University of Idaho

2019 – 2020 University Faculty Meeting Agenda

Meeting #1

Wednesday, September 18, 2019 at 2:30pm (PT) / 3:30pm (MT)

Pitman Center, International Ballroom and
ZOOM to approved site locations

President Scott Green Presiding

I. Call to Order

II. In Memoriam

III. Meeting Logistics
   • Eligible members of the faculty to vote
   • Approved voting venues
   • Counters present at approved voting venues
   • Submit questions through Zoom chat if not in Moscow

IV. Approval of Minutes (vote)
   • Minutes of the 2018-2019 University Faculty Meeting #3 (May 1, 2019) Attach. #1

V. Announcements

VI. Special Orders
   • Introduction of new faculty members and recognition of 2019 Promoted/Tenured
     Faculty including University Distinguished Faculty rank bestowed

     Each college dean will introduce the new members of the faculty by name and unit as
     well as the faculty who were promoted/tenured this year.

VII. President's Remarks

VIII. Discussion: Questions/Answers

IX. Adjournment

Attachments:

• Attach. #1 Minutes of the University Faculty Meeting #3 (May 1, 2019)
Call to Order: President Staben, called the meeting to order at 3:02 pm PDT.

In Memoria. The President read the names of university faculty members who died since the last university faculty meeting:

- Thomas Bitterwolf  
  Professor in Chemistry  
  February 2019

- Jerome Dahmen  
  Professor in Animal Science  
  April 2019

- Maxine Dakins  
  Professor in Environmental Science  
  March 2019

- Anthony K. Dunnam  
  Professor Emeritus of Computer Science  
  December 2018

- J.D. Makin  
  Extension Professor Emeritus of Animal Science  
  January 2019

- Florence White  
  Professor Emerita of Education  
  October 2018

The President requested a moment of silence in honor of these former colleagues.

Quorum Count: A quorum was present. 107 voting members of the faculty were required, 113 members were present (Moscow - 89, Boise - 5, Idaho Falls - 10, Twin Falls - 4, CDA – 5).

Minutes: A motion (Lee-Painter/Wiencek) to approve the minutes of University Faculty Meeting #2 on December 5, 2018 was approved unanimously.

Announcements:

President Staben announced the successful VIP-Transform Projects:

1. Momentum Building Freshman Lab Experience in Cross-Disciplinary CUREs  
   Kris Waynant, James Moberly, Mark Roll, and Paul Rowley
2. A Transformative Online Learning Approach to Enhance GenZ Learning in Engineering Courses.  
   John Crepeau, Barry Willis, and Terence Soule
3. Blazing Trails Abroad. Kate Wray Chettri, Rachel Halverson, Bob Neuenschwander, and Laurie Barker
4. Vet2Vandal: A Bridge to College Success. Elizabeth Kochevar, Jason Nierman, Karla Eitel, and Lee Vierling
5. Multicultural Academic Success Program. Jesse Martinez, Sydel Samuels, Evelina Martinez, and Yolanda Bisbee

The president also announced that an open forum on the university’s finances will be held in the Administration Auditorium on the Moscow Campus on May 7, 2019 at 9:00-10:15 PDT/10:00-11:15 MDT. The forum will be available by Zoom.

Report of the Faculty Senate.

Prof. Aaron Johnson, Chair of Faculty Senate, presented the report:

FS-19-071: FSH 1570 – Secretary of the Faculty passed unanimously.

FS-19-072: FSH 1520 – Constitution of the University Faculty (requires quorum & 2/3rd affirmative vote). A faculty member asked how the revisions would impact the functioning of the faculty senate. Faculty Secretary Liz Brandt responded. She pointed out that the current faculty secretary position would be divided into two positions a .5 policy coordinator and a .25 faculty secretary. The faculty secretary will no longer be responsible for supporting the drafting, development and communication of university policy. This should enable the secretary to focus on faculty governance and on support of faculty senate. The proposal passed unanimously.

FS-19-073: FSH 1580 – Bylaws of Faculty Senate (requires quorum & majority vote). The proposal passed unanimously.

FS-19-075: FSH 1640.41 – Faculty/Staff Policy Group. The proposal passed unanimously.

FS-19-076: FSH 1640.28 – Committee on Committees. The proposal passed unanimously.

FS-19-077: FSH 1640.42 – Faculty Affairs. The proposal passed unanimously.


FS-19-064: FSH 3720 – Sabbatical Leave. A faculty member asked why the form was eliminated from the policy. Secretary Brandt responded that she has advised eliminating forms from policy so that the forms may be more easily kept up-to-date and may be digitized where appropriate. When the form is part of policy, the policy must be revised to change the form. The proposal passed unanimously.

FS-19-053: FSH 3340 – Performance Evaluation of Staff Employees (see APM 50.21 below). The proposal passed unanimously.

FS-19-080: FSH 3420 – Faculty Salaries. The proposal passed unanimously.


FS-19-024: FSH 1640.46 – Arts Committee. The proposal passed unanimously.


FS-19-062: FSH 1640.08 – Admissions Committee. The proposal passed unanimously.

FS-19-082: FSH 1640.22 – Campus Planning. The proposal passed unanimously.


FS-19-084: FSH 1640.90 – General Education Assessment Committee. The proposal passed unanimously.


FS-19-067: FSH 1520 – Constitution of the University Faculty. This change to the constitution was not substantive, but instead was a minor edit that added a historical footnote that originally resided in FSH 1566. The proposal passed unanimously.

FS-19-068: FSH 1566 – Appointment to Faculty Status. The proposal passed unanimously.

After reviewing the above changes to the Faculty-Staff Handbook, the chair called attention to revisions in the Administrative Procedure Manual. He reminded the assembly that these items come through Senate and the University Faculty as informational items to more broadly communicate these changes and invited questions. A faculty asked for an explanation of the changes in APM 30.15 regarding passwords. Mitch Parks, Director of Security for IT, explained that because the university has instituted dual authentication, it is in a position to relax its password policy. These changes reflect the relaxed policy.

Finally, Chair Johnson proceeded to the changes to the university catalog.

FS-19-070 (UCC-19-051): Plus/Minus Grading. A faculty member commented that the last time a proposal to change the grading system was before the faculty on 5/4/2015 he spoke in favor of it. He believes that the change was a good idea then and is a better idea now. He stated that President White vetoed the proposal. The faculty member commented that he was sorry it has taken so long to get through the committee and back to the faculty. He commended the Teaching and Advising Committee (TeAC) for proposing the policy. He also commented that postponing implementation of the change for four years in order to ensure that the change is only implemented for prospective students was a good idea.

A faculty member asked what students think of the proposal. Senate Vice Chair Grieb responded that several polls have been conducted. The results varied strongly across different groups. However, he stated that it appears that in general, students do not support the policy. The student votes on TeAC were mixed. The Graduate and Professional Students Association (GPSA) voted in favor of the proposal. Grieb believes that many students feel the proposal adds stress to the grading process because it will increase close
grading decisions at the end of the semester. In addition, not all students are convinced that faculty will implement the proposal fairly. In this regard, student comments echo some of the faculty input on the proposal such as making too many distinctions that will not be grounded in clear objectives. Further, students believe the plus/minus system will negatively impact top students’ grades. This view seems to be especially strong among students in STEM fields and other majors that are perceived as difficult. Finally, many students perceive that the decision to postpone implementation until 2023 is an “end run” around students.

The former chair of TeAC, Prof. Stephan Flores, spoke in favor of the policy. He stated that the one student member who voted in support of the plus/minus system was the ASUI vice president who had been very engaged in the research regarding the use of plus/minus grading. This research indicated that plus/minus grading is often more nuanced and allows for greater transparency. He also stated that students with 4.0 grade point averages (GPAs) constitute less than 3% of the students. The impact of plus/minus grading will even out – helping some students and not others across that spectrum of student performance. He agreed that plus/minus grading may be a source of stress for some students, but also stated that the system offers the opportunity for more nuanced faculty judgment. Where plus/minus grading has been adopted it has lead to only a small change in overall GPAs. In the survey conducted by TeAC, 269 faculty participated and 78% supported plus/minus grading and believe they can make the required decisions to appropriately assess student work. Finally, he pointed out that the change would bring UI’s grading system in line with the other Idaho institutions.

A faculty member expressed appreciation for the information provided and expressed concern that a plus/minus grading system would lead to grade inflation. He also asked to hear more of the pros and cons of the proposed system.

Chair Johnson responded that one of the pros of the new system is that it will be harder for students to “coast” on earlier grades. Students may have more incentive to keep their level of effort high because they may be able to have more influence on their grade. He also pointed out that, with regard to grade inflation, the new system does not include a grade higher than 4.0.

Flores responded that at other schools that have shifted to a plus/minus system the argument was that the system provides a greater hedge against grade inflation. Once the system has been implemented, other schools have not experienced a statistically significant shift in cumulative GPAs. In one study there was a small shift down. The plus/minus system provides a finer-grained view of student’s academic performance and can provide a better understanding of a students’ academic journey toward a degree.

A faculty member stated that he believes the plus/minus system will provide students more motivation to keep their level of performance up throughout the semester.

The proposal passed with 77 votes in favor.

President’s Remarks. President Staben began by thanking faculty for the great professional honor of serving as president of the University of Idaho. He is thankful for the hard work and accomplishments of the past five years. He encouraged faculty to continue to strive for excellence, and he underscored his belief in the power of land grant universities and their mission to teach, discover and serve. He underscored the continuing relevance of the land grant mission to the UI.

During the past five years he has worked to enhance access to higher education through direct admissions and scholarship funding. Student retention and graduation rates have increased. UI researchers have
conducted research and scholarship with substantial impact. This research has been in both traditional and emerging fields. Staben pointed to UI’s crop research and industry partnerships such as the Center for Agriculture, Food & the Environment, the Sandpoint Organic Agriculture Center and the new potato germplasm laboratory. Staben complemented the Natural Resources Fire Science and Species Restoration at the Rinker Rock Creek Ranch facility. He highlighted the Center for Secure and Dependable Systems which is competing successfully in the Cyber Grand Challenge sponsored by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency.

President Staben also commented on the enhanced integration of research into the undergraduate experience. The recent undergraduate research symposium had 183 participants. He noted that one student who had several posters at the symposium was currently in Washington DC presenting a different poster. These opportunities are facilitated by the undergraduate research office.

President Staben also discussed various partnerships to promote health, leadership and economic prosperity. The Caminos al Futuros program continues to thrive through the Juntos program being promoted by 4H. The WWAMI program has added programs focused on opioids and behavioral health. The program is expanding into its new facility on Sweet Avenue. The Law program has successfully expanded in Boise.

Staben thanked all those who participated in the programs he mentioned and concluded by acknowledging that they are only a partial list of the successful work at the university.

President Staben thanked faculty for their belief in the UI and for their commitment to keeping UI strong. He urged faculty to continue to work toward excellence as they meet the challenges ahead and to work together to respond to challenges. He expressed his optimism that incoming president Scott Green is bright, capable and will work closely with faculty to continue to build on the progress UI has already made.

On a personal level, President Staben urged faculty to think about meaning and importance of their work. UI is bigger than any of us. He encouraged faculty to use their window of time at the institution wisely and intentionally. The UI’s special mission has motivated him and he is sure it has motivated faculty.

A faculty member thanked President Staben for his service and asked what advice Staben would give to incoming President Green to build a positive and productive relationship with the faculty and what advice he would give faculty to support Green’s presidency. President Staben responded that he believes it is of critical importance that President Green take action early to build a strong relationship with faculty. Doing so will involve talking with faculty in various venues and ways. Staben stressed, however, that there is no “magic” advice he could give regarding faculty/president interactions. The president’s goals are more focused on institutional concerns than are the goals of individual faculty members. Faculty should consider how they are contributing to the university’s mission. President Green will want to rely on faculty for that support so that he can get the resources and authority necessary to advance the UI mission to donors and other supporters. Faculty play a large role in building a president’s credibility.

Chair Grieb thanked President Staben and read the following resolution adopted by the Faculty Senate into the record:

In Recognition of his Service and Leadership, the Faculty, Staff and Students that Comprise the Faculty Senate at the University of Idaho Adopt this Resolution in Honor of Dr. Chuck Staben

WHEREAS Dr. Staben has served since 2014 as the 18th president of the University of Idaho; and
WHEREAS Dr. Staben has worked continuously to improve the access of all Idahoans to high-quality higher education; and
WHEREAS Dr. Staben promoted the development of a state-wide direct admissions program, free admissions processing for all Idaho residents and a durable admissions program allowing admitted students to defer attendance for up to four years; and
WHEREAS Dr. Staben has championed the funding and development of the University’s new ICCU Arena; and
WHEREAS Dr. Staben has fostered and supported the growth in the University’s research programs including revising the university’s approach to intellectual property and fostering the development of the Center for Agriculture, Food and the Environment; and
WHEREAS Dr. Staben has embraced and promoted the highest ideals of the land-grant mission for Idahoans and the United States;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate expresses its gratitude for the contributions made by Dr. Chuck Staben during his service at the University of Idaho and in support of higher-education in Idaho; and extends its best wishes as he returns to full time faculty responsibilities.

Adjournment: A motion (Wiencek/Cannon) to adjourn passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 4:55 PDT.

Respectfully Submitted

Liz Brandt
Faculty Secretary