University of Idaho
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
2018-2019 Meeting #23, Tuesday, March 26, 2019

Present: Brandt (w/o vote), Benedum, Bridges, Cannon (Boise), Caplan, Chopin, DeAngelis, Ellison, Grieb (Vice Chair), Jeffery, Johnson (Chair), Keim, Kern (Coeur d'Alene), King, Kirchmeier, Laggis, Lawrence (for Wiencek w/o vote), Lee, Lee-Painter, McKellar (Idaho Falls), Morgan, Raja, Schwarzlaender, Seamon, Tibbals, Vella, Wiest. Absent: Dezzani, Lambeth, Luckhart, Wiencek. Guests: 5

Call to Order and Minutes. The chair called the meeting to order at 3:32 pm. A motion to approve the minutes (Lee-Painter/Seamon) passed unanimously.

Chair’s Report.

- The second Udaho Bound event will be held this weekend, March 30. The chair encouraged faculty to participate and engage with incoming students.
- The 20th Annual Tutxinmepu Powwow will be held on April 6-7, 2019 at the UI Kibbie Dome. The Native American Student Center, in conjunction with the Native American Student Association and the University of Idaho, hosts the powwow each year.
- The U of I Undergraduate Research Symposium will be held on April 29, 2019 at the Pitman Center from 11:30-1:30 PDT.
- There There by Tommy Orange has been selected as the 2019-20 U of I Common Read.

Provost Report. Vice Provost for Faculty Torrey Lawrence attended the meeting in the provost’s absence. He did not have a specific report.

FS-19-063rev: FSH 3320 C. - Administrator Evaluation (substitute FS-19-001). Professor Marty Ytreberg, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), presented the proposal. Consideration of this proposal was postponed at Meeting #21 on March 5, 2019 so that Faculty Affairs could consider questions that arose during the senate discussion. The proposal under debate is the amended proposal presented as a seconded motion from FAC. The changes made by the committee clarify the procedure for maintaining the confidentiality of faculty and staff feedback.

A senator asked why staff had not been included in the process for triggering a review under sub-section C in response to discussion at the March 5th meeting. He stated that staff are often more directly involved with an administrator than are faculty because they work in close proximity to the administrator and may be privy to information not generally available to faculty. Ytreberg responded that the sense of FAC was that including staff in the petition process for a review would place many staff in a precarious position. He pointed out that many units have only one or two staff. He also pointed out that staff feedback is included in the feedback process and that no distinction is made between staff and faculty feedback. The senator responded that he believes many staff would participate in the petition process if they felt strongly that the administrator needed to be reviewed.

The faculty secretary pointed out that in some units with large numbers of staff, the inclusion of staff in the petition process would make it very difficult if not impossible to trigger a review if staff did not feel comfortable participating in the process. In addition she commented that staff do not have the protection of academic freedom which could be important depending on the situation. While UI policy is to protect the confidentiality of petitioners, under state law, if the petition is deemed to be part of a personnel record, the administrator may have access to the petition.
It was moved (Tibbals/De Angelis) to add staff to the process by amending two subsections of the proposal. Subsection C-4 would be amended as follows: “C-4. Review initiated by Faculty and Staff. An administrator review may be initiated through a petition signed by at least 50% of the faculty and staff members in the unit and delivered to the provost. The names and percentages of faculty and staff signing the petition shall be maintained in confidence by the provost.” Subsection C-4. 5 would be amended as follows: “5. Upon completion, the supervisor or provost shall notify the faculty and staff in the unit of the review.”

Ytreberg stated that on behalf of FAC, he would accept the proposed amendment of subsection C-4.5 as a friendly amendment to the proposal.

A senator asked whether the participation of staff would be required, or optional. The faculty secretary explained that unit staff would be counted in the number of individuals necessary to constitute 50% of the faculty and staff, but that the decision of whether to sign a petition would be up to the individual staff member.

A senator asked for clarification regarding the confidentiality of the petitioners. The faculty secretary explained that if the proposal passes, UI policy would be to protect the confidentiality of the petitioners. However, she noted that it is possible that the petition could be considered a personnel record and might, therefore, have to be provided to the administrator upon request under the Idaho Public Records Law. The senator followed up and asked whether staff and faculty could be retaliated against for signing such a petition. The faculty secretary responded that UI policy provides protection to faculty and staff against retaliation. [NB: Faculty-Staff Handbook (FSH) 3810 regarding retaliation applies to retaliatory conduct “which includes conduct that intimidates, threatens, coerces, or retaliates against any individual because that individual reports a perceived wrongdoing, inequity, or violation of law or UI policy, files a complaint alleging illegal or prohibited discrimination, participates in a grievance or appeals procedure, or participates in a dispute resolution through Human Resources or the Office of the Ombuds.”]

The motion passed with 12 votes in favor and 10 against.

The faculty secretary raised the possibility that, in light of the amendment, the percentage required to trigger a review under subsection C should be reconsidered because the large number of staff in some units might make it impossible to undertake such a review. A senator suggested that further collaboration between FAC and staff leadership might be able to resolve this issue. Ytreberg stated that FAC would be open to such collaboration, but emphasized that FAC believes the bar for triggering a review under subsection C should be high and that the committee would be reluctant to lower the percentage. He emphasized that staff have full participation in the annual review process and that staff input must be considered as part of a review under subsection C.

It was moved (Grieb/Lee-Painter) that amended subsection C-4 be further amended to provide as follows “C-4. Review Initiated by Faculty. An administrator review may be initiated through a petition signed by at least 40% 50% of the faculty and staff members in the unit or 50% of the faculty members and delivered to the provost. The names and percentages of the faculty and staff signing the petition shall be maintained in confidence by the provost.”

A senator expressed concern that faculty members were governing staff participation in the evaluation process. She asked if the policy applied to staff reviews of staff? The faculty secretary explained that the faculty senate is the governing body that establishes policy in the FSH. The FSH applies to the entire institution – faculty and staff. She stated that slow steps were being made to foster further inclusion of
staff in the governance process. Finally, she pointed out that the policy under consideration applies only to administrators who have a faculty appointment.

A senator asked how staff would be defined? Would staff include custodians, teaching assistants, post docs, or shared staff such as those from University Marketing and Communications or from Information Technology? Ytreberg also explained that the term unit is broadly defined at UI and includes not just academic departments, but also large units such as colleges.

A senator stated that he had concerns about expanding the petitioning process in a review under subsection C to include staff. He stated that most faculty who take on administrative responsibilities do so out of a sense of institutional commitment and often at the expense of activities that would be more professionally rewarding. Including staff in the petition process would undermine faculty control of the academic mission. He explained that he could envision situations in which staff and faculty perspectives on an administrator’s performance might vary greatly. He pointed out that with the growth of administrators, an expanded petition process would include the growing number of staff.

A motion (Schwarzlaender/Chopin) was made to again postpone further consideration so that the question of which staff could participate in the petition process could be addressed. A senator asked whether it would be possible to revisit the question of including staff in the petitioning process upon further consideration after the postponement. The faculty secretary stated that because additional information would be made available regarding which staff would participate, the question could be reconsidered after the postponement. The motion passed unanimously.

**FS-19-025 (UCC-19-054): Family & Consumer Science, Discontinue Food Option.** Consideration of this proposal was postponed because no representative of the unit was available to explain the proposal.

**Faculty Secretary.** The chair explained that he would invite discussion of the next four proposals, all of which related to the restructure of the Faculty Secretary position, together. He indicated that he would undertake individual votes on each proposal. The faculty secretary reminded senators that consideration of a motion to amend FSH 1570 was postponed at Meeting #22, March 19, 2019 after discussion at senate revealed the need to consider several issues. She explained that the proposal currently being presented addresses the issues. It includes a clearer advocacy role for the faculty secretary, provides that the faculty secretary shall serve as the secretary of the faculty senate and establishes clear lines of collaboration and communication between the faculty secretary and the policy coordinator.

**FS-19-071rev: FSH 1570 - Secretary of the Faculty.** It was moved (Tibbals/Morgan) that the pending motion regarding FSH 1570 be amended as presented. The motion to amend passed unanimously. The pending motion regarding FSH 1570 then passed unanimously.

**FS-19-072: FSH 1520 – Constitution of the University Faculty (requires quorum at UFM).** A motion (Lee-Painter/Wiest) to amend the constitution as presented passed unanimously.

**FS-19-073: FSH 1580 – Bylaws of Faculty Senate (requires quorum at UFM).** A motion (Tibbals/Morgan) to amend the bylaws passed unanimously

**FS-19-078: FSH 1460 – University-wide Policy Development Statement and Process.** A motion (Lee-Painter/Seamon) to amend FSH 1460 as presented passed unanimously.
Chair Johnson next explained that four editorial changes implementing the changed position responsibilities of the faculty secretary were presented for senators’ information.

**FS-19-074: FSH 1640.91 – UCC (FYI)**

**FS-19-075: FSH 1640.41 – Faculty/Staff Policy Group (FYI)**

**FS-19-076: FSH 1640.28 – Committee on Committees (FYI)**

**FS-19-077: FSH 1640.42 – Faculty Affairs (FYI)**

**Parking Update.** Rebecca Couch the Director of Parking and Transportation Services (PTS) presented upcoming changes in the parking and transportation system. These changes are part of the PTS strategic plan. The changes align with PTS efforts to enhance the campus alternative transportation network, address customer priorities regarding space availability and permit affordability, and further the PTS goals of utilizing improved parking technology, improving parking lot maintenance, and improving overall quality of parking.

As part of its process PTS has consulted many stakeholders including the City of Moscow, students, faculty and staff. Ten proposed changes are detailed on the PTS website. PTS has already begun implementing the first four changes as a result of previous input from stakeholders. They are seeking input at this time on the last six changes.

Couch first reviewed the four changes currently being implemented.

1. The Gotcha Mobility Bike Share program will be launched in early August in partnership with the City of Moscow. This program will include 50 pedal-assist 3-bikes. They can be used community-wide for up to 30 minutes per day at no cost.

   A senator questioned choice of offering bikes to help reduce vehicles on campus. She believes people would be more likely to use a zip car than a bike so they can travel to buy groceries, etc. Couch responded that the bikes are one step in the overall plan. At present, the funds for the bike share program are available. The bikes will support on-campus trips as well as off-campus travel. While PTS realizes that many people will not use bikes to replace cars, offering the use of bikes may provide a good alternative.

2. Lot 35 north of the Student Health Center will be converted from a gold lot to an hourly pay lot. As part of this plan, the lot will be paved. Currently the lot is a sloped, gravel lot that creates difficulty during the winter and is unsightly. The goal of the change is to increase short term parking in the campus core –23 hourly pay spaces will be added. PTS will provide coupon codes for guests and is hoping to implement a mobile pay option that will allow users to add time electronically.

3. The metered parking in Lot 53 will be converted to “access permit required” spaces. In addition, the campus walkway entry from University Ave. at Pine Street will be moved to University Avenue and Ash Street (one block east). The meters in the area resulted in traffic jams in the campus core as users hunted for spaces or drove into the area to drop off or pick up riders. The changed configuration will limit traffic and discourage drop offs.
A senator commented that art and architecture students are often required to transport bulky projects to and from the campus core. She expressed concern that the elimination of the metered parking and ability to make drop offs will create problems for these students. Couch responded that temporary delivery permits are available free online to UI affiliates. The permit must be printed in advance.

4. A major traffic and parking realignment in the areas of University and Idaho Streets will be undertaken. Purple permit on-street parking will be converted to gold parking. The direction of University Avenue, Ash and Idaho Streets, which are all one-way streets, will be reversed. The purpose of the street direction reversal is to reduce traffic on the campus walkway. The change will make it clearer that the walkway is not accessible to cars. A loading zone will be provided. The street reversal also opens the possibility of a future transit stop in the area. Changing parking on streets from purple to gold permits will increase safety and aesthetics. Because of the switch to gold permits, overnight parking will not be allowed. This will facilitate better snow removal and street cleaning. The change will happen this summer. Temporary signage and flashing warnings will be in place by August 1st.

A senator asked whether there is a parking option for those who only occasionally drive cars to campus. Couch responded that 10 day parking permits are available.

A senator expressed concern about the elimination of the purple permits for students. As a result of the proposed changes, 100 fewer purple will be available. Couch responded that some of the changes contemplated for the future will add more useable student parking options.

Couch next addressed the remaining six changes on which PTS is currently seeking stakeholder input.

5. Orange Lot 6 between College Avenue and Narrow Street will be converted from an orange commuter lot to a purple lot. Currently the lot is underused by orange permit holders. As a result of converting the lot, 28 additional purple spaces will be gained over and above those lost in other proposals.

6. Free and unregulated street parking on Railroad Street and College Avenue will be converted to red commuter permit parking. At present, these street parking spots are being used for vehicle storage and by students in nearby apartments. By converting the lots, safety will be enhanced. Currently, because parking on these streets is not part of the UI parking plan, services such as assisting with dead batteries cannot be provided in these areas. In addition, aesthetics will be improved. The change will add 32 commuter spaces to replace the loss of Lot 6 (see proposal 5).

7. Blue Lot 60 (the Sweet Avenue lot behind the Transit Center) will be converted to a red lot. Demand for blue permit parking on the east side of campus is increasing. Demand on the west side of campus is quite low. East side commuter lots are full, while west side commuter lots have many open spaces. PTS is converting the lot to provide a disincentive for blue parking on the east side of campus and an incentive to use the available spaces on the west side of campus.

8. Lot 104 near the WWAMI Building on Sweet Avenue will be reopened as a red permit lot. The rationale for making this a red lot instead of a blue lot is the same rationale as applied to the conversion of Lot 60 (see proposal 7 above). This change will add 41 red permit spaces on the east side of campus.
9. Lot 107 (on the east side of the Student Recreation Center (SRC)) is being converted from a free lot to an hourly pay lot with a 2.5 hour time limit. Currently the lot is very full with cars often waiting in line to park. Students are using the lot as free parking to attend class. Enforcement of the time limit for using the lot is erratic. Meanwhile, the pay lot on the west side of the SRC is empty much of the time. PTS has been working with SRC management on how to manage this parking situation. Once the change is implemented, PTS will monitor the situation and can adjust the rates for parking and the time limits.

A senator asked whether permit holders could park in the lot without paying. Couch responded that this has been considered but would be very difficult to enforce and may increase illegal parking as a person might buy one of the less expensive permits and then park all day in the SRC lot closer to the campus core.

A senator asked whether Lot 1 could be shifted to a red permit lot. This lot is close to the SRC and might provide an option. Couch responded that PTS could consider this change. Couch indicated her willingness to consider creative solutions that would allow faculty, staff and students to park close to the SRC, but not facilitate illegal or unsafe parking. She stressed that safety and access are her biggest concerns with this problem and that she is not concerned about revenues.

10. Couch provided a schedule of parking permit price increases.

A senator expressed concern that, as a whole, the changes will most impact working students who must commute to and from campus. Couch appreciated her concern and expressed her thought that increasing alternative transportation such as bus services would help such students.

A senator noted that parking in Moscow is easier and less expensive than in Boise. Couch pointed out that demand is less in Moscow than in Boise and that Boise has more public transportation options for students and employees. A senator expressed the view that parking in Moscow is relatively affordable and plentiful. Couch responded that in the long run there will be a need for more parking on the periphery of campus. PTS plans to increase the number of new parking lots, but does not have a plan for adding a parking structure due to funding limitations. If such a structure is built, permit prices will need to increase. Current rates provide only enough funds to maintain our parking facilities. PTS is also trying to promote options for getting to and from Moscow that will alleviate the need for students to drive cars to campus.

A senator commented that revenues from parking will increase by $500,000 over the next five years. She asked what this increased funding will be used for? Couch explained that the increased funding will be used to meet current PTS maintenance needs. She pointed out that re-surfacing the Kibbie Dome lot last year cost $300,000. She also stated that PTS is investing some of the money in alternative transportation such as the bike share program. They are working to develop a scooter program, ride share services, and other smart transit services. Finally, PTS is taking over Vandal Access Program for people with disabilities and is taking on more snow removal.

Couch concluded by thanking senators and encouraging them to continue to provide feedback.

The agenda having been completed, a motion (Keim/Lee-Painter) to adjourn passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 4:54 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted, Liz Brandt, Faculty Secretary & Secretary to the Faculty Senate