Minutes for Faculty Affairs meeting at University of Idaho
Date: 8:30 am Friday November 3, 2018

Present: Brandt (ex officio w/o vote), Brown, Eveleth, Ibrahim, Isenbarger, Lawrence (ex officio w/o vote), McColough, Powell, Shrestha, Thompson (ex officio w/o vote), Ytreberg. Absent: Freeman

A motion (Isenbarger/Ibrahim) to approve the minutes of October 26th passed unanimously.

Chair Ytreberg discussed the proposed change to FSH 3320 (i.e., Section C. Administrator Evaluation) that we approved last spring. Because we are now planning to discuss another possible change to FSH 3320 the senate leadership agreed to hold the initial proposal (which passed Senate in August) until we either come forward with a substitution motion or decide not to do so.

We spent the remaining time discussing a set of ‘principles’ that could guide future drafting of policy around performance compensation increases. We discussed the following three principles:

1. Performance increases should be based on the faculty members’ performance of responsibilities in the faculty member’s position description. Excellence in any category of responsibility can be the basis for a performance increase.

With respect to this first principle, there was a motion (Isenbarger/McColough) to limit performance increases to only those who meet expectations in all areas of responsibility listed on their position description. 6 – 2 (approved).

2. If the dean or provost limit performance increases to a specific number, the relative size of units within a college shall be considered in setting the number of increases for each unit.

We noted that unit size should be considered in setting the number of ‘nominations’ from each unit in a college.

3. To be eligible for a performance increase each faculty members published CV shall be up to date as of the time of annual evaluation and shall be publically available on the faculty member’s University of Idaho faculty profile

We discussed the value of requiring a faculty member to publish a current CV as a condition of getting an award. While it would not be possible to know why any specific faculty member received a performance increase, having access to each faculty member’s CV would allow for a certain amount of transparency about the decision process. Two potential challenges were noted: 1. The task of keeping a publically available CV current can be challenging, given in many units the responsibility for the CV lies with the faculty member, while the responsibility for posting items on a website, for example, would be the responsibility of a different person; and it is positions such as these that often go unsupported or unfilled. 2. It is possible that a CV would be considered ‘personnel information’ and therefore, should not be made publically available without written permission from each faculty member. Torrey Lawrence planned to follow-up on those question and report back to the committee.

The group also noted that we may want to re-order the guiding principles into a logical order.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:34.

Respectfully Submitted,
Dan Eveleth