

University of Idaho
FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES

2004-2005 Meeting #15, Tuesday, February 15th, 2005

Present: Bailey (chair), Adams (w/o vote), Anderson, Baillargeon, Exon, Farnen, Geist (sitting in for Gunter), Greever, McLaughlin, McMurtry, Morris (w/o vote), Reid, Rinker, Woolston, Young, Zemetra

Absent: Beard, Bechinski, Cloud, Gunter, Hammel, McGuire, Reese

Observers: 2

Call to Order: A quorum being present, Faculty Council Chair Bailey called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m. in the Brink Hall Faculty Lounge.

Minutes: The minutes of Meeting #14, February 8th, 2004, were approved as distributed.

Chair's Report: Chair Bailey expressed the hope that all members of Faculty Council had been able to attend the university convocation the previous Friday or had been able to read the president's comments (accessible via the president's page on the web).

Provost's Report: Provost Morris took a few minutes to clarify the budget figures presented in the president's report of last Friday. One has to remember that while the revenue attribution figures given there are additions to the colleges' base budgets for FY 2006 and following years, these are monies that the colleges have historically had to spend, even though they have not been historically a part of their base budgets. Thus to arrive at the true figure for how much each college will have less to spend next year (and subsequently) the revenue attribution monies need to be subtracted from the FY 2006 budget proposals. She also emphasized the president's directive to the colleges that the "new" revenue attribution monies added to their base budgets should not be viewed as an opportunity to replace what would otherwise be loss through budget cutting but should be viewed as an opportunity to strengthen a college's strongest programs, even at the cost of deeper cuts to the college's weakest programs. In response to a comment from a council member, she acknowledged that, since 80% to 90% of a college's budget was devoted to salaries, budget reductions would probably result in the loss of positions.

As early as tomorrow the final version of the "prioritization tool" would be published. She emphasized that any prioritization should be based on both quantitative and qualitative measures. Draft budgets from the colleges and other administrative areas are due into the president by March 11th. The week of March 21st will be given over to presentations from the various deans and vice presidents to the central administration of these proposed budgets. The president will then accept, modify, or reject these proposals. She reiterated the emphasis the president expected to see on reallocating resources to the colleges' strongest programs and the concomitant reallocation of resources away from, and perhaps the elimination of, weaker programs. She also cautioned that programs should not be taken as the equivalent of departments; programs might be majors within a department or groups of service courses.

Announcements and Communications: Chair Bailey introduced Kimberly Farnen as a prospective new representative from ASUI. Her confirmation to this post is expected at the next ASUI Senate meeting.

Provost Morris reported on the final report from NWCCU concerning the university's institutional accreditation. The university's accreditation has been reaffirmed on the basis of NWCCU's comprehensive evaluation in October 2004, based on the institution's self-study and the site visit by

NWCCU representatives. While accreditation had been reaffirmed, as is usually the case, the accrediting body would be wanting interim progress reports on a number of issues, sixteen in number, where the institution did not fully meet the accreditation standards. The university is to prepare an interim report on certain of these issues and host a visit by representatives of NWCCU in the spring of 2006 and a second interim report and visit on the remaining issues in fall 2007. [Items for spring 2006 are (numbers refer to NWCCU's report): (1) review of institutional mission statement, (3) evaluation of Board of Regents effectiveness, (6, 7) policy changes to ensure public trust, identification of a solutions for ongoing and cumulative deficits, (8) plan to increase liquidity and operating reserves, (9) creation of a comprehensive plan of checks and balances on spending, (10) board consideration of a well-function internal-audit system, (12) disparity between university and State Board core requirements concerning math, and (14) development of a comprehensive, university-wide assessment program. Items for fall 2007 are: (2) development of an inclusive process of strategic planning, (5) maintenance of the appropriate number and quality of faculty to maintain quality and timely student achievement, (13) alignment of mission and enrollment management to the priorities emerging from UVRT, (15) establishment of leadership stability by filling positions permanently now held by interim appointments, and (16) a sufficiency of core library collections to support graduate education and research. Only recommendation (11) deferred maintenance is not mentioned as a concern for one of these two visits.]

General Orders:

FC-05-020: Changes in Committee Structure. A set of changes to the structure and/or function of several Faculty Council committees was brought to council as a seconded motion from the Committee on Committees. The subsequent discussion centered not on the proposed changes themselves, which were seen as routine, but on the question of student membership. Several committees have as part of their memberships student representatives. However, rarely is it specified as to whether those students should be undergraduate or graduate. The faculty secretary recounted a bit of the history of student memberships, pointing out that these memberships had been established usually at a time when ASUI was the sole student representative body and suggested that if the Graduate Student Association, the Student Bar Association, and the ASUI wanted to get together and make comprehensive proposals about student membership of Faculty Council committees, that would serve everyone's interest better than trying to tackle the process on an ad hoc basis. The motion on the changes proposed by the Committee on Committees carried unanimously.

FC-05-021: FSH 2300: Student Code of Conduct, Article II, Academic Honesty, and FC-05-023: FSH 5400: Employment Agreement Concerning Patents and Copyrights. These two proposed changes came to Faculty Council as seconded motions from the Faculty Affairs Committee. The proposed changes in part A of 5400 were the result of an attempt to find realistic language concerning the disclosure by a faculty member to the university concerning possible patentable inventions conceived or brought to fruition using university resources. The difficulty in demanding that all such possibilities be disclosed is that the investigator him- or herself may not be aware of all patent possibilities, thus the suggested language has the investigator "excerciz[ing his or her] best efforts." The complete rewording of part B, concerning copyright, results from the necessity of conforming the university's policy to that of the state board. The proposed change to part C is also an attempt to find realistic language concerning students and visiting scholars' responsibility to the university in participating in research programs at the university. The original language states that such participants must sign a memorandum of understanding concerning the university's rights to patentable results from the research; the proposed language would state only that such participants would be informed of those rights.

One of the proposed changes to FSH 2300 is a companion to the FSH 5400. The proposal is to insert language that would make clear that data collected as part of a university-sponsored research project belonged to the university. Fran Wagner, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee presenting the proposals,

agreed that this language fitted a bit awkwardly in this section of the Student Code of Conduct but said that an attempt to find a better location in the Handbook had failed. A second proposed change was the addition of “anti-hacking” language.

Discussion of the proposed changes to 2300 centered on what “unauthorized use” of university computers meant. It was moved and seconded (Greever, Bailey) to add a reference to the ITS guidelines on this subject as a way of clarifying the language. The amendment carried unanimously. The vote on the amended changes to 2300 carried unanimously.

The discussion on the proposed changes to 5400 centered on how difficult it really was to obtain signatures from students and visiting scholars (and thus whether it was really necessary to change part C at all) and whether the new wording of part B, despite its being state board policy, was inconsistent with the way in which the College of Graduate Studies currently handled theses and dissertations (certainly the boilerplate language inserted at the beginning of theses and dissertations concerning the assignment of literary rights to the university would seem to be inconsistent with this policy). It was moved and seconded (Anderson, Young) to table consideration on 5400 until such time as the faculty secretary is able to explore these issues with the College of Graduate Studies. The motion carried unanimously.

FC-05-022: FSH 3520. The third proposal from FAC concerned FSH 3520 “Faculty Tenure.” The proposed language, arrived at in consultation with the provost and the deans, was an attempt to promote consultation, during a faculty member’s probationary period, among dean, department head, and faculty, and if requested, the possibility of written reasons for non-renewal of an untenured faculty member, particularly at the time of the third-year review. Fran Wagner pointed out that we cannot change the line of authority or impair the right of a dean or provost to reach a judgment very divergent from that of a department concerning the retention of a probationary faculty member; however, we can require more consultation between these parties and that is what the proposed changes attempt to do. After some discussion it was moved and seconded (Rinker, McLaughlin) to specify that the departmental bylaws should contain detailed procedures for the appointing of a committee to conduct the third-year review and for how it conducts the process. The third sentence of H-3 would read: “The detailed procedures for appointing the committee and conducting the third-year review are developed by the faculty of each department and made a part of the departmental bylaws.” The motion to amend carried unanimously. The main motion, thus amended, carried unanimously.

Adjournment: Noting that it was already 5:08 p.m., it was moved and seconded (Baillargeon, Young) to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Q. Adams,
Faculty Secretary and Secretary of Faculty Council