Minutes for Faculty Affairs meeting at University of Idaho

Date: 8:30 am Friday October 26, 2018

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

A motion (McCollough/Brown) to approve the minutes of October 19th passed.

Dr. Traci Craig attended the meeting to share some of her experiences with Human Assurances that could inform the committee’s discussion about possible changes to policy on administrator evaluations (i.e., FSH 3320 C). In particular, Dr. Craig shared her thoughts about data-collection practices that could be used to give faculty confidence that their feedback is confidential (or anonymous).

- In the past, feedback has been solicited by the Provost office via email; and the process by which feedback was sent to the Provost was by a return email. It is processes like these (i.e., receiving email from the Provost, rather than a third party, and feedback associated with an email address) that have caused concern by some faculty and staff.
- When respondents are asked for such information as the name of their unit, their rank, or their gender it creates a situation where it would be easy to link respondents to responses - especially in small units.
- One way to increase credibility of the process would be to make the data collection part of a research study (e.g., asking some questions about university culture and climate). In this case the process would require IRB approval, and therefore, respondents could be more confident that the process was fair and confidential.
- Another idea would be to use Qualtrics, which would allow for confidentiality (e.g., setting the survey to not track the IP Address).

Other discussion about the topic resulted in the following comments:

- Given Idaho public record laws, ‘anonymous’ Is not feasible.
- Important that data from the survey go directly to the reviewed administrator – not to an administrator’s assistant, for example.
- Question: Without tracking IP address we could end up with multiple submissions by the same person.
- Use individual invite feature in Qualtrics. This would create two files – one from email to second link which would identify who responded and a second file that disconnects email from responses. IRB would often require people to delete the first file.
- Have invitation come from someone outside the Provost Office.
- Question: Should we use the IRB connection or not?
- If we added research questions and therefore required IRB approval then Dale Pietrzak would be the official PI.
- Institute directors are not currently evaluated. The new policy makes it clear that they should be evaluated.
- State Board policy states that every five years faculty must be evaluated. Eliminating the group evaluation of administrators takes much control from the hands of faculty because an administrator could just ignore the feedback. We may want to revisit this change.
- Next step: Meet from Sharon Stoll (IRB), Dale Pietrzak (Institutional Research).

Chair Ytreberg reminded the committee that discussions about policy regarding performance-based compensation increases would continue at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:33.

Respectfully Submitted,
Dan Eveleth