evaluation is, in the future, to be both retrospective and prospective. Lawrence agreed and indicated that he is planning such training and guidance for the unit administrators later in the semester.

Lawrence concluded by encouraging faculty to talk through issues and work together to make the new system successful.

With the senate having concluded its business for the meeting, a motion (Tibbals/Watson) to adjourn passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 4:48 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Liz Brandt, Faculty Secretary &
Secretary to the Faculty Senate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TUESDAY MEETING TIMES</th>
<th></th>
<th>WEDNESDAY MEETING TIMES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:30-5:00 conflicts</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>3:30-5:00 conflicts</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-4:30 conflicts</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>3:00-4:30 conflicts</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30-4:00 conflicts</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>2:30-4:00 conflicts</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Two changes:

1. The committee believes that it is vital that all faculty affairs committee members attend meetings, similar to UCC, UCGE, etc. It is nearly impossible to schedule meetings where all members can attend, and thus the committee proposes to have a fixed timeslot for the meeting. Putting it in policy ensures that when faculty select it as a committee preference they are fully aware of the set meeting time.

2.1. To open communication lines between the administration and faculty where policies directly impacting faculty are concerned, the Vice Provost for Faculty was added as an ex officio member of the committee, without vote.
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1640.42
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (FAC)

A. FUNCTION.

A-1. To conduct a continuing study of salaries, professional problems, welfare, retirement options and benefits (including 403b plans), and working conditions of faculty members.

A-2. To call the attention of the Faculty Senate or the president, as appropriate, to matters concerning faculty affairs in any college or other unit that the committee believes should be of concern. [ed. 7-09]

A-3. To serve as a point of first contact involving questions of interpretation and application of policies affecting the welfare of faculty members such as promotion and tenure. [rev. 7-17]

A-4. This committee traditionally meets on Fridays at 8:30 a.m.

B. STRUCTURE. Nine faculty members, not more than two of whom are departmental administrators (administrators above the departmental level are not eligible for membership on this committee). The Vice Provost for Faculty serves as an ex officio member of the committee without vote. [rev. 7-09]
Graduate Assistantships and Research Fellowships

Assistantships are open to domestic and international students who are regularly enrolled students in the College of Graduate Studies. Students in the provisional enrollment category, or in the unclassified enrollment category, or are not in good academic standing are NOT eligible to receive assistantships.

An inquiry for a position or award should be addressed to the administrator Director of Graduate Studies of the graduate program in which the applicant plans to enroll for graduate study. Appointments include a work requirement of up to 20 clock hours per week. All Graduate Assistants are considered students. Graduate Assistants who provide primary teaching responsibilities, grading assignments, assisting with the delivery of instruction through technology, and providing other assistance related to instruction under the active supervision of a member of the university faculty are teaching assistants. Graduate Assistants who provide support of research, scholarship, or creative activity are Graduate Research Assistants. Graduate Assistants who provide support functions to a unit and are related to the graduate students’ program of study are Graduate Support Assistants. (See FSH 1565 H-2 for full definitions.) Those appointed to graduate assistantships supported by the university are advised that the appointments are tenable only in the program of the major field of study, except where prior written exceptions are made. Annual leave, sick leave, and health insurance benefits are not available for graduate assistants.

Graduate Assistant appointments are awarded as either full-time (.5 FTE, 20 hours per week) or part-time (.25 FTE, 10 hours per week). All graduate assistants must be registered as full-time students. Full-time graduate assistants are allowed additional university employment for up to 10 hours per week. There is no restriction on part-time graduate assistants.

Continuation of any graduate assistantship after the first semester is contingent upon satisfactory academic performance, satisfactory teaching and/or laboratory performance, acceptable progress toward your the degree, and abiding by the program and University’s policies and procedures. UI policies and procedures are available online in the Faculty-Staff Handbook.

All Graduate Assistants are required to sign a Terms of Employment form and a Patent and Copyright Agreement for University of Idaho Employees. All assistants are required to have personal health insurance coverage or enrollment in the Student Health Insurance Program. Salaries-Stipends for graduate assistantships vary depending upon the type of assistantship, discipline of the graduate program, and length of graduate service, and whether they are for an academic year or for 12 months. Contact the director of graduate studies in the department for current salary-stipend levels.

All new teaching and/or research graduate assistants are required to attend the TA/RA Graduate Assistant Institute prior to the beginning of the semester in which they are first offered an assistantship. Dates and times are posted on at www.uidaho.edu/cogs. New TA/RA's are also required to complete a follow-up course through BbLearn the university on-line course.
delivery system. All new international TA's are required to register for and successfully complete INTR 508 (see University course schedule for times and location).

In addition, nonresident tuition will be waived for persons holding full appointments and a pro rata portion of nonresident tuition will be waived for persons holding partial appointments. However, Graduate tuition and fees (excluding special lab and course fees) will be paid for each full-time teaching and support graduate assistant. Teaching and support graduate assistants on half appointments will have 50% of their tuition and fees paid. The College of Graduate Studies pays the tuition and fees for teaching assistants; support assistants’ tuition and fees will be paid by the hiring unit. Research assistant tuition and fees may be paid by the hiring unit or through a grant/contract. 

Each person who holds a full appointment as an assistant is required to pay the uniform student fees and tuition charged to registered full-time students, regardless of the number of credits for which the student is registered. Persons accepting part-time assistantships will be required to pay the uniform student fees and tuition based on the number of credit hours for which the person is registered. Nonresident tuition will be waived by COGS for persons holding full graduate assistant appointments and 50% of the non-resident tuition will be waived for those on half-time appointments.

Students on an assistantship cannot use a staff or staff spouse fee waiver or senior scholar waiver.

Research fellowships are awarded by various colleges. Research conducted on fellowships may or may not be used for dissertation purposes. Credit enrollment and stipends vary according to the particular fellowship. Fees and tuition are charged, but in some cases may be remitted, depending on the type of fellowship and the availability of funds. Inquiries should be addressed to the program administrator in which the applicant plans to enroll.
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TEACHER EDUCATION

PREAMBLE: The preparation of teachers is of necessity a cooperative enterprise involving the College of Education and other UI colleges. This section discusses the primary policy concepts on which procedures are based. It appeared in the 1979 Handbook; in May, 1983, art education was added to the list (in section C) of those disciplines where there is a subject-matter advisor only. For further information, contact the College of Education (208-885-6772).

A. Majors. A student may prepare for a career in teaching in one of two ways: by completing the requirements for a bachelor's degree that is offered by the College of Education, or by completing the requirements for a bachelor's degree that is offered by one of the other colleges and taking the additional professional courses required for certification.

B. Teaching Fields. Requirements for both teaching major and teaching minor subject-matter fields are determined primarily by the appropriate subject-matter department in consultation with the College of Education and are printed in the catalog.

C. Advisers. Teacher-education students have two advisers: one from the subject-matter department and one from the College of Education. When students identify teacher education as their objective (this could be as early as the freshman year and certainly no later than admission to the Teacher Education Program) their advisers are designated. They plan and approve a program of studies with the student. As long as this approved program is followed, only the student's college adviser is required to sign the registration cards. Changes in the program require the signatures of both advisers. Exceptions to this rule are students majoring in agricultural education, art education, family and consumer sciences education, music education, and subject-matter areas in the College of Education, who have advisers in their subject-matter areas only.

D. Certification. The college in which the student is enrolled initiates the application for certification. The subject-matter adviser and the professional education adviser sign the necessary forms and forward them to the dean of the College of Education. The dean, in turn, works with the registrar to get the necessary supporting credentials and forwards the materials to the proper certification office. The College of Education keeps a record of all students recommended for certification. Recommendations concerning a student's competence are made by the departments in which the skills and concepts are taught.

E. Teacher Education Coordinating Committee. For the function and structure of this committee, see 1640.86.