

Spring 2012 – College of Natural Resources Faculty Meeting

05 April 2012 – Faculty Lounge, Brink Hall, University of Idaho

Meeting opened by Karen Launchbaugh, CNR Faculty Secretary

Attending: Brian Kennedy, Brenda McGuire, Christine Moffitt, Courtney Conway, David Tank, David Roon, Janet Rachlow, Jay O’Laughlin, Jo Ellen Force, Karen Launchbaugh, Katy Kavanagh, Kelly Wendland, Kerry Reese, Kurt Pregitzer, Lisette Waits, Mark Coleman, Nick Sanyal, Penny Morgan, Ronald Robberecht, Steve Bunting, Steve Hollenhorst, Tom Gorman, Troy Hall

College budget update by Dean Pregitzer: College budget is looking pretty good. No problem closing out fiscal year at end of June. College is making good progress towards becoming more stable. Several new hires will occur in the next few months. Thanks to all for time invested in interview processes. Dean Pregitzer asked Kerry Reese to provide job description information for Dr. Garton’s position so we can request that position be filled next fiscal year. We won’t know what UI budget looks like in solid form until end of May.

Discussion regarding direct and indirect cost recovery: Good discussion ensued but no clear consensus on the topic. Topic tabled until Fall 2012 to allow discussions among faculty and CNR Leadership. Dean Pregitzer suggested conversing with colleagues regarding the topic. There is a lot of dialogue and discussion with deans at the national level regarding this topic. To establish a good policy it is important for faculty to have enough of a dialogue about it so that the majority feels comfortable with policy implications. It is important to the college to increase indirect cost recovery so we can do more in the college.

Ideas for curriculum reform by Steve Hollenhorst. A discussion about curriculum reform came out of leadership team when the Dean requested a look at curriculum and ways to create efficiencies and consolidate courses so we as a group can pursue more research and outreach opportunities. The Curriculum Reform Committee identified every course, which programs those courses are required in, and now we know where our courses are embedded in curriculum. The Curriculum Reform Committee has looked at enrollment trends, identified pre-reqs, etc., and has benchmarked programs with other programs in the Western US. Jessie, a grad assistant, has done a lot of research and has learned that many peers have a basic “generalist” degree which we may consider. Also looking at surveying graduates and employers to see what they’re looking for. Group is drafting a set of guiding principles and is currently looking at whole body of courses and how we can be more efficient. We have 165 courses in the college with about 40 faculty. That’s about 4 courses per faculty on average. The dean asked all to consider what it would be like if there were 2 courses per faculty, or 3 courses including 1 graduate course. We discussed the opportunity to hire an instructor or two who teaches full time. Still it seems apparent that we need to reduce the number of courses offered; especially if a 1:1 teaching load is a goal. Real efficiencies may occur by collaborating across departments. Nothing is proposed for elimination anything yet. The Curriculum Reform Committee needs faculty input. Representatives on the task group are from all departments and programs.

Timeline is to get a general sense of where we’re going with CNR curriculum reform by end of semester, give faculty and programs time in the last few weeks to look at it, and get potential revisions in a form for a vote in the fall, and on track for catalog changes by September 30.

Mentoring policy: Dr. Troy hall reminded us that we voted to have a mentoring policy in the fall faculty meeting. Dr. Hall presented an update policy after looking at policies at peer institutions. The proposed CNR policy is therefore a “middle of the road” consolidation of what our peers are doing. There was general agreement with duties and responsibilities. Biggest question was confidentiality and the role of committee in evaluations. Sense of faculty was that the main goal of the mentoring committee was to support and advise the faculty mentee. A statement was added to the policy that recommendations of the mentoring committee would be “confidential, but mentee may choose.....” Hope to circulate for electronic vote and get into bylaws. Ron Robberecht asked if mentoring committee members could also serve on 3rd year T&P committees. It was pointed out that to ensure confidentiality, the mentoring committee and the T&P review committee cannot be the same. After additional discussion, we voted whether or not mentoring committee members should be allowed to serve on T&P review committees for their mentee. The vote indicated that faculty who serve on a mentoring committee should be allowed to serve on the T&P committee. Dr. Hall made a few additional changes to the proposed policy based on consensus suggestions. Troy will add language that members can be from outside the university. Revised CNR Mentoring Policy will be sent for an electronic vote.

Faculty Representatives: There are 3 positions for Faculty Representatives are open for fall 2012: Faculty Senate Rep, Faculty Senate Rep Alternate, and Faculty Secretary. Nominees will be secured and a vote will take place before the fall semester.

Minutes of Fall Meeting: Suggested changes to minutes of fall meeting were sought. No suggestions or corrections were given. Motion to accept minutes from Fall 2011 CNR Faculty meeting was made by Mark Coleman. Jay O’Laughlin second. Vote to accept minutes was approved.

Meeting adjourned 4:39.