

University of Idaho
FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES

2002-2003 Meeting #9, Tuesday, November 12, 2002

Present: Bitterwolf (chair), Wagner (vice-chair), Bailey, Baillargeon, Chandler, Cloud, Daley Laursen, Fairchild, Guenther, Haggart (w/o vote), Lillard, McCaffrey, Nelson, Netzer, Pikowsky, Johnson (for Pitcher) (w/o vote), Reese, Rinker, Schekler **Absent:** Hong, McClure, McGuire, Rahim **Observers:** 5

Call to Order. A quorum being present, Faculty Council Chair, Professor Thomas Bitterwolf, called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. in the Brink Hall Faculty Lounge.

Minutes. Faculty Secretary, Peter Haggart, advised the council that the minutes had been corrected to reflect the correct month (August instead of December) for full implementation of the recently adopted revision in U of Idaho Regulation K. The council accepted the minutes of the November 5, 2002, meeting as distributed and editorially corrected.

Chair's Report. Chair Bitterwolf took this opportunity to review for the council the several aspects of the continuing budget crisis at the U of Idaho. Bitterwolf said that talk of further budget reductions should not be news to the faculty. However, it is clear that some faculty members have mistakenly concluded that the budget cuts made for this year were the only ones that would be made. Rumors keep spreading of a new shortfall of funding when, in fact budget cuts will need to be made for the next two years. He reminded the council that U of Idaho President Hoover had presented the budget crisis last fall and spring in terms of a three-year reduction process. There is still the need to cut close to \$14 million from our operations. He described this as an obviously painful problem and he expressed the hope that every dean and department head would be discussing the budget reductions with his or her faculty and involving the faculty in the decision-making process. Bitterwolf said that he has asked the administration to hold a university-wide meeting to discuss the continuing budget crisis.

FC-03-017 Proposal for Change in the Budget Liaison Committee Name, Function, and Membership as follows:

Institutional Planning and Budget Advisory Committee

A. Function. The function of the Institutional Planning and Budget Advisory Committee is:

A-1. To advise the Faculty Council and the Executive Director of Institutional Planning and Budget concerning University of Idaho planning and budget issues. The committee does not vote on any planning or budget issue brought before it.

A-2. To ensure that budget and planning issues are reviewed by a committee that represents the diversity of values and perspectives that exist within the university community. The Planning and Budget Advisory Committee will ensure that policies of institutional planning and budgeting will be addressed in their formative stages. The committee reports on a regular basis to the Faculty Council and through the minutes and actions of council, to the university community.

B. Structure and Membership. The committee is composed of fourteen (14) members all serving three-year staggered terms. The committee chair will usually be the senior member of the representatives elected by the Faculty Council.

- Three (3) faculty members elected by and from the membership of the Faculty Council representing each council "class"
- One (1) faculty member not associated with the Faculty Council
- Three (3) staff members, not associated with the university planning or budget offices, selected from nominations provided by the Staff Affairs Committee
- Three (3) students selected from nominations by the ASUI, GSA, and Student Bar Association to be representatives from those student organizations
- One (1) academic department administrator (selected from nominations from that group)
- Immediate Past Chair of the Institutional Planning and Budget Advisory Committee
- Chair of the Faculty Council
- Executive Director of Institutional Planning and Budget

Background on the proposed committee change was provided by Councilor Nelson and Wayland Winstead (Director of Institutional Planning and Budget). The purpose of the change is to turn the Budget Liaison Committee into a university-wide institutional planning and budget advisory group, with a diverse membership, offering up a variety of viewpoints for consideration. Although she approved of the concept, Councilor Lillard remarked that this kind of expansion in membership put yet another burden on already overburdened faculty and staff members. Councilor Wagner responded that the Committee on Committees had discussed that issue, but believed that the membership of this new committee needed to be increased to make sure that it truly represented the faculty, staff, and students who make up the university community. Winstead added that the increased membership was essential in the advisory process. Councilor Cloud wondered how this group fit into the present decision-making structure, as well as responsibility center management concepts. Winstead responded that institutional level issues needed to be looked at in terms of the goals and mission of the university. This group would not impinge on the current responsibilities of deans and managers. We do not now have a university-wide planning committee and this proposal would solve that problem and provide him with valuable advice. The seconded motion was **adopted** by unanimous voice vote.

FC-03-018, Proposed New Degree Program in Virtual Technology and Design. Before this motion could be considered by the council, Councilor Reese asked to read a memorandum written by Councilor McClure (who could not be present at the meeting). The chair recognized Councilor Reese for that purpose. Professor McClure's memo spoke favorably of the proposed academic degree program, but questioned, in light of current budget reductions and other factors, the method in which the new program had gained approval from the college. She expressed her concern over the fact that the faculty of the architecture department never had the opportunity to discuss or review the program, writing that *"neither the initiator, who is a member of the architecture faculty, or our chair, has ever discussed this initiative openly with the architecture faculty."* She went on to say that the proposal also had potential impacts on faculty positions, staffing, use of the computer lab hardware and software, and access to resources by all architecture students. She concluded by saying that *". . . the ends simply do not justify the means. Therefore, I ask that you deny passage of this proposal today, and to recommend instead, that the proposal be properly presented to the architecture department faculty, and discussed, before it is brought forward to faculty council."*

It was **moved and seconded** (Reese, Nelson) **to table FC-03-018 and return it to the architecture department faculty for discussion and recommendation to the Faculty Council.** The motion will be brought off the table when a report from the architecture department has been received by the council chair and distributed to the council.

The author of the proposal, Professor Brian Sumption, provided background information concerning the merits of the proposed degree program. After his introductory remarks, the discussion centered on the process by which the degree proposal arrived on the Faculty Council's agenda. Professor Sumption and College of Letters, Arts and Social Science (CLASS) Associate Dean Sandra Haarsager pointed out that the proposal was not for a degree program that would be offered by the architecture department, but for an interdisciplinary degree involving several academic units. They both assured the council that the program had wide support from the college.

Councilor Chandler pointed out that while he served on the curriculum committee that approved the program at the college level, he was concerned that his new college had never held a faculty meeting since its inception, and had no operational by-laws to handle new degree proposals. Haarsager responded that the new college was operating under the old College of Letters and Science by-laws. She reminded the council that interdisciplinary degrees are handled differently because they do not belong administratively to one department. She said the new degree program had been discussed by the departments that would be collectively offering the courses, faculty, and support.

Several members of the council questioned not only the process that was used to approve the degree program, but the possible strain on resources as well. Professor Reese pointed out that in difficult budget times the resources involved in the significant use of the computer lab by the new majors could jeopardize lab use by current majors, and might even have an adverse affect on future accreditation of the professional architecture degree program. He also pointed out that architecture students were charged a substantial fee to cover lab expenses, and that these fees were intended to cover only the lab usage by current majors in the department.

CLASS Dean Joe Zeller responded that only 25% of the fee charged to architecture majors was used to support the computer lab operation. He said that the same type of fee would be charged to the majors in the new degree program. Dean Zeller also pointed out to the council that majors in architecture are now required to provide their own computer "platforms" and that the impact on the lab was not as significant as it might have been in the past. The computer lab in question was not a "work station" type of lab, but one that provided "enrichment" of all disciplines who interacted with the lab environment. He said that majors in the new degree program would also be required to provide their own computer "platforms." He also noted that there is greater access to the architecture computer lab now than when it was started.

While the council was in general agreement that the proposed new major appeared an excellent program, they were not willing to approve the new degree until they could be assured that the proposal had been openly discussed with the faculty of the architecture department. The **motion to table FC-03-018 was adopted** by unanimous voice vote.

FC-03-019, Proposed Discontinuance of the Scientific Option to the Applied Mathematics B.S. Degree. This proposal and FC-03-020 are interconnected. One option is being discontinued (019) and replaced by a new option (020) in the Department of Mathematics. Coming as a seconded motion from the University Curriculum Committee (UCC), the motion was **adopted** by unanimous voice vote.

FC-03-020, Proposed Addition of the Math Modeling Option to the Applied Mathematics B.S. Degree. Following the adoption of FC-03-019, this seconded motion from the UCC was **adopted** by unanimous voice vote.

Adjournment. It was **moved and seconded** (Baillargeon, Fairchild) to adjourn. The motion was **adopted** by unanimous voice vote, and Chair Bitterwolf adjourned the meeting at 4:10 p.m.

Next Meeting. The next meeting of the council will be held on **November 19, 2002.**

Respectfully submitted,

Peter A. Haggart
Secretary of the Faculty Council