

University of Idaho
FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES

2002-2003 Meeting #11, Tuesday, December 10, 2002

Present: Wagner (vice-chair), Bailey, Baillargeon, Cloud, Daley Laursen, Fairchild, Guenther, Haggart (w/o vote), Lillard, McCaffrey, McClure, McGuire, Nelson, Netzer, Pikowsky, Johnson (w/o vote), Rahim, Rinker **Absent:** Bitterwolf, Chandler, Hong, Reese, Schekler **Observers:** 1

Call to Order. A quorum being present, Faculty Council Vice Chair, Professor Francis Wagner, called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m. in the Brink Hall Faculty Lounge. Wagner noted that Chair Bitterwolf could not attend today's council meeting because he was attending the SBOE/Regents meeting.

Minutes. The council accepted the minutes of the November 19, 2002, meeting as distributed.

All University Meeting. A meeting of the U of Idaho community will be held on Friday, December 13th beginning at 1:00 pm in the ASUI/Kibbie Activity Center. U of Idaho President Bob Hoover will preside and lead a question and answer session concerning the financial crisis facing the university.

Degree Candidates – Summer and Fall 2003. The Faculty Council was in receipt of the list of Summer and Fall 2003 candidates for degrees to be awarded at the December 14th commencement ceremonies. As is the custom and duty of the Faculty Council (representing the entire faculty), it was **moved and seconded** (Fairchild/Guenther) **that the list of candidates provided by the Office of the Registrar be approved.** The motion was **adopted** by unanimous voice vote.

Sabbatical Leave Recommendations. The Faculty Council was in receipt of a memorandum from the provost **recommending a list of faculty members to be awarded one and two semester sabbatical leaves during the 2003-2004 academic year.** The list came as a seconded motion from the Sabbatical Leave Evaluation Committee. The motion was **adopted** by unanimous voice vote. The list will be published and is also available for inspection at the Office of the Faculty Secretary.

FC-03-021, Proposed Revision of Faculty-Staff Handbook Section 3320, Annual and Periodic Performance Evaluations and Salary Determination of Faculty Members and Performance Evaluation of Academic Administrators. Professor Kerry McKeever, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, provided the council with background information on the proposed changes.

A-1. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION. Annual evaluation of the appropriate [performance](#) of each member of the faculty is, primarily, the responsibility of the faculty member and the unit administrator concerned. The provost is responsible for preparing supplementary instructions each year, including the schedule for completion of the successive steps. The form to be used, "Annual Performance Evaluation Form 1: Evaluation of Faculty," is appended to this section. [See also 3380 C.]

d. Evaluation of Faculty by Unit Administrators. Unit administrators evaluate their faculty members; the performance of each faculty member over the period covered by the evaluation is judged on the basis of the position description(s) in effect during that period. In the case of faculty members holding joint appointments in two or more academic or administrative units, it is the responsibility of the administrator in the faculty member's primary academic discipline to solicit and consider relevant information on job performance from other administrators with responsibility for the faculty member's work. [See also 3080 E.]

~~Ratings are determined by comparing the faculty member, primarily, with other members of the unit faculty and, secondarily, with other members of the same profession nationally.~~ Ratings are determined by comparing the faculty member's performance to the position description and the weightings set forth in the departmental by-laws approved by the unit members [effective Fall 2003]. The results of the student evaluation of teaching are carefully weighed and used as a factor in this evaluation. For each area of responsibility evaluated, the unit administrator shall describe the basis for conclusion/judgment in assessing the performance of the faculty member. The ratings and additional comments or narrative as the evaluator deems appropriate are entered as indicated on the form. The annual evaluation score for an individual faculty member in Form 1 relates to the individual faculty member's performance evaluation relative to his/her job description. The overall unit average is provided so that each faculty member can gauge his/her performance relative to other faculty members within the unit. After the unit administrator has completed written evaluations and ratings of faculty for the annual review, he or she shall provide, as they become available:

The council engaged Professor McKeever in an informative discussion of the reasons for the changes and the implications of the changes for faculty members and administrators.

McKeever pointed out that the changes were intended to strengthen the use of position descriptions as the guide by which to judge a faculty members' performance. She also emphasized that guidelines were to be developed by the faculty of each academic unit and then placed in the academic unit's by-laws. The idea being to put the guidelines for evaluation and salary determination in the hands of the faculty of an academic unit, rather than leaving them in the hands of the academic administrator. Furthermore, these guidelines would then be approved by the college dean, who would be responsible for seeing that all of the guidelines within the college adhered to the general principles set out in the Faculty-Staff Handbook. The departmental guidelines could be viewed as clarification and application of the handbook regulations regarding promotion, tenure, and salary determination.

McKeever reminded the council that one of the prime reasons for making changes in the evaluation process over the past three years was because there was little uniformity in the processes being used. Her comments were supported by the remarks of Vice Provost Leonard Johnson, who pointed out departmental criteria and the position description of the faculty member would become a part of the package of materials sent forward to evaluation committees.

In response to a councilor's questions about existing departmental guidelines, which stressed "numbers" instead of quality of work, McKeever noted that the university had already instituted training sessions for academic administrators. She hoped that this training would put an end to the often vague guidelines and provide the faculty members with meaningful and achievable expectations. Although the number of publications and exhibitions might carry some weight in some departments, the department guidelines must take into consideration any number of components that would eventually make up the professor's professional portfolio and eventually make its way into the administrative narrative statement that would accompany the professor's material. Another councilor pointed out that having all of these pieces will prevent the faculty member from just aiming at the low end of some arbitrary scale.

Professor McKeever said that the essence of all of the changes was to return to the faculty member a good measure of control over his or her future and the guidelines that would be followed in the evaluation process. The faculty member is a participant in the development of the guidelines and will be reviewed and evaluated in the context of his or her position description.

Councilor Daley Laursen concluded the discussion by saying that, if the council really wanted to move away from the "counting" mentality of evaluation and toward a complete portfolio approach to evaluation, then the most influence for change must come from members of the faculty.

It was **moved and seconded** (Fairchild, Bailey – later editorially changed by Daley Laursen) to amend the motion from the Faculty Affairs Committee by **adding the following notation to each sub-part of A-1, b.** ***"including full consideration of the unit's priorities."***

b. Performance levels in each criterion evaluated are described as follows:

- i. **Exceptional Performance (5)** is extraordinary performance well beyond that required relative to the position description, including full consideration of the unit's priorities.
- ii. **Above Expectations (4)** represents performance which is better than that expected relative to the position description, including full consideration of the unit's priorities.
- iii. **Meets Expectations (3)** is the performance expected of a faculty member relative to the position description, including full consideration of the unit's priorities, that can be defined as normative.
- iv. **Below Expectations (2)** denotes performance that is less than that expected of a faculty member relative to the position description (including full consideration of the unit's priorities) and means improvement is necessary. A rating of this type triggers procedures outlined in 3320 B.
- v. **Unacceptable Performance (1)** is performance that is not acceptable relative to the position description (including full consideration of the unit's priorities) and/or is inconsistent with the conditions for continued employment with the institution. Failure to meet these standards in any of the following ways will result in a rating of unacceptable performance:
 - a) received a "1" rating the previous period but did not make the improvements required.
 - b) consistently violated one or more of the institution's standards for meeting the expectations of the position
 - c) violated one or more standards of conduct as specified in the *Faculty/Staff Handbook*

The motion to amend was **adopted** by majority vote (13 yea, 1 nay, 1 abstention)

The initially considered **proposed changes**, coming as a seconded motion from the Faculty Affairs Committee, and **as amended**, was **adopted** by a majority vote (14 yea, 1 abstention).

Following the adoption of the main motion there was a **brief discussion of the use of student evaluation of instruction and courses** in the overall faculty evaluation process. Councilor Cloud said that he understood that the percentage of students completing on-line evaluations was very low. He suggested that there needed to be some statistical notation attached to these evaluations indicating a minimum participation rate required for them to be used in the evaluation process at all. Vice Provost Johnson reported that the current rate of participation was 37% (as reported on December 9th) and there was still a week or more to go in the evaluation process. He suggested that we reserve judgment about the effectiveness of the on-line evaluation until after the two-year trial period had been completed.

FC-03-022, Proposed Discontinuance of the B.S. Ag. Econ. Degree in Natural Resources and Rural Development. Councilor Nelson provided the council with background information concerning the discontinuance of this degree program. In response to a councilor's question, Nelson explained that there would be no effect on the department's graduate degree offerings or graduate assistants employment. The motion (coming as a seconded motion from the University Curriculum Committee) was **adopted** by unanimous voice vote.

FC-03-023, Proposed Modification of the B.S. Degree in the Animal Sciences Curriculum to Convert Current Majors to Degree Options. Councilor McGuire provide the council with background information concerning the proposed changes. After a brief discussion the motion (coming as a seconded motion from the University Curriculum Committee) was **adopted** by unanimous voice vote.

FC-03-024, Proposed Discontinuance of the Agricultural Economics Minor. Councilor Nelson provided the council with background information concerning the discontinuance of this minor. After a brief discussion the motion (coming as a seconded motion from the University Curriculum Committee) was **adopted** by unanimous voice vote.

FC-03-018, Proposed New Degree Program in Virtual Technology and Design. (Tabled 11/12/02) Councilor McClure said that there was a pending meeting with the architecture faculty concerning this degree offering. Until the council hears from the Architecture Department the agenda item remains on the table.

Discontinuance of Academic Programs. Councilor Rinker wanted to know if the council would be discussing the email sent to the council by a member of the engineering faculty. That email expressed concern over the process used in discontinuing two engineering programs. It called particular attention to, what was in his view, a lack of faculty participation in the process and the failure to move the affected tenured faculty members to other programs. Rinker noted that his dean had said that there really isn't a UI handbook procedure for discontinuing a program that corresponds to the new SBOE/Regents regulations (*Section III. G. 8. and 9.*). He said that his college (engineering) curriculum committee discussed the discontinuance of those programs at great length, but nobody wanted to vote. The proposed closures seemed to be a financial rather than a curricular issue. With reference to the discontinuances approved by the Faculty Council today, Councilor Nelson said that discussions concerning those programs began at the department level in the context of a more general curriculum reorganization plan. Vice Chair Wagner noted that most program closure discussions would probably start at the college level. Adding that all colleges are faced with making large cuts, but the expectation is that college faculty will have a great deal of input in the decision-making process.

Professor Haggart pointed out that the discontinuance of programs is addressed in the U of Idaho Faculty Constitution (*Article IV, Section 12*). That section calls for consultation with the faculty in reaching a closure decision, but does not call for a vote. Therefore, it is possible for colleges to discontinue programs, departments, and majors without ever seeking general faculty approval. However, the implication in the constitution is that faculty members in the affected college would be consulted about the proposed discontinuation of an academic program.

Other councilors wondered how this situation might be addressed in the future. Vice Provost Johnson said that the handbook regulations needed to be reviewed and possibly changed to reflect the board policy that governs the way the university handles program closures. Johnson said that the result of a college curriculum committee not voting on a closure meant that the program closure would not be forwarded to the University Curriculum Committee, and thus not to the Faculty Council.

Vice Chair Wagner told the council that Chair Bitterwolf is involved in on-going discussions with the provost concerning these issues. Everyone would like to see more faculty input on the discontinuance of programs. Wagner said that an equitable solution was being sought by Bitterwolf.

Adjournment. It was **moved and seconded** (Lillard, McClure) to adjourn. The motion was **adopted** by unanimous voice vote, and Vice Chair Wagner adjourned the meeting at 4:39 p.m.

Next Meeting. The next meeting of the Faculty Council will be held on **Tuesday, January 21, 2003.**

Respectfully submitted,

Peter A. Haggart
Secretary of the Faculty Council