REGULAR MEETING OF THE
FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO

Tuesday, August 27, 2002
3:30 p.m., Janssen Engineering Building – Room 104
President Hoover presiding

• Call to Order.

• In Memoriam.

• Minutes. Meeting of May 8, 2002

• Announcements.

• Special Orders.
  Introduction of New Faculty Members
  Each college dean and the provost will introduce new members of the resident faculty by name
  and department.
  Information about these new faculty members will be distributed at the door.

• President’s Remarks

• Adjournment.

Peter A. Haggart
Secretary of the Faculty
http://www.its.uidaho.edu/facultycouncil
(885-6151)

117 faculty members constitute a quorum
Those who are recognized by the president for the purpose of speaking should identify themselves by name and discipline or position.
Call to Order. University of Idaho President, Robert Hoover, called to order the spring meeting of the university faculty at 3:35 p.m. in the Agricultural Sciences Auditorium. The 130 faculty members in attendance surpassed the quorum requirements (117) and thus, provided the opportunity for faculty discussion and vote on each article of business.

In Memoriam. Hoover asked the faculty for a moment of silence following the reading of the names of faculty members who had died since the last general faculty meeting. Those faculty members remembered were:

- Theodore C. Bjornn, Professor of Fish Resources and Research Scientist
- R. Bruce Bray, Professor of Music and Secretary of the Faculty Emeritus
- Elmer Canfield, Professor Emeritus of Forest Resources
- Mark L. Freer, Professor Emeritus of Education
- Eric B. Kirkland, Professor Emeritus of Physical Education
- Blaine Linford, Extension Professor Emeritus
- Allison R. Manson, Professor of Statistics and Director, Division of Statistics
- Ralph J. Moss, Jr., Extension Professor Emeritus
- Ronald W. Stark, Professor of Entomology and Dean Emeritus
- Esther Wilson, Extension Professor Emerita of Foods and Nutrition
- Mary V. Zaehringer, Professor Emerita of Home Economics Research

Minutes. The minutes of the general faculty meeting held on August 28, 2001, were approved as written and distributed by the Secretary of the Faculty.

Announcements. The new chair and vice chair of the Faculty Council for the 2002-2003 academic year were introduced. Professor Thomas Bitterwolf is the new chair and Professor Francis Wagner is the new vice chair.

President’s Remarks. U of Idaho President Hoover gave his remarks on the state of the university earlier than usual on the agenda. He needed to catch a plane to attend an important budget meeting in Idaho Falls.

Hoover reviewed the budget problems facing the state of Idaho and thus, the University of Idaho. Tax collections continue to be less than forecast. April revenues were 20% less than expected. All of this means continued budget restraints for the university.

The governor has asked that all new hiring be suspended and out-of-state travel be stopped for the remainder of the fiscal year. He also indicated that he would like the state to “sweep up” any unexpended funds and that no state appropriated general funds be carried forward into the next fiscal year. The University of Idaho staff and the governor’s staff have been meeting on these budget issues.

Hoover said that the U of Idaho is already preparing to build a new FY03 base budget reduced by another 5 to 10 percent. He emphasized that all university departments must use caution in spending during the remaining months of this fiscal year. However, subject to budget availability, deans and vice presidents may authorize “essential” (as determined by those administrators) out-of-state travel, equipment purchases, projects, and filling position vacancies. There will be no merit salary increases in the FY03 budget, but money will be set aside for promotion in rank, counter-employment offers, compensation for added responsibilities, and increased teaching assistant stipends. He also indicated that any money returned to the state at the end of the fiscal year will come only from the central administration.

In response to a question, Hoover said that neither the governor or the members of the legislature are presently considering calling a special legislative session to deal with the current revenue and budget issues.
Hoover concluded his remarks by characterizing the continuing revenue/budget problem as potentially destructive to the point of undermining the role and mission of the University of Idaho and also that of higher education in general.

**Special Orders.** Faculty Council Chair, Professor Ronald Smelser, presented the report from the Faculty Council, noting that there were a great number of items to be considered and that it could be most easily accomplished by grouping and voting on non-controversial items together, reserving the remaining time for discussion of controversial items.

**Section I of the Agenda.**
Professor Smelser asked the faculty if they would take items A through O in Section I of the agenda, and adopt them by unanimous consent. He noted that if any member of the faculty would like to have an item removed from the consent order, then it would be done.

Faculty members requested that items M (FSH 3910) and N (FSH 5400) be removed for separate consideration. They were removed from the general consent order.

Smelser then asked the faculty to adopt by consent the remaining items in Section I of the agenda:
- A. Section 2700, Student Evaluation of Teaching
- B. Section 3040, Faculty Personnel Files
- C. Section 3080, Classification and Appointment
- D. Section 3085, Recruitment Procedures
- E. Section 3170, Professional Ethics
- F. Section 3260, Professional Consulting and Additional Workload
- G. Section 3420, Faculty Salaries
- H. Section 3480, Compensation for Service in Addition to Regular Duties
- I. Section 3520, Faculty Tenure
- J. Section 3560, Faculty Promotions
- K. Section 3710, Leave for Professional Improvement
- L. Section 3840, Procedures for Faculty Appeals
- O. Section 6240, Employee Rights and Responsibilities

The faculty adopted the consent order (Items A through L, and O) by majority voice vote.

It was moved and seconded to return Item N (FSH 3910, Dismissal of Faculty) to the 2002-2003 Faculty Council for further consideration. A brief discussion followed concerning the intent and definition of the language contained in the policy and the ability of the university to enforce the policy. The provost pointed out that the SBOE/Regents policy language (which is the language contained in the revised policy) will always take precedence. If the language needs to be changed, then the SBOE/Regents will have to be convinced to change the language. The motion to return was adopted by majority voice vote.

It was moved and seconded to return Item M (FSH 5400, Employment Agreement Concerning Patents and Copyrights) to the 2002-2003 Faculty Council for further consideration. The discussion that followed pointed out faculty concerns about: (1) the agreement statement that had a distinctive institutional rather than individual perspective; (2) the difficulty in interpreting the terms in the agreement; (3) the need to create an agreement that would benefit all parties; (4) the need for a better understanding of an individual faculty member’s rights; (5) the need to create research incentives; and (6) the need to protect everyone’s rights, not just the rights of the university.

Professor Smelser pointed out that the Intellectual Property Committee had reviewed the new policy language and found it to be consistent with the way business is now being conducted at the U of Idaho. Most of the language is, in fact, the original language and the new material in the policy is for protection and disclosure purposes concerning sponsored research projects. The policy is consistent with contractual law.
It was noted that the SBOE/Regents had appointed a task force to re-write this policy 18 months ago, but the task force draft did not meet with the approval of the SBOE/Regents. This caused them to initiate an external review of intellectual property policy. That report was presented in March, but the SBOE/Regents has not yet made a final decision on the policy. There is the feeling that, at some levels, people believe that everything created by faculty members belongs to the state of Idaho.

Several faculty members pointed out that the proposed policy represents a clarification of current university policy and is an attempt to put the policy in line with contractual agreements that are currently being entered into by the university. The provost indicated that the SBOE/Regents has already affirmed the proposed policy language. On the other hand, others noted that since the board has not yet approved a formal policy, that sending the policy back to the Faculty Council would make sure that there was a “fresh start” in crafting a good policy to present to the SBOE/Regents. After a voice vote that was too close to call, a show of hands showed that the motion to return was adopted by majority vote.

**Item P, Proposed Changes in Faculty-Staff Handbook Sections 3140, 3050, and 3320.** Professor Kerry McKeever, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, reviewed the process and reasoning behind the proposed changes in the handbook regarding review and evaluation of faculty members. This revision process began two years ago and, in fact, still has more pieces to come next year. One involving the annual review of administrators and the other a faculty development program. The overall goal of all of the changes is to provide a “faculty friendly” evaluation system that will help faculty members and administrators achieve their career goals.

There followed a spirited discussion of the merits of the proposed revisions resulting in the following major points/issues being raised: (1) the efficacy of faculty development/retraining programs; (2) changing from a 9-point evaluation numbering system to a 5-point system and the interpretation of those numbers; (3) re-training and re-orientation of administrators and faculty in the use of the new evaluation system; (4) the definitions of the numerical categories; (5) current research on faculty evaluations (published and unpublished); (6) defining development standards and language; (7) recognizing that academic units need flexibility in all evaluation processes; (8) the importance of the faculty narrative in self-evaluation and the role it plays in decisions made by evaluators; (9) the inclusion of faculty in all phases of the evaluation system.

It was moved and seconded to call the previous question. The motion to call was adopted by majority voice vote.

**Item P** (with a friendly amendment to the evaluation form – using the words “Evaluation of Faculty” in the heading and the words “University Service” in the evaluation form), coming as a seconded motion, was adopted by majority voice vote.

**Section II of the Agenda.** Chair Smelser proposed the adoption of items A through C by unanimous consent.

A. Regulation E-5-b, Replacing a Grade by Repeating a Course
B. Regulation D-2, Credit Load Limitations
C. Regulation K-2, Dean’s List

The consent motion was adopted by unanimous voice vote.

**Item D, Proposed change in University Regulation J-3-a., J-3-b., and J-3-c., University Core Curriculum.** University Curriculum Committee Chair, Professor Jeffrey Harkins, provided background information on the development of the additions and changes to the core curriculum. He said that it was obvious to everyone that changes needed to be made in the core curriculum. The resulting proposal is not perfect, but one that is going to continue to evolve over time. He emphasized that everyone in the university would now have a better opportunity to contribute to the core curriculum.
In response to a question concerning financial resources for the core, Provost Brian Pitcher noted that the university has made a commitment to the core and the administration will do everything in its power to see that all of the additional core sections are adequately funded.

University Core Curriculum Coordinator, Professor William Voxman, also responded to several faculty questions concerning the proposal. He noted that the foreign language courses have been moved from the “Communications” core requirement and can now be used to satisfy the “International” and “General Elective” requirements. Professor Sheila O’Brien noted the irony of the focus of the current “International” courses on the teaching of only recent cultural and global issues. She noted that most of the world accepts the proposition that the past is essential to understanding the present. O’Brien hoped that those responsible for this part of the core would expand the course offerings and course content to include established historical foundations for current international issues.

**Item D**, coming as a seconded motion, was **adopted** by majority voice vote.

Professor Harkins took this opportunity to praise the cooperative work between Professor Voxman (representing the faculty) and Provost Pitcher (representing the administration) on the development of the new core curriculum. His remarks were followed by a round of applause from the faculty.

**Section III of the Agenda.**
Chair Smelser proposed the **adoption of items A through D** by unanimous consent.

A. Ph.D. degree in Environmental Science  
B. M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Bioinformatics and Computational Biology  
C. M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Neuroscience  
D. B.S. degree in Early Childhood Development and Education

After a brief discussion concerning the eventual “home” of the graduate program in Environmental Science (no decision has been made), the consent motion was **adopted** by unanimous voice vote.

**Closing Announcements and Comments.** Professor Smelser thanked the faculty for giving him the opportunity to serve as Chair of the Faculty Council. He said that it had been a very enjoyable experience. Provost Pitcher thanked the officers of the Faculty Council, Professor Smelser, Professor Bitterwolf, and Emeritus Professor Haggart, for their leadership this past year. The faculty joined him in a round of applause.

**Adjournment.** It was **moved and seconded to adjourn** the meeting. The motion was **adopted** and Provost Brian Pitcher adjourned the meeting at 5:06 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peter A. Haggart  
Secretary of the Faculty