University of Idaho
2018-2019 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #9

3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, October 16, 2018
Paul Joyce Faculty-Staff Lounge & Zoom

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2018-19 Faculty Senate Meeting #8, October 2, 2018 (vote)

III. Consent Agenda.

IV. Chair’s Report.

V. Provost’s Report.

VI. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

VII. Committee Reports.

   Committee on Committees:
   • FC-19-008: FSH 1640.76 – Safety & Loss Committee (Grieb)(vote)
   Teaching & Advising Committee (Johnson)(FYI)
   University Curriculum Committee:
   • FC-19-006 (UCC-19-006) – FSH 4620 – Academic Calendar (Hubbard)(vote)
   Term/Tenure-track Taskforce (Eveleth)(FYI)

VIII. Other Announcements and Communications.
   • Communications (internal) (Senate Leadership)

IX. Special Orders.

X. New Business.

XI. Adjournment.

Professor Aaron Johnson, Chair 2018-2019, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2018-2019 FS Meeting #8
               FC-19-008
               FC-19-006
               2017-18 Minute Excerpts
               Communications
Call to Order and Minutes. The chair called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

A motion to approve the minutes (Morgan/Seamon) passed unanimously.

Chair’s Report:

- The Board of Regents announced the members of the Presidential Screening Committee in a press release on Monday, October 1, 2018.
- Ben Bridges is a new senator representing staff. He replaces Brian Mahoney who resigned earlier in the fall. Penny Tenuto is sitting in for John Cannon who was unable to attend.
- The Vandal Ideas Project, a competitive university-wide grant program to stimulate bold new ideas to support our strategic plan goals, launched its latest proposal process last week. This year’s focus is on the “transform” goal in our strategic plan. A PowerPoint presentation from the launch is available on the VIP website. In addition, there will be a VIP brown bag event regarding the process on October 25 at 12:30-2 p.m. in the Vandal Ballroom. The process is open to all faculty, staff and students and collaboration is encouraged.
- A VandalStar orientation video is now available on the VandalStar resource website. The resource website also has a recorded session from an open forum with Vice Provost Dean Kahler and Lead Advisor Shishona Turner. Also, a quick snapshot of a searchable Faculty/Staff Guide is posted on the website.
- Faculty are encouraged to participate in the Argonaut Readership Survey - The newspaper is collecting feedback to better serve the UI community. The survey takes less than five minutes to complete.
- The Fall Career Fair is Wednesday, October 3, from 2:00--6:00 pm in the Kibbie Dome. Faculty are encouraged to drop by and show support for the vendors attending the fair and encouragement to students participating in the fair.
- Applications for Equipment and Infrastructure Support Awards are due on October 10.
- The Fire Ecology and Management Program at UI is celebrating its 40th birthday during the week of October 8-12. The program is one of the oldest in the country. The College of Natural Resources (CNR) began offering the first fire science courses in 1978, and in 2008 began a full Bachelor of Science program in fire ecology and management, the first of its kind in the nation. Hundreds of fire researchers and managers who are now leaders in industry, universities, government and nonprofit organizations across the country are alumni of the program. The program is sponsoring two events that are free and open to the public:
  o Conversations through the Smoke. Come see art from the people who fight, study and are affected by fires. Ridenbaugh Art Gallery, University of Idaho campus. Facebook: @ConvosThruSmoke October 8-12, with reception 5-7 pm October.
  o G-Wiz, the fire wizard presents Combustion Chemistry. October 9, 3:30-4:30 p.m. Shattuck Arboretum Amphitheater.
A senator asked for clarification of whether the Presidential Screening Committee announced by the Regents was different from a search committee. The chair and the provost responded that the responsibility for the search process lies with the Regents. The committee that has been appointed has yet to meet and receive instructions, but it is likely akin to what most faculty and staff would think of as the search committee. In the past, the committee’s responsibility has been to screen the candidates for our presidency and to recommend a final list of candidates to the Regents.

**Provost Report:** The provost noted that a candlelight ceremony was held over the weekend to honor Katherine Grogget, a current UI student and president of the Tri-Delta sorority, who recently died in a car accident near Lewiston. Katherine’s parents were able to participate in the vigil. The provost also expressed thanks to the UI community for its support of the Tri-Delta as the sorority, in particular, mourns Katherine’s death.

The Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Committee (IPEC) recently met for the first time this fall. The committee is initially focused on Program Prioritization (PP). Program prioritization was based on three elements – impact and essentiality to the UI’s mission, contribution to the UI’s strategic plan, and institutional investment. Last spring IPEC charged a sub-committee – Re-Engaging another Program Prioritization (REAPP) – to study the second criteria regarding contribution to the strategic plan. Dean Ali Carr-Chellman, the chair of REAPP, provided an overview of the sub-committee’s work. REAPP agreed with the suggestion of IPEC that contribution to the university strategic plan should be evaluated using college and unit cascaded plans. REAPP has proposed that college cascaded plans be evaluated by a small, but representative group using a rubric proposed by the sub-committee. This process would replace the institution-wide polling process used previously. REAPP also made recommendations to IPEC regarding how to assess centrality to mission. IPEC is evaluating the REAPP recommendations along with other proposals in light of the requirements of the State Board of Education (SBOE).

The provost reminded senators of the requirements of SBOE Governing Policy V.B.11. The policy requires that PP focus on mission, core themes and strategic plans. He pointed out that the term “core themes” is a reference to the continuous improvement portions of the university’s accreditation process. UI’s strategic plan directly reflects our core themes. The requirements of the board process fit well with our internal institutional planning processes. He reminded senators that an early version of PP did not focus on the strategic plan. As a result IPEC received significant negative feedback. The process was modified with a focus on the strategic plan. The resulting process was less than a perfect measurement and IPEC is now working to improve the process. Referring to the SBOE policy, the provost next pointed out that the board expects our PP process to be linked to our budgeting and program review process. IPEC is exploring whether the university should look to our required program review process as part of PP. Such a linkage might eliminate duplicative processes. Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives Cher Hendricks will be meeting with IPEC to discuss such a link. Finally, the Board policy requires annual reports regarding the university’s process. The provost does not believe this last requirement means that the university must run the PP process every year. However, we must be in a position to give a meaningful progress report regarding our PP process each year. The provost indicated that he will be providing regular updates to senate as the PP revision process moves forward.

The provost has been meeting with the deans of colleges that have undergraduate programs to discuss the institutional activities related to advising and recruiting. The deans have emphasized that in their opinions, advising should be a second priority behind recruiting additional students. They have emphasized that the university should work to excel at both advising and enrollment. The provost and deans discussed several ideas developed by Vice Provost for Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM)
Dean Kahler that will allow colleges to have a more active role in the strategic planning process for enrollment growth. He likened some of the ideas to the concept of the “flipped classroom.” Pursuant to which the college would play a leadership role in the planning process. The provost also presented data to deans regarding the number and structure of staff involved in the recruitment process. As senators have pointed out, our structure may have too many “middle managers”. He and the deans will be looking at this issue to ensure that our resources are deployed most effectively. He also will be working to ensure that the colleges address needs.

**Senate meeting time.** Following up on prior discussions in senate, the chair provided detailed information regarding the class conflicts that would arise if the senate meeting time and/or date were changed to better accommodate southern Idaho faculty and staff who must stay late to attend senate meetings because of the time zone difference. Unfortunately, the information gathered indicated that moving the time of the meeting earlier in the day or changing the day of the week on which senate meets, would drastically increase the number of class conflicts. This means significantly fewer faculty would be available to serve as senators. A senator suggested that the increased conflicts may reflect the efforts of current senators to avoid conflicts with senate. The chair responded that this was not likely given the number of additional conflicts created by a time change. The 2:00-3:30 time slot on Tuesdays and Thursdays is a very popular class time.

**FS-19-007 – FSH 1640.42 Faculty Affairs.** Prof. Terry Grieb, Chair of the Committee on Committees (ConC) presented a proposal to change the structure of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) by adding the Vice Provost for Faculty as an *ex officio* member without vote. Grieb explained that FAC had originally also recommended creating a pre-set meeting time for FAC. ConC rejected that proposal out of concern that some faculty might be excluded from serving because of conflicts with the pre-set time. ConC did not think FAC was a large enough committee to make such an approach necessary. The ConC proposal to change the structure of the committee passed unanimously.

**Graduate Council Report.** Dean of the College of Graduate Studies (COGS) Jerry McMurtry presented the report. Graduate Council is proposing changes in the catalogue regarding the responsibilities of teaching assistants (TAs) and research assistants (RAs). The changes also implement the new graduate position approved as part of the restructured TA compensation system – graduate support assistants (GSAs). The proposed changes required TAs, RAs and GSAs to be in good academic standing. The proposal also limits the extra hours of work that TAs, RAs and GSAs can perform in on campus positions beyond their assistantships to 10 hours. UI records indicated that in the past some assistants had exceeded 40 hours of work per week in addition to their course responsibilities and assistantship responsibilities. Nationally, schools varied between allowing no extra on campus work hours up to 20 extra on campus work hours. The proposal requires that assistants be full time students and defines full time as nine credit hours.

A senator pointed out that the proposal uses the incorrect terminology for the intellectual property agreement required of employees pursuant to FSH 5400. He also questioned how graduate students could be both full time students (which he equated to 40 hours of work/week) and still work 20 hours per week as assistants. McMurtry responded that because assistant appointments are exempt positions and do not equate easily to 40 hours/week. He indicated in the past the lack of coordination in our assistantship programs made tracking work hours difficult. Under the restructured program such tracking will be possible. The senator suggested that Graduate Council consider whether the expectation of a 60 hour work expectation is excessive. Another senator questioned whether it was appropriate to equate full time student status to a 40 hour work week.
The Faculty Secretary reported on issues raised by a faculty member questioning the requirement that TAs be in good academic standing. At the beginning of graduate school some students struggle with the sophisticated level of the course work and can be placed on probation for a semester. McMurtry responded that Graduate Council discussed this and concluded that a student who is on probation should concentrate on classes. Graduate students only have one semester to improve their academic standing and get off probation. Another senator followed up pointing out that the new approach might cause faculty members to relax their grading standards to keep students above the minimum. Another senator asked for clarification on who flags the student’s situation adding that disqualifying a person from serving as a TA at the last minute might be very disruptive to departments. McMurtry responded that COGS will be able to track TA academic performance and alert departments when a TA is disqualified. He stated that Graduate Council understood that such disqualifications might cause disruptions. McMurtry also indicated that a department or student could petition for an exception to the rule. A senator asked for clarification of the academic requirements for graduate students. McMurtry responded that graduate students must maintain an overall grade point average of 3.0, or better. The chair commented that the proposed policy would send a clear message regarding the priority of course work to graduate students.

**FS-19-005 – FSH 4300 -- Teacher Education.** The faculty secretary presented this proposal for Professor Taylor Raney, Chair of the Teacher Education Coordinating Committee and Director of Teacher Certification in the College of Education Health and Human Services (CEHHS). The proposal is to eliminate FSH 4300 in its entirety. This policy is out of date and is descriptive in nature. It was probably included in the *Faculty-Staff Handbook* at a time when the handbook contained many informational items. With the growth of the internet the handbook no longer serves as much of an informational role. A motion (Foster/Jeffrey) to eliminate the policy passed unanimously.

The business of the meeting having been completed, a motion (Foster/Dezzani) to adjourn passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 4:14 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Liz Brandt, Faculty Secretary &
Secretary to the Faculty Senate
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.

During the last USLCC meeting of 2017-18 on April 18, 2017 the committee voted to have the Risk Manager as a permanent voting member. The proposed change will remove “the Executive Director of Public Safety” from FSH 1640.76 section B. STRUCTURE and replace the wording with “Risk Management.” Note, the position of Executive Director of Public Safety no longer exists. The proposed update does not change the overall structure of the USLCC, but brings the committee in line with current university administrative structure.

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

No fiscal impact is expected to result from this revision. Risk Management already has a member who regularly attends meetings of the Safety and Loss-Control Committee.

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

A similar change in FSH 1640.76 was enacted in 2018. On November 17, 2018 the SLCC approved a resolution to seek a change to the SLCC's membership. The change added four new voting members, to represent Information Technology Services, University Support Services, the University Library, and the Office of Research and Economic Development. The current requested change to add Risk Management as a voting member is similar in nature, as the change enhances participation by stakeholders in our culture of safety.

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: ____________________________
SAFETY AND LOSS-CONTROL COMMITTEE
[created 7-00, replacing previous Safety Committee]

A. FUNCTION. The responsibilities and purposes of the committee are as follows: a. to promote policies and programs that will provide a safe and healthy working and living environment for university students, employees, and members of the public, and that will protect public property from injury or damage; b. to promote the principles and associated benefits of an effective Safety and Loss-Control Policy; c. to endorse and systematically promote university employee safety training; d. to encourage the campus community to identify, correct, and report potential hazards and/or unsafe work practices; e. to monitor and review University of Idaho accident and loss summarized reports and statistics; and; f. to report annually to Faculty Senate and the President's Executive Council on campus-wide safety initiatives and program development. [ed. 7-09]

B. STRUCTURE. The committee is composed of 21 voting members and 3 ex-officio (non-voting) members, as follows:
- One faculty member from each college;
- A member from Information Technology Services, University Support Services, University Library, Office of Research and Economic Development;
- Director of University Residences or designee;
- Director of Student Health Services or designee;
- Assistant VP of Facilities, or designee;
- Senior Human Resources executive, or designee;
- A Staff Council representative;
- One undergraduate student;
- One graduate student;
- Executive Director of Public Safety Risk Manager, or designee;
- The three ex-officio non-voting members include the Commander, Moscow Police Department, campus subdivision; Occupational Safety Specialist; the Director, Environmental Health & Safety. [rev. 7-18]

The Safety and Loss-Control Committee is governed by a chair and vice-chair, with the vice-chair assuming responsibilities of the chair after one-year rotation. The committee elects its own chair and vice-chair from among the voting members. Committee members representing colleges are appointed by the university's Committee on Committees and serve a three-year period. The faculty representatives are ex officio members of their college unit safety committees. Student members of the committee will serve terms as recommended by the ASUI and GPSA. [rev. 7-05, 7-06, 7-08, ed. 6-09, 10-13, 7-18]
Request to Teaching and Advising Committee
TeAC should examine the timeliness of grade reporting and of appropriate feedback on student progress within undergraduate courses. TeAC should propose approaches and/or policy changes needed to address issues that emerge. The process should begin by gathering data to determine the scope and nature of the problems regarding timely reporting of grades and performance feedback.

Background
The issue of timely reporting of grades has been around since 2015 (see ASUI Resolution). The students want some mechanism to understand how they are going in a class. This request falls in line with effective teaching efforts of providing feedback to students as a check of how well they really understand material (versus left to personal perceptions which have been proven to be not as accurate). In summary, the request is not only logical from the students’ perspective, but it also supports the learning process.

The issue of timely reporting has different facets. One is the frequency of assessments (tests, quizzes, homework, etc.). The question of frequency is considered for now outside the scope of this charge. However, it is left to the committee to make that determination. Another facet is the timely response by faculty/instructors to student work. That is the heart of this issue and is the intended focus of this work as Faculty Senate is concerned.

Over the years, the request and concern of students has been discussed and circulated around in different forms and places. The intent here is to address the concern/question with objective analysis, which will hopefully include quantifying the problem.
November 17, 2017

To Whom It May Concern:

Included is a resolution passed by the Senate of the Associated Students of the University of Idaho to reaffirm its support for a stronger use of Blackboard Learn.

ASUI representatives consistently hear from students that they would like more of their professors to use BBLearn. This tool can foster a stronger dialogue between students and their professors as well as enhance student performance in the classroom. Additionally, the success of VandalStar largely depends on the use of BBLearn. If faculty do not use this tool, then it is much more difficult to track student success and to help students who may be struggling.

The ASUI Senate believes that a greater use of BBLearn will increase student success and enhance the overall student experience here at the University of Idaho. We emphasized that two years ago by passing a similar resolution and communicating the importance of this issue to Faculty Senate. We, as representatives of the student body of the University of Idaho, call on UI leadership to encourage faculty to improve their use of BlackboardLearn.

Sincerely,

Catherine Yenne
Vice President, ASUI

On Behalf of: The Associated Students University of Idaho Senate
IN THE SENATE
SENATE RESOLUTION NO. F17-R06

BY ASUI PRESIDENT MCKENZIE MACDONALD & FACULTY SENATE REPRESENTATIVE
JESSE WATSON
SPONSORED BY SENATOR ZACHARY SPENCE

A RESOLUTION

1
2
3
4
5

WHEREAS, during the 2015-2016 academic year ASUI expressed to Faculty Senate the
6 widespread student support for better and more consistent utilization of Blackboard Learn by faculty;
7
8 WHEREAS, ASUI presented its request to Faculty Senate twice. It was referred to a committee,
9 and, to our knowledge, no further action has been taken;
10
11 WHEREAS, as of October 19, 2015, an ASUI poll found that 94% of University of Idaho student
12 respondents would find it useful for more classes to post grades on Blackboard Learn;
13
14 WHEREAS, more consistent use of Blackboard Learn is one of the issues about which ASUI
15 representatives receive the most student input;
16
17 WHEREAS, Blackboard Learn serves as one of the most useful digital tools for professors and
18 students to interact at the University of Idaho;
19
20 WHEREAS, University of Idaho has chosen to implement VandalStar, a Starfish software
21 package, which requires the use of Blackboard Learn for optimal functionality and student benefit;
22
23 WHEREAS, a Blackboard account is automatically created for every course, although not all
24 professors choose to activate that account;
25
26 WHEREAS, the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning provides one-on-one trainings
27 with professors to help build Blackboard programs;
28
29 WHEREAS, the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning provides a line open 8 a.m. to 6
30 p.m. Monday through Friday to assist professors who may be experiencing technological issues or
31 need help with Blackboard;
32
33 WHEREAS, updated grading information would allow students and faculty to participate in a
34 more informed discussion about the students’ performance in a class;
35
36 THEREFORE, Be it Resolved that the Senate of the Associated Students of the University of
37 Idaho again calls upon the University of Idaho professors to increase their utilization of Blackboard
38 Learn.
39
40 COPIES OF THIS RESOLUTION SHALL BE SENT TO
ACADEMIC CALENDARS

PREAMBLE: This section outlines the basic structure of the academic year and includes planning calendars for fall semester, spring semester, summer session, and the intersession. The material assembled here all appeared in the 1979 Handbook. Subsection A was modified in February of 1991 by the removal of a requirement that the regents approve all annual calendars. Subsection B has been updated from time to time to keep the calendars presented there useful while subsection C was revised in 1984 and again in 1989 to reflect the changing demands of summer scheduling. Subsection D, which reflects and makes explicit long-standing practice, was added in 2001. For further information, contact the Registrar’s Office (208-885-6731). [ed. 7-97, 7-01]

CONTENTS:
A. Academic Calendar
B. Planning Calendars
C. Summer Scheduling Plan
D. Intersession Scheduling Plan

A. ACADEMIC CALENDAR. Each academic year includes two 16-week semesters, a summer session between Spring and Fall Semesters, an intersession between Fall and Spring semesters, and short courses that fall within one of these standard sessions. The Fall semester ends shortly before Christmas; the Fall and Spring semesters together must include at least 160 instructional days, including the final-examination period. Changes in the established pattern for the academic calendar require approval by the Faculty Senate and the university faculty. [ed. 7-01, 7-09]

B. PLANNING CALENDARS. For planning purposes, the pattern of the academic calendar in effect for 2003-04 has been projected through the year 2012-13 as shown on the following page. In each year there are 79 instructional days in the fall semester and 81 in the spring. [ed. 7-98, 7-02, 7-04]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer Session Begins</td>
<td>May 19</td>
<td>May 18</td>
<td>May 16</td>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>May 14</td>
<td>May 13</td>
<td>May 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Day</td>
<td>May 26</td>
<td>May 25</td>
<td>May 30</td>
<td>May 29</td>
<td>May 28</td>
<td>May 27</td>
<td>May 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Day</td>
<td>July 4</td>
<td>July 3</td>
<td>July 4</td>
<td>July 4</td>
<td>July 4</td>
<td>July 4</td>
<td>July 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor Day</td>
<td>Sept 1</td>
<td>Sept 7</td>
<td>Sept 5</td>
<td>Sept 4</td>
<td>Sept 3</td>
<td>Sept 2</td>
<td>Sept 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement</td>
<td>Dec 13</td>
<td>Dec 12</td>
<td>Dec 10</td>
<td>Dec 9</td>
<td>Dec 8</td>
<td>Dec 7</td>
<td>Dec 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Grades Due, 12:00 PM</td>
<td>Dec 16</td>
<td>Dec 21</td>
<td>Dec 13</td>
<td>Dec 19</td>
<td>Dec 18</td>
<td>Dec 17-24</td>
<td>Dec 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes Begin</td>
<td>Dec 20</td>
<td>Dec 19</td>
<td>Dec 17</td>
<td>Dec 16</td>
<td>Dec 15</td>
<td>Dec 14</td>
<td>Dec 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close of Session</td>
<td>Jan 13</td>
<td>Jan 12</td>
<td>Jan 10</td>
<td>Jan 9</td>
<td>Jan 8</td>
<td>Jan 7</td>
<td>Jan 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes Begin</td>
<td>Jan 14</td>
<td>Jan 13</td>
<td>Jan 11</td>
<td>Jan 10</td>
<td>Jan 9</td>
<td>Jan 15</td>
<td>Jan 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Luther King Jr. Day</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>Jan 18</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Jan 15</td>
<td>Jan 14</td>
<td>Jan 18</td>
<td>Jan 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Day</td>
<td>Feb 16</td>
<td>Feb 15</td>
<td>Feb 20</td>
<td>Feb 19</td>
<td>Feb 18</td>
<td>Feb 17</td>
<td>Feb 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finals</td>
<td>May 11-15</td>
<td>May 9-13</td>
<td>May 8-12</td>
<td>May 7-11</td>
<td>May 6-10</td>
<td>May 11-15</td>
<td>May 10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement</td>
<td>May 16</td>
<td>May 14</td>
<td>May 13</td>
<td>May 12</td>
<td>May 11</td>
<td>May 16</td>
<td>May 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Grades Due, 12:00 PM</td>
<td>May 19</td>
<td>May 17</td>
<td>May 16</td>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>May 14</td>
<td>May 19</td>
<td>May 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Session</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Session Begins</td>
<td>May 17</td>
<td>May 16</td>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>May 13</td>
<td>May 12</td>
<td>May 11</td>
<td>May 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Day</td>
<td>May 31</td>
<td>May 30</td>
<td>May 29</td>
<td>May 27</td>
<td>May 26</td>
<td>May 25</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Day</td>
<td>July 5 (observed)</td>
<td>July 4</td>
<td>July 4</td>
<td>July 4</td>
<td>July 4</td>
<td>July 3 (observed)</td>
<td>July 5 (observed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Session Ends</td>
<td>Aug 6</td>
<td>Aug 5</td>
<td>Aug 4</td>
<td>Aug 2</td>
<td>Aug 1</td>
<td>July 31</td>
<td>Aug 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Grades Due, 12:00 PM</td>
<td>Aug 10</td>
<td>Aug 9</td>
<td>Aug 8</td>
<td>Aug 6</td>
<td>Aug 5</td>
<td>Aug 4</td>
<td>Aug 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor Day</td>
<td>Sept 6</td>
<td>Sept 5</td>
<td>Sept 4</td>
<td>Sept 2</td>
<td>Sept 1</td>
<td>Sept 7</td>
<td>Sept 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finals</td>
<td>Dec 13-17</td>
<td>Dec 12-16</td>
<td>Dec 11-15</td>
<td>Dec 9-13</td>
<td>Dec 8-12</td>
<td>Dec 7-14 Dec 13-17</td>
<td>Dec 11-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement</td>
<td>Dec 11</td>
<td>Dec 10</td>
<td>Dec 9</td>
<td>Dec 7</td>
<td>Dec 6</td>
<td>Dec 5</td>
<td>Dec 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Grades Due, 12:00 PM</td>
<td>Dec 21</td>
<td>Dec 20</td>
<td>Dec 19</td>
<td>Dec 17</td>
<td>Dec 16</td>
<td>Dec 15-22</td>
<td>Dec 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes Begin</td>
<td>Dec 18</td>
<td>Dec 17</td>
<td>Dec 16</td>
<td>Dec 14</td>
<td>Dec 13</td>
<td>Dec 12-19</td>
<td>Dec 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close of Session</td>
<td>Jan 11</td>
<td>Jan 10</td>
<td>Jan 9</td>
<td>Jan 7</td>
<td>Jan 6</td>
<td>Jan 5</td>
<td>Jan 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes Begin</td>
<td>Jan 12</td>
<td>Jan 11</td>
<td>Jan 10</td>
<td>Jan 8</td>
<td>Jan 7</td>
<td>Jan 6</td>
<td>Jan 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Luther King Jr. Day</td>
<td>Jan 17</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Jan 15</td>
<td>Jan 20</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>Jan 18</td>
<td>Jan 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Day</td>
<td>Feb 21</td>
<td>Feb 20</td>
<td>Feb 19</td>
<td>Feb 17</td>
<td>Feb 16</td>
<td>Feb 15</td>
<td>Feb 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finals</td>
<td>May 9-13</td>
<td>May 8-12</td>
<td>May 6-10</td>
<td>May 5-9</td>
<td>May 4-8</td>
<td>May 10-14</td>
<td>May 8-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement</td>
<td>May 14</td>
<td>May 13</td>
<td>May 11</td>
<td>May 10</td>
<td>May 9</td>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>May 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Grades Due, 12:00 PM</td>
<td>May 17</td>
<td>May 16</td>
<td>May 14</td>
<td>May 13</td>
<td>May 12</td>
<td>May 18</td>
<td>May 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RATIONALE for UCC-19-006, changes to the Academic Calendar:

The 2019-2020 Academic Year as currently scheduled includes a four week break between the fall and spring semesters. The break between semesters is typically three weeks so this extends the academic year from the usual 37.5 weeks to 38.5 weeks. While not imposing additional responsibilities (number of “working” weeks remains the same), this results in 20 biweekly payrolls rather than 19.5. This will require the “spreading” of pay for all academic year contracts (faculty and staff) over 20 biweekly payrolls rather than the usual 19.5 (1600 hours rather than 1560). This extra week in the academic year would result in a 2.5% decrease in each biweekly pay, without considering the impact of salary increases for FY20. This differential will be recovered in the last payroll of the year (June 2020), but will be felt all year.

In considering a number of different options we felt changing the academic calendar to delay the start of the fall semester by a week would impact the fewest number of faculty and staff.
Market Compensation discussion related to “non-tenure track faculty”.

University of Idaho
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
2017-2018 Meeting #19, Tuesday, February 20, 2018
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Faculty Compensation Taskforce Report: Chair Hrdlicka, who also co-chairs the taskforce, gave the report. He summarized the activities and recommendations of the taskforce, and the administrative implementation of the new market-based compensation process for the recent mid-year salary adjustments. He pointed out that the adjustments had resulted in a distribution of ~$700k, bringing UI faculty closer to market levels (from 89.6% to 90.8% of market).

Hrdlicka stated that the taskforce has received input that the starting target salary for full professor of 83% of market is too low and that 17 years in rank is too long to reach 100% of market. He explained that the longevity schedule was informed by data. The longevity range for full professors at the University of Idaho is from 0 to more than 35 years. On average, full professors have been in this rank for ~16 years. The approach implemented means that the target salary of full professors who meet expectations, will be 100% of market halfway through their time in rank, based purely on longevity factors. Hrdlicka indicated that he had advocated for the range for full professors to start slightly higher and reach 100% of market rate slightly faster, but this recommendation was not implemented.

Hrdlicka next stated that the taskforce had received several comments regarding the market rate definition for non-tenure track faculty such as instructors, senior instructors, clinical faculty and research faculty. A significant impediment to market rate determination for these faculty is that there is an insufficient number (or even lack of) data points for these ranks in the CUPA-HR and Oklahoma State databases, from which national market data are obtained.

As a stop-gap measure, to enable these faculty members to be considered for mid-year salary increases, the decision was made to define market rates for these ranks as follows: instructors - 65% of the market rate for an associate professor in the corresponding discipline (CIP); senior instructors - 70% of the market rate for an associate professor in the corresponding discipline (CIP); and clinical and research professors - 85% of the market rate for the corresponding tenure-track faculty member in the discipline (CIP). These selections are data-informed and based on current UI practices. Hrdlicka acknowledged that there is concern that these one-size fit all market rate definitions are not sufficiently nuanced and, in some cases, de-motivating. However, he pointed out that the choice confronting the university at the time was to make a data-informed decision, or to exclude non-tenure track faculty from the mid-year salary adjustment process. He also explained that another aspect of the difficulty confronting the taskforce was that the university’s standards for clinical and research faculty are ambiguous and faculty in these ranks have a wide range of responsibilities. The suggestion has been made to give discretion to chairs and deans to define where on the spectrum of responsibilities individual non-tenure track faculty fall. The compensation taskforce has added non-tenure track faculty and is in the process of addressing these issues of non-tenure track faculty. Finally, Vice Chair Anderson pointed out that Faculty Senate, Faculty Affairs Committee, and the Provost Office are convening a taskforce to review university policies and definitions for non-tenure track faculty.
Term/Tenure-Track Task Force (formerly Non-Tenure Track Faculty Task Force)
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Non-Tenure Track Faculty Task Force. Chair Hrdlicka reported that senate leadership, together with the Faculty Affairs Committee, and the Provost’s Office, is creating a joint task force to look at a number of issues affecting non-tenure track faculty. The taskforce will be chaired by Prof. Dan Eveleth of the College of Business and Economics. The description of the taskforce’s responsibilities is as follows:

The desired outcomes of the task force’s work are to help the university community:

• Develop a shared understanding of (and commitment to) the roles and expectations of non-tenure track faculty.
• Increase fairness and consistency with respect to practices associated with recruiting, selecting, developing, rewarding, including, and managing non-tenure track faculty.

To achieve these goals the task force is charged with:

• Identifying the current, potentially disparate, beliefs about the roles and expectations of non-tenure-track faculty across the university.
• Developing a comprehensive understanding of the issues and concerns associated with the current state of affairs.
• Identifying sentiment about a future, aspirational state of affairs, and coalescing around a single view of the future that honors the identified sentiment.
• Making policy and practice-related recommendations to Faculty Affairs, Faculty Senate Leadership and the Provost that are designed to achieve the desired outcomes.

The chair explained that the taskforce was formed because of the need to have broader representation across colleges and to include non-tenure track faculty that was not possible on the Faculty Affairs Committee. In addition, he noted the broad scope of the assignment and thanked Dan Eveleth for taking on this challenging, but important topic. He solicited recommendations for taskforce members from senators.
Communications – internal

At the Senate Retreat and responses from the Great Colleges to Work for Survey “communications” was a top issue identified by many at the University. This concern is one shared across staff, faculty and administration. In fact, last year the Faculty Secretary created the “Talking Points” to provide brief notes about items discussed at senate meetings. The goal was twofold:

1) Assist senators with their role in communicating Senate discussions to their constituents and to the broader community.
2) Improve communications university-wide (on and off campus).

The current Senate Leadership would like to consider how we communicate internally in hopes of identify what is going well and what needs to be changed. To begin that effort, we want to start a dialogue on “Communications at the University” beginning with internal communications, and the Talking Points are a good starting point. Please reflect on the items listed below to ensure a productive discussion at the next Senate meeting.

1) How are senators using Talking Points to communicate Senate discussions?
2) Are they helpful?
3) Have you experienced any barriers with respect to:
   a) Time constraints or support?
   b) Distribution issues (email lists or college, group, and/or university level communication constraints)?
   c) Other?
4) What can Senate Leadership do to help you?
5) Is this the best tool for communication? Do you have other ideas?
6) What other communications need to happen?
7) Any other ideas or suggestions?