

University of Idaho  
**FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES**

**2002-2003 Meeting #8, Tuesday, November 05, 2002**

**Present:** Bitterwolf (chair), Wagner (vice-chair), Bailey, Baillargeon, Chandler, Cloud, Daley Laursen, Fairchild, Haggart (w/o vote), Lillard, McCaffrey, McClure, McGuire, Nelson, Pikowsky, Pitcher (w/o vote), Rahim, Rinker, Schekler  
**Absent:** Guenther, Hong, Netzer, Reese **Observers:** 2

**Call to Order.** A quorum being present, Faculty Council Chair, Professor Thomas Bitterwolf, called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. in the Brink Hall Faculty Lounge.

**Minutes.** The council **accepted** the minutes of the October 22, 2002, meeting as distributed.

**Chair's Report.** Chair Bitterwolf took the opportunity to remind the council members to be sure and cast their election ballot before the polls closed today. He also said that it had been a pleasure to report on the activities and accomplishments of the faculty to the U of Idaho Foundation. Provost Pitcher added that the U of Idaho Foundation has now grown to include 120 committed alumni and friends of the university. They are genuinely excited about what we are doing in research, teaching, and service and they are anxious to know how they can help.

**Provost's Report.** Provost Brian Pitcher reported to the council that the week leading up to homecoming held a number of successful meetings relative to the mission of the U of Idaho. He said that the UI Research Foundation is a strong group that challenges the university community while at the same time applauding the U of Idaho's growth in all areas of research. The official opening of the Albertson Business building was held and featured a visit by J. R. Albertson's grandson Scott. Pitcher noted that the Albertson Foundation continues to have a significant impact on the delivery of instruction and said that the U of Idaho is looking forward to seeing that relationship grow. The university also announced its success in surpassing its goals for Campaign Idaho, as well as the addition of a \$4 million major gift from Idaho rancher Harry Bettis and the Laura Moore Cunningham Foundation. Bettis, president of the Boise-based foundation, made the gift to support "presidential initiatives" at UI. All in all, the provost commented that homecoming week was very remarkable. Pitcher said that a lot of positive energy seems to be focused on the U of Idaho.

**FC-03-012, Proposal to Offer Four (4) New Options under the B.S. Degree in Agricultural Systems Management.** Professor John Hammel, Chair of the University Curriculum Committee, provided the council with background information on the proposal. The new options will help the Biological and Agricultural Engineering Department's Agricultural Systems Management (ASM) Program meet the diverse career goals of its majors. The options (emphasis areas) will be in: Agricultural Information Systems, Water and Waste Management Systems, Agricultural Production Systems, and Agricultural Machine Systems. These emphasis areas will allow ASM students to gain an educational background that will make them more employable. After a brief discussion, the seconded motion was **adopted** by unanimous voice vote.

**FC-03-014, Proposal to Change the B.S. Degree Major and Minor in Plant Science.** Professor Hammel provided the council with background information on the proposed changes. The Department of Plant, Soil, and Entomological Sciences wishes to change the B.S. degree, Plant Science majors from Crop Science, Plant Protection, and Horticulture, to one B.S. Plant Science degree with the new major of Horticultural and Crop Science and to also include four options under that major: Horticultural Plant Production, Plant Protection, Crop Management, and Urban Landscape and Turf Management. The change also includes four corresponding minors: Horticulture, Crop Science, Plant Protection, and Arboriculture and Urban Forestry. The change will allow the Plant Science Program to be more consistent, and will require a standard core for all Plant Science students. The addition of the Urban Landscape and Turf Management option will allow the department to attract an additional 50-75 majors. Students that complete this program will be able to find employment in production or management of horticultural crops or management and maintenance of urban forests, city parks, or golf courses. After a brief discussion the seconded motion was **adopted** by unanimous voice vote.

**FC-03-015, Proposal to Add a Jointly Offered Minor in Arboriculture and Urban Forestry by the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and the College of Natural Resources.** Professor Hammel again provided background information on the proposed minor. The Arboriculture & Urban Forestry Minor program will be available to all students that want to focus their course options to study the care and maintenance of trees in urban landscapes and community forests. The package of courses are designed to prepare students for entry-level positions in commercial, municipal, or utility arboriculture and/or community and urban forestry positions within local, state and federal agencies and organizations. The minor will provide students with a coherent knowledge base for careers in commercial and municipal tree care and community forestry. The U of Idaho will be the only university in the nation to offer this minor. After a brief discussion the seconded motion was **adopted** by unanimous voice vote.

**FC-03-013, Proposal for Honors Qualifications for December 2002 and May 2003 Graduates.** This proposal was generated by the Associate Deans. The council was provided with several options to handle a problem in conferring honors on December and May graduates, caused by the recent reorganization of U of Idaho departments and colleges.

The current practice in determining qualification for graduation with honors has been to take the top 3%, 6%, and 10% of the graduates in each college and award them the honors of summa cum laude, magna cum laude, and cum laude respectively. Although the honors are designated as “university” distinctions, the grade point average varies in each college for each honors category. New departmental and college alignments mean that some December 2002 and May 2003 graduates may not qualify for the honor category they expect.

The Associate Deans offered three options to solve this problem: (1) obtain UCC and Faculty Council approval and implement for May 2003 a new Regulation K, (2) approve the minimum requirements from the existing college structure and apply them to December 2002 and May 2003, ensuring that no student would be denied honors expected under the former college structure, and (3) implement the GPA cut-offs for the new colleges and begin communicating with students now about the new requirements in effect for May 2003. The recommendations of the Associate Deans were taken into consideration when discussing the following **linked agenda item proposing a significant change in U of Idaho Regulation K (Academic Honors).**

**FC-03-016, Proposed Change in U of Idaho Regulation K, Academic Honors.** (New Wording)

### **K – Academic Honors**

**K-1. Graduation with Honors.** Candidates for baccalaureate degrees are graduated with honors if they satisfy ONE of the following conditions. Note: Graduation with honors is determined at the point in time when the degree is posted to the student's academic record based upon the student's grade point average at that time.

1. Their cumulative UI grade-point averages are as specified in K-1-a, K-1-b, K-1-c, or K-1-d and they have earned at least 56 credits in UI courses OR
2. Both their cumulative UI grade-point averages AND their grade-point average from all sources (the overall GPA on Banner) are as specified in K-1-a, K-1-b, K-1-c, or K-1-d and they have earned at least 32 credits in UI courses.

No credits earned through correspondence study, bypassed courses, credit by examination, College Level Examination Program, experiential learning, or technical competence may be counted among these 56 or 32 credits.

**K-1-a.** Candidates whose grade-point averages are 3.90 to 4.00 are graduated *summa cum laude* (with highest honors).

**K-1-b.** Candidates whose grade-point averages are 3.75 to 3.89 are graduated *magna cum laude* (with high honors).

**K-1-c.** Candidates whose grade-point averages are 3.60 to 3.74 are graduated *cum laude* (with honors).

**K-1-d.** Candidates whose grade-point averages are 3.40-3.59 are graduated with *academic distinction*.

*[Note: Students graduating with Latin Honors as listed in K-1-a. –K-1-c. receive honor cords to wear at commencement. Their transcripts and diplomas reflect the final honors designation when degrees are posted. Students graduating with distinction as described in K-1-d. do not receive honor cords at graduation, but their transcripts and diplomas are annotated appropriately with the posting of degrees.]*

**K-2. Graduation with Honors in the College of Law.** [This part of Regulation K would not change as the College of Law does not award an undergraduate degree]

**K-3. Dean's List.** Undergraduate students who are registered for at least 14 credits (10 in the College of Law) and attain a grade-point average of 3.30 (3.00 in the College of Law) for a given semester are placed on lists prepared for the college deans. (Except for grades of P earned in English 101, credits for which a student was graded P are not computed in the specified minimums.) These lists are publicized within UI and are distributed to news agencies.

Professor Hammel pointed out that the proposed changes in Regulation K would do away with the use of college percentages and establish solid university grade point average requirements for each honor category. The proposal would also add one additional category of graduating with “academic distinction.”

The **discussion** on both agenda items FC-03-013 and FC-03-016 included the following **major points**:

- changes in college structures cause concern about a student's expectations for qualifying for honors
- surveys of peer institutions reveals a variety of regulations, but the majority use a fixed grade-point-average
- the new regulation closely follows past practice in awarding honors to graduates
- option two of the associate deans proposal would "grandfather" in current seniors, and then put the new regulation in effect for 2003-2004
- the new regulation changes the term "distinction" to "honor" and then reverts to "distinction" in the new category for honors
- colleges should set the grade-point-average standards rather than having one university standard, students would like to know that they graduated in the top level of their own college
- the new regulation seems both fair and inclusive
- the new regulation seems unfair because it reduces eligibility for highest honors, penalizing students in colleges that have more rigorous programs resulting in lower overall grade-point-averages
- we can't make assumptions about the reason for the grade levels in each college
- the majority of students are motivated by career choices in choosing a college, rather than college grading practices
- the new regulation provides one standard rather than a constantly moving target, students would know exactly what grades were needed to qualify for each honor category, and this may motivate students to earn better grades
- can't make assumptions about the motivation of students with regard to seeking honors
- most students don't seem to notice the honor requirements until they are juniors or seniors
- there would likely be more honors awarded overall under the new regulation, but less at the highest level
- the new regulation is not a major change, it is "tweaking" the existing standards

When the discussion had come full circle, it was decided that **a vote should be taken on FC-03-016**. This vote would determine whether or not the council wished to see a change in the way qualification for graduating with honors was calculated. The seconded **motion was adopted** by majority voice vote.

It was then **moved and seconded** (McGuire, Nelson) that the council **adopt option two from FC-03-013, the recommendation presented by the Associate Deans, that would use the minimum requirements for the new and old colleges (as compiled by the Office of the Registrar) for December 2002 and May 2003 graduation honors and then implement the new Regulation K (just adopted) for the 2003-2004 academic year, beginning with the August 2003 degree candidates**. The motion was **adopted** by majority vote (12 yea, 3 nay).

**FC-03-011, Proposed Revision of *Faculty-Staff Handbook* Section 1570, Secretary of the Faculty, Appointment, Duties and Responsibilities, and Nomination Process.** This proposal came as a seconded motion from the ad hoc council committee to review the current handbook section and make recommendations for updating prior to advertising and filling the faculty secretary position next year. Professor Haggart, the incumbent faculty secretary, reviewed the changes to the section and answered questions from the council. The following proposal was adopted by unanimous voice vote:

**A. APPOINTMENT.**

A-1. The secretary of the faculty (aka faculty secretary) is appointed on a fiscal-year basis by the president from among the tenured members of the university faculty or faculty emeriti [see 1520 II-1 and III-2]. The president appoints the secretary of the faculty from a list of candidates recommended by a nominating committee and ratified by the Faculty Council [see C below].

A-2. Release time for the faculty secretary will be at least one-half time and may be greater, at the discretion of the president, depending on the circumstances, the needs of the Faculty Council, and the needs of the faculty member appointed.

A-3. The term of service is three years and is renewable.

A-4. The faculty secretary serves at the pleasure of the president and reports to the chair of the Faculty Council and to the provost. The provost, in consultation with the chair and vice chair of the Faculty Council, conducts an annual review of the faculty secretary. Early in the third year of service, an in-depth evaluation is conducted by the provost and the chair of the Faculty Council. Included are evaluations by the council as a whole, by other appropriate administrators and faculty, and by the incumbent. A confidential evaluation report is given to the president for review and discussion with the incumbent by the first week in October in the third year of service.

**B. RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES.** The Secretary of the Faculty shall:

B-1. Prepare, with the president's approval, the agenda and supporting documents for each meeting of the university faculty; record and publish the minutes of meetings; forward reports of actions of the university faculty to the president; provide the registrar, the Department of Special Collections and Archives in the University Library, and other interested parties with copies of the minutes of the university faculty meetings; and serve as a channel of communication to the members of the university faculty concerning administrative and regents' actions.

B-2. Serve as webmaster and/or supervisor for the Faculty Council and Faculty Secretary websites. Oversee the placement of material on those websites.

B-3. Oversee the placement of Faculty-Staff Handbook sections and keywords on the UI policy and regulations website.

B-4. Serve as an ex-officio nonvoting member of the Faculty Council and, as his or her primary responsibility, provide services on request for the Faculty Council and other faculty bodies.

B-5. Serve as secretary to the Committee on Committees. Oversee the process for solicitation of faculty members to serve on university-wide standing committees and the publication of committee function statements and membership lists.

B-6. Cooperate with UI officials to ensure the accuracy of all published academic information .

B-7. Oversee the preparation and data processing of faculty curricula vitae by personnel in the Faculty Secretary's Office using the official format approved by the provost. Oversee distribution of curricula vitae to the faculty member, departmental administrator, dean, and University Communications.

B-8. Serve as the editor of the Faculty-Staff Handbook. Serve as a major resource to the faculty and administrators with respect to the contents of the handbook and participate in keeping it up-to-date. Serve as a liaison with the President's Office to ensure proper maintenance and publication of the handbook. Inform Faculty Council of any additions or changes to the handbook.

B-9. Prepare for publication General Policy Reports for distribution to the general faculty for review and approval.

B-10. Serve as a source of information for UI personnel and students concerning policies, regulations, and procedures.

B-11. Perform such other duties related to faculty governance as may be assigned by the president or the president's designee or the university faculty.

### **C. NOMINATION PROCESS FOR SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY.**

C-1. The chair of the Faculty Council appoints a five-member nominating committee, with the concurrence of the Faculty Council. The committee is composed of the provost and four other members of the council.

C-2. The nomination committee should seek out and give preference to nominees who have the following qualifications; (1) attained the rank of full professor or are faculty emeriti, (2) print and electronic publication editing skills, (3) supervisory experience, (4) extensive experience in university service, and (5) a good understanding and commitment to the role and mission of the University of Idaho.

C-2. The committee advertises the position, solicits and accepts applications and nominations, and screens candidates. The committee functions in a confidential manner.

C-3. The committee recommends a list of candidates for ratification by the Faculty Council. The council may meet in executive session to discuss candidates recommended by the nominating committee. The council may not add names to those recommended by the nominating committee, but may choose to delete any of the candidates nominated by the committee.

C-4. The Faculty Council forwards the name(s) of nominee(s) ratified by the Faculty Council to the president. The president selects the faculty secretary from that list or requests that a new group of nominees be selected following the procedures outlined in C-1 through C-4.

**Adjournment.** It was moved and seconded (Lillard, McClure) to adjourn. The motion was **adopted** by unanimous voice vote, and Chair Bitterwolf adjourned the meeting at 4: 51 p.m.

**Next Meeting.** The next meeting of the Faculty Council will be on **November 12, 2002.**

Respectfully submitted,

Peter A. Haggart  
Secretary of the Faculty Council