

University of Idaho
2008-2009 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA
Meeting #10

Tuesday, November 4, 2008, 3:30 p.m.
BRINK HALL FACULTY LOUNGE

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.

- Minutes of the 2008-09 Faculty Council Meeting #9, October 28, 2008

III. Chair's Report.

IV. Provost's Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.

Transportation Committee
Student Appeal – FSH 2450

FC-09-005:

- Off-campus Faculty Council Representation (Miller)
- Rename Faculty Council to Faculty Senate (Miller)

VII. Committee Reports.

Faculty Affairs Committee:

FC-09-010a: FSH 3050 Position Description (redline)

FC-09-010b: FSH 3050 Position Description (proposed final)

FC-09-011a: FSH 3320 Annual Evaluation (current)

FC-09-011b: FSH 3320 Annual Evaluation (redline)

FC-09-011c: FSH 3320 Annual Evaluation (proposed final)

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

- Program Prioritization Process

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Karen Guilfoyle, Chair 2008-2009, Faculty Council

Attachments: Minutes of 2008-2009 FC Meeting #9, October 28, 2008
Transportation Function
FSH 2450
FC-09-005: Constitution (distributed previously)
FC-09-010a: FSH 3050 Position Description (redline) (distributed previously)
FC-09-010b: FSH 3050 Position Description (proposed final) (distributed previously)
FC-09-011a: FSH 3320 Annual Evaluation (current) (distributed previously)
FC-09-011b: FSH 3320 Annual Evaluation (redline) (distributed previously)
FC-09-011c: FSH 3320 Annual Evaluation (proposed final) (distributed previously)

University of Idaho
Faculty Council Meeting Minutes
2008-09 Meeting #9 Tuesday October 28, 2008

Present: Baird, Baker (w/o vote), Battaglia, Chandler, Crowley, Das, Eveleth, Fairley, Frey, Fritz, Guilfoyle (chair), Holbrook, Hill (w/o vote), Huber, Limbaugh, Machlis, Miller, Murphy, Oman, , Schmeckpeper, Schmiede, Sullivan, Williams, Wilson, Liaisons: Budwig (Boise), Crepeau (Idaho Falls) Newcombe (Coeur d'Alene)

Absent: Holthaus

Guests: 4

A quorum being present, the chair called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. in the Brink Hall Faculty Lounge.

Minutes: It was moved and seconded (Wilson, Fairley) to accept the minutes of the October 21 meeting (Meeting #8) of the 2008-2009 Faculty Council as distributed. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair's Report: The chair urged the faculty to be proactive in the PPP and work together with the administration by sending ideas forward and working in a spirit of cooperation. The Provost has some important new aspects to share about the PPP.

The chair then noted that the Deans (Provost's Council) were working hard on the PPP, but it was very important that they get information out to faculty early in the process.

Provost's Report: The provost noted that there may be some confusion about the roll out of the PPP. The challenge is to ensure that we structure the university to be a vital player in the state, nation and internationally for the future. The vision is that the university will be a vital organization. He noted that we have great assets in our faculty, staff and students, an amazing state with bounteous natural beauty and pristine environments along with agriculture, high tech and low tech industries. This is an amazing laboratory in which to work. There are huge opportunities for UI and for Idaho. The renewal that has been called for is not just a short-term solution. It is the opportunity to begin with a new page in the history of the university.

The provost then outlined a new aspect of the PPP that had its inception through his interactions at recent FC meetings. The new element of the PPP would seek to mine the ground-swell of wisdom from across the UI community. He then distributed notes summarizing the PPP to date and incorporating the new element. This draft document is entitled "Transformation of the University of Idaho". The provost spoke to the elements of the handout – briefly, the current context and drivers for change at UI; the vision articulated by President Daley-Laursen; the approach to the Strategic Action Plan implementation and the measures of success; the process for university transformation; the issues around budget reallocations for 2008 through 2010; an overview of the current program prioritization process and review criteria; and finally the provost then presented in greater detail the new element of the PPP, the University Reformation RFP Process. This process is designed to seek input from across the UI community: faculty, staff and students. Proposals will be reviewed by a group with representatives from the Provost's Council, Faculty Council, Staff Affairs Committee, Strategic Plan Implementation Goal Teams and Student Governments. RFPs would have two phases, phase 1 will entail RFPs solicited from the university community. Pre-proposals will then be submitted to the committee for review. Pre-proposals will be mapped relative to PPP recommendations for synergy and reviewed by the committee. Selected pre-proposals will then move to full proposals. In phase 2, full proposals will need to include a business model, timelines and an assessment plan submitted for review. Full proposals would be reviewed by the committee and recommendations made to appropriate councils. The President/Provost

will determine the final full proposals for implementation. In another category, process re-engineering, proposals will be similarly reviewed to improve university effectiveness and efficiency. Pilot projects in selected areas will be undertaken in the fall. Full proposals from the RFP process with implications for engineering will be reviewed and re-engineering options evaluated. Recommendations will be made for re-engineering projects and a sub-set will be included in a final selection. Pre-proposals will be two to four pages.

Questions:

Is this a totally new concept?

The idea arose from discussion in FC meetings. Additional details were built off a University of Arizona model that is currently in use by Arizona. The idea is to build vision and enthusiasm.

How do you see the RFP and the PPP integrating?

The two processes will have to come together very closely. Programs that rank low will be phased out. The programs that we build on will be identified in the top and middle tri-tiles.

Is there a dollar figure allocated for this kind of process? What incentives will be provided that there will be funds available to support these initiatives?

It is hoped that funds will be identified. None are specifically allocated at this time. Possible allocations will only be identified at the earliest after the first Coarse review process.

Is this approach different from the blue ribbon initiatives, not a reinvestment of funds? Is it to be cost neutral or is it for great ideas that generate funds?

Yes different from the blue ribbon funding process and not a reinvestment of funds. It is designed to be cost-neutral and to generate funds. This may involve reallocated resources, but not necessarily.

This plan seems to imply that everything is broken at the university and there will be wholesale change. What of programs that are running successfully now? They may be de-valued by this process.

The intention was not to under-value those programs that are running well. However, programs that are good now have the potential to be even greater.

What is the time-line for implementation of the RFP Process?

The call for RFPs will go out in mid-November and the first phase proposals will be due in mid-January.

When will the first announcements from the Coarse Review process be made known to the UI community?

The Provost's Council will meet on November 8 and communications will be out soon after. There will be a period for feed-back and a more detailed analysis will be available the Thursday before the Thanksgiving break.

The chair noted that it was planned that materials from the Coarse Review would be considered by the FC meeting on December 2 and possibly December 9. FC should plan for long meetings on those days.

The handout notes that initiatives will need to be cost-neutral revenue-enhancing. Does this mean that the review will really be looking for cost savings?

For phase 2 proposals, the business plan will need to detail these items. They won't be needed for the phase 1 proposals.

The provost sought general FC reaction to this plan. The consensus was that the plan was a great way to build the visioning process and to get faculty involved. The structure of having a pre-proposal followed by a more detailed proposal was also strongly supported.

The provost requested feedback from FC on the proposal before it would be authorized for release to the UI community. The council overall seemed very pleased with the RFP concept and the presentation.

Other Announcements and Communications: The chair circulated a form for faculty nominations for the university promotions committee. Faculty from across UI were eligible to serve and nominations are encouraged. The letter from the Provost's Office asked that faculty consider the broad cross section of academic duties for the professorate, scholarly work via teaching, research/creative activity, and outreach and service, when making your nominations. It is important to have a committee that on the whole is representational of these major pursuits. I encourage you to nominate professors who are seen as leaders in their colleges and departments. The responsibilities of the committee collectively are to understand and implement the university's policies regarding tenure and promotion.

The chair noted that we would be short on time for the remainder of the meeting and requested approval to change the order of business. Consideration of the ombuds revision would be followed by a brief presentation from Faculty Affairs Committee chair covering the changes to position description and annual evaluation forms.

FC-09-009: FSH 3820 – Ombuds Office. Dr. Fazio presented the intended changes to the FSH ombuds section. Two main changes were to recognize both ombuds (faculty and staff) with equal status and the second issue was to add to the ombuds' responsibilities to include student issues. FC briefly discussed the issues. A concern was raised that including students in the client portfolio for the ombuds would greatly increase the work-load. Dr. Fazio indicated that the work-load increase had been considered and was estimated to be about one student issue per week. This was within scope of a reasonable work-load. The provost commented that this system worked well in other universities. It provided the Dean of Students with relief from issues that sometimes arose in which the office was both in a policing role and an advising role where a potential for conflict-of-interest issues might arise. Thus, the neutral role of the ombuds extended to students was a win-win solution.

The motion to support the changes was adopted as proposed (Wilson, Miller) with one abstention.

FC-09-010a-011c: FSH 3050 & 3320 - Position Description and Annual Evaluation forms. The Faculty Affairs Committee chair briefly presented an overview of the changes to the forms. The major changes included the way outreach is described, and in addition the nine categories used previously were collapsed to four. A concern was raised that interdisciplinary activities were not well addressed. In reply, the FAC chair noted that there were several places in which interdisciplinary activities could be described. This included sections in scholarship, teaching and outreach. Another concern was that committee service did not appear to be well addressed. The FAC chair noted that these activities were addressed in the section entitled "University Leadership and Service".

The chair urged FC members to reflect the proposed changes with their constituent faculty.

Adjournment: It was moved and seconded (Miller, Schmeckpeper) to adjourn at 5:07 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Rodney A. Hill
Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Council

Faculty Council member sought to serve on Transportation Committee: Identify pedestrian conflict areas around campus. Further work will center on analyzing pedestrian, vehicular, bicycle, and transit means of transportation and ensuring all modes work together in the smoothest and safest manner possible. Also, UI's sustainability goal will be considered and incorporated into the work.

FSH 2450 - APPEALS TO FACULTY COUNCIL IN DISCIPLINARY CASES

PREAMBLE: This section, added to the Handbook in May, 1984, outlines the appeal process in student disciplinary cases. For further information, contact the Dean of Students (208-885-6757).

A. RIGHT OF APPEAL. "Any party to a disciplinary hearing shall have the right to appeal the decision to the faculty or its duly authorized representative. Subsequent appeals may be taken to the president and to the regents when the president and the regents agree to hear the appeal." [2200 IV-11]

B. APPELLATE JURISDICTION. "The Faculty Council has appellate jurisdiction over all student disciplinary proceedings and must comply with section IV, paragraph 11, item (d), of the 'Statement of Student Rights.'" [2400 B-3]

C. PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENT. "Appellate bodies shall establish their own procedures; these must include adequate notice to the parties and sufficient opportunity for the parties to prepare their arguments." [2200 IV-11(d)]

D. PROCEDURES. Pursuant to the authority and responsibility cited above, the Faculty Council has established the following procedures for the exercise of its appellate jurisdiction over student disciplinary proceedings:

D-1. If a party to a disciplinary proceeding desires to lodge an appeal with the Faculty Council, the party must notify the Faculty Council to that effect, in writing, within two weeks following receipt by the party of the written decision of the University Judicial Council (UJC).

D-2. Within two weeks after receiving a notice of appeal, the Faculty Council appoints five of its members, including one student, to constitute a panel with power to act on its behalf in hearing and deciding the appeal; one of the members is designated as chair. Persons appointed to the panel must have no interest in or involvement with the parties to or the subject matter of the case under appeal.

D-3. The panel, as soon as possible after its appointment, sets the date, time, and place for the hearing and provides notice thereof, in writing, to both parties. The time set must provide the appellant with adequate opportunity to comply with the requirement stated immediately below.

D-4. The appellant must submit a brief to the panel, and see that a copy is delivered to the appellee, at least one week before the hearing date; a copy must be provided for each member of the panel.

D-5. The appellee must submit a brief to the panel, and see that a copy is delivered to the appellant, at least one day before the hearing date; a copy must be provided for each member of the panel.

D-6. A transcript of the UJC hearing is provided to the panel and to both parties by Student Advisory Services.

D-7. At the hearing, the appellant is allowed 15 minutes for oral argument; the appellant may reserve a maximum of 5 minutes for rebuttal following the appellee's argument. The appellee is allowed 15 minutes for oral argument and may not reserve any time.

D-8. Oral arguments are recorded on tape and the tape is stored in Student Advisory Services.

D-9. As to questions of law, the panel may review the record of the UJC hearing and all the evidence presented therein and may make an independent resolution of those questions of law.

D-10. As to questions of fact, the panel may reverse the decision of the UJC only on a showing of clear error. Further, on appeal by the university of an adverse UJC ruling, the defendant may not be placed in jeopardy a second time; the purpose of such an appeal is the clarification of rules and establishment of precedent.

D-11. The findings and decision of the panel must be based on concurrence of a majority of its members; these are issued in writing to the parties.