University of Idaho
2012-2013 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #27

3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, May 7, 2013
Brink Hall Faculty Lounge
IWC Room 390 – Boise
213 – Coeur d’Alene
TAB 321B IF4 – Idaho Falls

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2012-13 Faculty Senate Meeting #26, April 23, 2013

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Committee Reports.
   • University Budget and Finance Committee (Budwig, via e-mail)
   • Sabbatical Leave Committee (Sprague)
   • President Diversity Council Subcommittee on Campus Culture & Climate Assessment & Continuous Improvement (Awwad-Rafferty, Hopper, Baillargeon)

VI. Other Announcements and Communications.

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Kenton Bird, Chair 2012-2013, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2012-2013 FS Meeting #26
University of Idaho
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
2012-2013 Meeting #26, Tuesday, April 23, 2013

Present: Aiken, Baillargeon, Stevenson for Baker (w/o vote), Bird (Chair), Budwig (Boise), Dodd, Eckwright (w/o vote), Flores, Frey, Goddard, Hartzell, Hasko, Hopper, Karsky, Kennelly, Kitchel, Mic, Miller, Ostrom, Pendegrift, Qualls, Safaii, Smith, Strawn, Stuntzner (Coeur d’Alene), Ytreberg

Absent: Garrison, Morra, Teal

Guests: 11

A quorum being present, Senate Chair Bird called the meeting to order at 3:30pm.

Minutes: It was moved and seconded (Karsky, Miller) to approve the minutes of meeting #25. Motion carried with three abstentions.

Chair’s Report. Chair Bird reported on the following items:

- Chair Bird and Faculty Secretary Eckwright met this morning with Interim President Burnett, who looks forward to working with the Senate during the transitional period. He indicated that he may need to consult with the Senate over the summer, so outgoing senators should be prepared if necessary for a special meeting on the call of the chair.
- Chair Bird, Vice-chair Hartzell, and past Senate chairs Don Crowley and Jack Miller, met last week with two representatives of AGB, the search firm that is working with the presidential search committee. The AGB consultant asked important questions about qualities that the faculty would like to see in the next president.
- Thanks to all senators who responded to my query over the weekend about qualities you would like to see in the interim provost. If you have not yet responded, please e-mail Chair Bird tonight with your suggestions. Candidates for the interim provost position will hold public forums next Monday and Tuesday, April 29 and 30.
- Chair Bird attended the Athena awards reception Monday evening, where leadership awards were presented to Jennie Hall, College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences (CLASS), staff award; Monique Lillard, College of Law, faculty award; and Jeanne Stevenson, vice provost, administrator award. Congratulations to all three winners.
- Chair Bird attended the State Board of Education (SBOE) meeting last Wednesday and Thursday, at which the board:
  - Approved a 5.0% increase in resident tuition, less than the requested 5.9%.
  - Approved selling general-obligation bonds that Vice-president Smith described to the Senate last week and are referenced in the minutes of meeting #25.
  - Did not vote on allocation of the legislature’s appropriation for Enrollment Workload Adjustments to the three universities and Lewis-Clark State College, deferring a decision to a special board meeting at a later date.
  - Argonaut reporter Kaitlyn Krasselt provided a full account of the tuition and fee discussion, available here: http://www.uiargonaut.com/2013/04/18/inadequate-increase/
- Vice-chair Hartzell and Chair Bird had lunch last Wednesday with Sarah Knudson, vice-chair of the Idaho State University Faculty Senate. Chair Bird came away with a greater appreciation of the relationship our senate leadership has with our president and provost and their commitment to shared governance.
- Chair Bird attended a meeting of the Safety & Loss Control committee, chaired by Senator Alistair Smith. He was pleased to hear of the committee’s willingness to work with students on the possibility of instituting a smoking ban on campus. This will be an item for next year’s
Senate. Watch for additional information about this in an e-mail addendum to the chair’s report.

- We have secured an additional commitment from President Nellis for the renovation of the Brink Hall faculty lounge over the summer. Chair Bird is awaiting a new construction timetable from the architect, but it’s possible that the Senate may need to find another location for meetings for the first month of fall semester.

- The University Faculty Meeting is next week, Tuesday, April 30 at 3pm (PT) in the SUB Ballroom. We need at least 95 faculty members statewide for a quorum to approve changes to the Faculty Constitution to give a senate seat to the Student Bar Association.

- April’s faculty gathering will be Friday from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. in the Commons Clearwater-Whitewater Room. This month’s gathering is hosted by the College of Graduate Studies. [N.B.: The College of Science was actually the host of this event.]

Provost’s Report. Vice-provost Stevenson reported on the following items:

- Keith Ickes, Executive Director of Planning and Budget, and senate guest today, will provide details about the significance of the SBOE’s decision to approve a 5% resident tuition increase as opposed to U-Idaho’s requested 5.9% increase.

- Those who are interested in the interim provost and executive vice president search are encouraged to attend the public forums next Monday and Tuesday, April 29 and 30.

- President search process:
  - It is Vice-provost Stevenson’s impression that the search firm’s representatives intend to open the process to nominations and applications in late summer or early fall.
  - Please consider who you may want to nominate and think about how we present ourselves in a recruitment mode, since we are recruiting both a president and a provost. Our work needs to continue, without pause, as we prepare for our next president.

- We are also recruiting for an interim Dean for the College of Law and a Dean for the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences.

- Institutional accreditation is part of the recruitment piece and we need to make an investment in it. Many of us are working through the strategic plan as it relates to our mission and core theme statements. The accreditation process is the topic for discussion at this week’s leadership breakfast and it will be brought to senate for discussion next year as we work through the process.

Chair Bird then introduced the consent agenda, consisting of two items, spring 2013 graduates list and Committee on Committees appointments. These items are considered to have senate approval unless a senator requests that an item be removed from the consent agenda for separate consideration. The “spring 2013” graduates list includes names of those who expect to graduate in spring 2013, pending successful completion of classes in which they are currently enrolled. The list also includes the names of those students who graduated in summer and fall 2012. Thanks to the Registrar’s Office for providing this list nearly three weeks in advance of graduation. The Committee on Committees under the leadership of Vice-chair Hartzell has put together committees for next year and these appointments require senate approval, as well. As no senators requested either item be removed from the consent agenda, the two items were deemed to have unanimous senate approval.

Chair Bird turned his attention to a series of committee reports, some of which have come to senate previously and others that are on the agenda for the first time. These items require senate approval before they may be considered at the University Faculty Meeting (UFM) next week. Any items that are not approved by senate today will be withdrawn from the UFM agenda.
University Committee on General Education and University Curriculum Committee: FS-13-052. Catalog J-3-d. Change “General Core” to “Integral Studies.” Chair Bird invited Jason Porter, chair of the University Committee on General Education (UCGE), to address the rationale for the proposed catalog change from “general core studies” to “integral studies.” Professor Porter reported that UCGE has been working to change catalog language regarding general education to get away from the use of the word “core” as part of the revamp of general education. This change will align U-Idaho with other universities in Idaho that do not use the term “core” and we want to be consistent with the other institutions. “General core” is the last piece of this change and after much debate UCGE came up with the term “integral studies.” A major consideration was that we did not want to make this group of courses seem any more important than any other essential courses that make up the general education curriculum. “Integral” seems a good term for these courses that are integrated in nature.

Professor Porter responded as follows to senators’ questions and comments:

- My sense is that people will not be happy with this as they were unhappy when we went from “core” to “general.” Why is “general” no longer a good term and what terms do our sister institutions use? This is a subset of general education. Overall, the courses that make up our general education now are referred to as general education curriculum. Others include science, mathematics, communications and this is one segment of that – this is the most disparate group with international courses, American diversity courses, great issues courses and other “outlier” courses that do not form a cohesive group. A lot of our courses are different from those at our sister institutions and I am not aware of them using a specific title within general education for them. We are trying to use the general education umbrella as this is part of general education and we gave it a title.

- Nationally the trend is for “general education” to replace “core.” The Association of American Colleges and Universities, the large umbrella organization for general education, has moved toward that term. Using this term helps our students to be consistent with the use of “general education” at peer institutions and for transferability. It is part of a national best practices use, i.e., “general education” in lieu of “core.” We thought “integral” was nice because it has multiple meanings, including a mathematics reference, and the meaning of “completing” something. Making this catalog change is a step by the registrar’s office to eliminate one more aspect of the use of “core” and then the requirement is to move to “integral.” [Senator Frey provided this response.]

- Did you survey any groups at the university to see how they feel about this term? No, we did not. Dean Aiken offered that a term used by another institution in the state is “foundational studies” and other institutions use a term like it.

- Do you know why the math and science requirements are not part of this since those courses are taken by everyone? The regulations are in the catalog – to break out general education into subsections, I guess, to make it easier to explain to students, but without Charles Tibbals here I hesitate to say that is the primary category.

- The original core requirements in the catalog many, many years ago entailed communications, mathematics, science, behavioral sciences and humanities. As our component increased in this area, including at one point some ten years ago core discovery and international, as we expanded that part it became this general core studies that complemented communications, science and math. It is partly a function of history, but each component is integral in that sense. [Senator Frey provided this response.]

- Is there any concern that Integral Studies may be confused with International Studies, commonly referred to as “IS” and using the IS prefix in the catalog? We did not have that discussion.

- We work with transfer students and at times we fall back on the SBOE core. Is the SBOE core considering changing their language, too? SBOE is currently looking at a reassessment of its competencies but at this time they are using the term “general education.” The University of
Idaho is the only institution the state acknowledges as having a transfer core – we use the SBOE core. All other institutions have their own general education requirements. We are looking at those competencies that all universities have to abide by in order to have ease of transferability. [Senator Frey provided this response.]

- **What term is the SBOE using for this particular segment of general education?** It is under revision. In summer 2010 the University of Idaho began discussing what we want to use for institutional best practices. Do we want to simply meet SBOE core or as the flagship institution do we want to make sure our students have the best possible liberal education that the general education can provide? We have components in our general education that other institutions do not have, such as ISEM 101, ISEM 301, international, American diversity and senior courses. This is unique to the University of Idaho. [Senator Frey provided this response.]

- The term “integral studies” does not necessarily pose a problem in relation to the term “general education” because “general education” is overarching in J-3 for all of those 30-plus credits, and as we have just heard this refers only to the 18-credit subset of “integral studies.” Using the term “integral studies” would prevent this part of general studies from being conflated with the overarching term for all of general education requirements.

- Using the term “integral,” which means essential for completeness, implies that the things not listed in this that are part of general education core are not required for a complete education.

- The term “integral studies” has a similar problem to “core,” as one of the concerns with the term “core” was the need for branding. “Integral” brings up the issue of the segment that is more encompassing – but it does not seem to be “integral” in that it is a piece of that, plus mathematics, science, and so forth. It does not seem to integrate any more than the other things that surround it.

- The term “integral” is used as “part” of the curriculum, just as “integral studies” is a component of general education.

After Chair Bird’s third request for senate action, it was moved and seconded (Pendegraft, Smith) that this be referred to UCGE for further consideration. Motion carried, 13 for, 5 against, with 4 abstentions.

**Faculty Affairs Committee. FS-13-039rev: FSH 3520 G-5. Tenure Committee.** Chair Bird invited Paul McDaniel, Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) member, to give a brief overview of this item. Professor McDaniel noted that this item addressing the composition of tenure committees was reviewed by senate in February 2013 but was referred back to committee for additional work on the language. FAC worked with General Counsel to come up with language that captured the desires of FAC, and those are the revisions brought to senate today. These changes allow units to determine whether to have student representation on tenure committees. Proposed changes allow for students to be appointed to tenure committees, but units are not required to have student representation on the committees as Board of Regents’ recently changed their policy and now does not require student representation. Regents’ policy does require that all committee members have equal vote and if a student serves on a tenure committee, the student must have vote. A number of units had expressed concerns about the student vote not being in their best interest and that some units have difficulty identifying a student to serve on the tenure committee. These proposed changes represent a compromise. A senator asked for clarification as to which part of the proposed policy changes are being discussed and Chair Bird indicated that these are the changes preceded by the notation “Below are Faculty Affairs revisions approved as of April 10, 2013, comes as a seconded motion.” The senator then inquired as to why the wording “one or more persons” is used in this section? It was explained that this wording is part of current policy and a senator suggested that this may refer to people in extension or perhaps it is intended to be more inclusive. University General Counsel Kent Nelson added that Board of Regents’ policy uses the phrase “one or more representatives” from outside the unit. A senator inquired if U-Idaho’s policy could be worded to require student representation on tenure committees, even though Board of Regents policy
does not require this? Mr. Nelson responded “yes,” and he added that board policy removes the board mandate for student membership but mandates that if there is a student representative on a tenure committee, then that student must have equal vote. Professor McDaniel said that some units on campus want to continue having students serve on tenure committees and that proposed language changes allow each unit to make that decision – if this option is provided for in the unit’s bylaws. It was moved and seconded (Kennelly, Goddard) to amend this by adding the word “sufficient” in the line “…the unit bylaws will address how student input will be accomplished…” The word “sufficient” will precede the phrase “student input.” Senator Kennelly further elaborated that ASUI is concerned with making sure students are involved in the process and if there is no requirement for them to serve on the tenure committee, the end result may be very little student input at all. Chair Bird asked Mr. Nelson whether adding “sufficient” would run afoul of Regents’ policy. Mr. Nelson replied that this is the kind of word that people like to argue but that adding it “would not be inconsistent” with board policy. The amendment was carried with a vote of 17 for, 5 against and 1 abstention. Chair Bird then called for the vote on the main motion. Main motion carried unanimously.

Senate sub-committee. FS-13-042rev: FSH 1565 D-1. Faculty Ranks. Instructor/Senior Instructor. A subcommittee comprised of Senators Garrison, Pendegraft and Smith has worked on this policy over the past weeks to address concerns that were first raised with senate two years ago. Under current Faculty-Staff Handbook (FSH) policy, those with instructor rank must be considered for promotion in their third year and if not promoted to senior instructor, they must be terminated in the following year. This policy is not uniformly enforced, which suggests that it may not be a good policy. Proposed changes to this policy would eliminate the “up-or-out” language and would alter the promotion consideration mandate with a requirement that if an instructor does not seek promotion after three years, then that instructor will go through a faculty review. The proposed language also provides for ongoing reviews of instructors, clinical faculty and lecturers by unit faculty at approximately five-year intervals. This language is similar to that for clinical faculty, who are also non-tenure track, and for whom there should be a periodic peer evaluation process by faculty apart from any annual evaluation by administrators. The other critical part of these proposed changes increases the unit cap on senior instructors from 15% to 25%. The proposed 25% cap will apply to all voting non-tenure track faculty, i.e., instructors, senior instructors, clinical faculty and lecturers who have served four or more consecutive semesters at half time or more. Chair Bird added that after this item was distributed to senators last week, it was sent to Mr. Nelson, who proposed a slight editorial amendment in section 1565 A-1 dealing with academic ranks and responsibility. Mr. Nelson explained that for purposes of bylaws, “unit” is defined as any university organizational structure below the faculty senate, which includes colleges, departments and any number of units. Striking the words “department or similar” before the word “unit” gives the opportunity for there to be inconsistencies in the cap between a college and department within the college. Senator Pendegraft noted that during the subcommittee’s discussions they were informed that “unit” was synonymous with “department.” Chair Bird commented that Mr. Nelson had suggested addressing the ambiguity of what constitutes a unit by using the words “department or similar unit” in place of the word “unit” but we did not send that language to senate because we did not want to send too many changes at one time. We could make that language change as an editorial amendment if the subcommittee views the proposed language as acceptable. Dean Aiken inquired if a “school” is a similar unit to a “department”, e.g., do we know that the School of Journalism and Mass Media (JAMM) is similar to a department? Mr. Nelson asked if there are departments within JAMM and Chair Bird said “no,” but that there are departments within the Martin School. Mr. Nelson said that the FSH currently uses the wording “department or similar unit” in the discussion about the cap and he recommends returning to that language.

Senator Pendegraft added that there is an issue with the use of some terms, such as the term “instructor,” which is used in multiple ways. In this particular policy we are using the term “instructor”
to refer to those who hold the rank of instructor. We need to be clear in policy that we are talking about instructors who hold the rank of instructor and that does not include a classroom teacher who may be referred to as an “instructor” or has "instructor" in their title, but who does not hold the rank of instructor.

Senators Smith and Pendegraft responded to questions and comments as follows:

- **Is there a cap only on instructors and no other category?** The cap is on only “senior instructors” which differs from the rank of instructor.

- **How does the cap apply to a division that employs 4-5 [tenure track] faculty and 7-8 non-tenure-track clinical faculty?** The unit refers to the 7-8 non-tenure-track as “clinical instructors” and “clinical faculty” and these terms possibly are used interchangeably. There is ambiguity as to whether the terms are being used formally or informally. If 7 of 12 faculty in the division are instructors, then the division is over the cap, regardless of whether the cap is set at 15% or 25%; but if those faculty do not hold instructor rank, that is a different question as there are some units that hire people and give them long titles that include the word “instructor,” but these people do not actually hold the faculty rank of instructor. The intent of this is to preserve the professoriate, and professors and faculty in general have quite a different philosophy in their teaching style than do instructors. This discussion was part of the charge given to the subcommittee. Chair Bird added that some units refer to faculty as “instructors” when, in fact, they are lecturers who do not have the academic rank of “instructor.”

- **The phrase “… or a lower limit as defined by the unit’s bylaws …” seems unnecessary since departments are able to make the decision not to hire another instructor into a department if they choose not to do so. Choosing to stay under the cap is not a violation; a violation occurs only if the department goes over the cap.** It would be best to keep the language as proposed because hiring decisions are made by administrators. A concerning scenario is if half or more faculty in a unit are non-tenure-track and not subject to review by regular faculty and therefore fundamentally beholden to deans and department heads – that is not an attractive scenario, so it is best to keep the language as currently proposed.

- A senator asked how we count individuals when calculating the cap – do we count full-time employees as one and two part-time employees as two? As it is written this policy seems to refer to positions rather than to FTE. It has been suggested that we look at FTE when counting for the cap.

- If there is a department with eight faculty, two of whom are clinical, and one resigns – is the department out of compliance with the policy?

- Some U-Idaho departments currently have significantly more than 25% of their teaching faculty who are non-tenure-track. The same argument applies to the existing cap figure of 15%. There are units that are well above that cap already – whatever the figure is, it is somewhat arbitrary.

Vice Provost Stevenson observed that perhaps if some terminology were more concretely defined it would eliminate some questions. One question relates to the definition of “unit” and the other relates to who is a faculty member. Also, there is merit in considering whether the cap is a management tool or a mandatory requirement. Chair Bird then said that senate cannot adequately deal with the complexity of these issues in the time remaining at today’s meeting. Unless there were objections, he suggested referring these items back to the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) for further consideration, along with a record of today’s discussion and including Vice provost Stevenson’s excellent questions about applicability and enforcement of this policy. There were no objections raised and Chair Bird directed these items to be returned to FAC for consideration with the expectation that they will return to senate early in the fall semester. Thank you to Senators Garrison, Pendegraft and Smith for their work.
FS-13-051: FSH 4220. Academic Cooperation between U-Idaho & Institutions of Higher Education. Chair Bird next invited Heather Chermak, senior associate registrar, to speak about changes to this policy which have been reviewed by General Counsel. Ms. Chermak said that current language in FSH 4220 no longer reflects our practices of the past several years regarding cooperative programs. These changes originated more than a year ago and it was mistakenly thought that the changes had come through senate at that time. The rationale for the proposed changes is the need to update processes and create more efficiency in managing cooperative course data.

Ms. Chermak responded as follows to senators’ questions and comments:

- **This proposed policy is very trimmed out. As you redo these cooperative arrangements, will we be incorporating those details that were in the old catalog or do you plan to leave it more flexible?** We worked with General Counsel when we removed the part about collaboration and procedures, as those do not belong in the Faculty-Staff Handbook. The procedures need to be flexible, as systems and policies change within the university and we want to have the flexibility to change procedures.
- **Where will the procedures reside now?** Since most of it has to do with registration and other topics, most of it will reside in the Registrar’s Office.
- **Since we are not designating language for cooperative courses in the catalog, is it correct to assume that the University Curriculum Committee would establish procedures for how those courses would be listed?** Yes.
- **It appears that since we have deleted sections B, C and D, we no longer need a section A, and that we would have a preamble and general policy without the “A”? That would be an editorial amendment.**
- **Could we make another editorial amendment to add the words “and administrative support services” to the list in the sentence that begins with “These cooperative efforts may include … “?** The final sentence would then read “These cooperative efforts may include the cooperative listing of regularly offered courses between the two institutions, the exchange of faculty members on a semester basis and administrative support services” and striking the words “should also be considered when developing cooperative programs” of the currently proposed last sentence. Chair Bird asked the Faculty Secretary to make this editorial changes.
- **Faculty senate last year or the previous year worked with the registrar on cooperative courses. Colleagues who participated in that work feel that some of the proposed changes make participation in cooperative courses more difficult because of processes the registrar says need to be followed. In the past, departments decided to designate a course as “cooperative” and they worked through the curriculum committee. If the course was approved as a cooperative course, then students could take the course by signing up at U-Idaho and they could take courses at WSU and vice-versa. Now you have to register as a non-degree student and transcripts must be sent back-and-forth. It has become more difficult. We need more faculty input on the entire subject of how to handle cooperative courses in a way that facilitates student and faculty participation.** The faculty participation part has not changed in regard to where you make that agreement and going through the curriculum committee process for approval. The piece that has changed is our ability to make sure that we are keeping track of our students participating at a U-Idaho campus whether from WSU or another university. We need to know where those students are at a given time and our process in the past did not permit us to account for those students from the other institution. There is a risk management factor in this that we have taken care of through our new processes. Then there is the transcript exchange which is done at no cost to the student. We literally are meeting at the state line on a given date and exchanging transcripts. We are transcribing that information on the student record so it is available for any other evaluation on part of a faculty member. It has been a hard transition this year but we are getting better at it.
and we have not heard many complaints from students. We have talked with many faculty about the process and we are working through their concerns.

- **Chair Bird asked the senator whether the concerns about how the cooperative courses are being implemented have any bearing on the handbook language changes under consideration at senate today or are those concerns better addressed in a follow-up conversation with the registrar?** The senator responded that the procedures have been removed from the handbook and left to reside in other places, so the concerns probably do not have to do with the FSH matter at hand.

It was moved and seconded (Baillargeon, Flores) to accept these changes to *Faculty-Staff Handbook 4220*. Motion carried with 22 for and one opposed.

**Teaching and Advising Committee.** Chair Bird next invited Miranda Anderson, chair of the Teaching and Advising Committee (TEAC), to provide a report on the committee’s activities. Professor Anderson highlighted the committee’s work reviewing the student evaluation process:

- The committee reviewed handbook language that guides their work as well as FSH 2700 which mandates a review of the student evaluation of teaching forms and processes “at least every five years.”
- TEAC first established a context for the review process with the assumption that given the economic factors, a move from online evaluations back to print format evaluations is not an option at this time.
- TEAC gathered information for their review from three key groups: administrators, faculty and students. The next step in the review process is to complete the compilation of the information that has been collected and to write a summary report.
- Both faculty and students have concerns about response rates on evaluations.
  - Both groups said that evaluations are more helpful when either completed during class or when done on paper.
  - Students reported that the biggest obstacles to completing evaluations are that it is easy to forget to do them and the timing of when they are asked to complete them is a problem.
  - Students reported that they would be more likely to complete them if evaluation were done during a class period and if they were done earlier in the semester when students are less busy.

Professor Anderson responded as follows to senators’ comments and questions:

- **In your discussion of best practices did you consider giving department chairs or administrators a “veto” on teaching evaluations? Sometimes there are a few evaluations that are personal and inappropriate attacks on the professor or the instructor of record, but those evaluations are still included in the average for tenure and promotion purposes. Some of the comments may suggest that “the professor should be fired” and no reason is given for the comment other than that the student does not like that person.** Yes, it could be part of the best practices discussion but we have not yet discussed it from that particular perspective. One of the themes repeated many times in the faculty responses to our questionnaire is the desire for the content of the evaluation questions to relate more to learning outcomes. The hope is that evaluations will become more focused on input as opposed to so broad that anyone can interpret anyway they feel. We can certainly address that more.

- **Do people give points to students for completing the evaluations and, if so, is it ethical?** We have heard of some people who do that. The way it is done is to say “if we reach a 90% response rate in this class, then everyone will get extra points.” You cannot give individuals points for completing the evaluations; you would have to give extra points to everyone or no one.
Chair Bird suggested that perhaps the TEAC committee members could present compiled survey results to senate next fall.

Chair Bird then invited Keith Ickes, executive director for planning and budget, to speak about the fiscal impact of the Board of Regents’ decision on tuition increases, employee dependent tuition benefit and revenue allocation for distance education. Mr. Ickes reported that U-Idaho requested a 5.9% increase in the basic resident undergraduate tuition rate, but the board approved 5% without discussion or input. The difference in the requested rate and the approved rate represents approximately $500,000 less revenue. We have not yet made decisions yet as to where to go with the budget based on the 5% increase. Other budgetary factors include:

- The board has not yet allocated $5 million in state appropriations for enrollment workload adjustment. By some formulas we are to receive $1,341,000 in normal adjustment.
- The board had entertained some discussion last week about allocating the entire $5 million on a different basis and BSU is making a big push for more funding now.
- We met with the board and made the case that the enrollment workload adjustment has been in place for many years, we followed it last year and we should follow it again this year. The board was generally supportive of our position but they elected not to make a decision today referring the matter back to the BAHR committee for review.
- The BAHR committee then will make a recommendation back to the general board who will meet in the next week or two to determine the issue. The BAHR committee has supported the normal workload adjustment in the past but if they do something other than that workload adjustment, U-Idaho stands to lose one-half million dollars. This additional half-million loss combined with the loss in fees and tuition would equal $1 million in revenue loss which would result in some level of budget reductions.
- If our overall budget is down “only” one-half million dollars as a result of the tuition decision we will need to determine whether that requires any budget reallocations across the university or whether we can find balance points with some of the other changes.

We will have budgetary difficulties if enrollment dips again next fall. Enrollment was down this past year, resulting in a $2.3 million shortfall on tuition revenue relative to the budget, but we covered the entire shortfall with one-time funds from central reserves. We hope that if enrollment falls again next year we will have sufficient central reserves to again cover the shortfall, although central reserves funds are low. An increase in overall enrollment of tuition-paying students would have a positive effect on the budget. This year we saw an increase in enrollment that was all due to high school students taking one or two courses for $65 per credit hour and while head count was up, tuition revenue was down.

Mr. Ickes then talked about the Dependent Educational Tuition and Fee Reduction Policy (FSH 3780). He apologized for a misunderstanding earlier in the year relating to implementation of the policy. Mr. Ickes had understood that there would be a policy change relating to this and he had waited for that to happen. It was eventually clarified by general counsel that a policy change was not needed. The new practice that was approved by senate is that an individual can receive a combination of employee dependent tuition waiver and university-funded tuition up to a maximum of resident tuition. Resident tuition this fall will be $4500 and the waiver will be worth roughly $3750. The value has gone up since the original proposal because tuition has gone up and it is equivalent to 50% of tuition and fees. For example, if someone receives a resident merit award of $2500 plus a need-based award of $1000, they will not be able to use the full waiver – and this is the part that Mr. Ickes thought would be a policy change but later learned from general counsel that it would not be a policy change. President Nellis is satisfied with the proposed changes. We will prepare the new forms after he signs the policy and be operating with the procedural changes approved by senate for the coming academic year.
A senator suggested that the subcommittee working on this policy brought recommendations to senate but those recommendations were not necessarily “approved” by senate. Chair Bird responded that the recommendations had come to senate as an information item and it was assumed that it did not require a formal change to FSH policy language. The senator asked if this is then more appropriate for the Administrative Procedures Manual (APM) than to the FSH? He added that there is still some tweaking that could be done to the language but that he is satisfied with it as it was discussed in the four-person subcommittee and presented to senate in December 2012. Vice chair Hartzell suggested that we may want to clarify the language in the FSH, which has not yet been done and the senator agreed that it is something that needs to be studied and perhaps placed in the FSH. Chair Bird said that next fall we will have had a full academic year to know the number of students who participated and the fiscal impact, and that may be the time to go forward with additional review of the FSH policy.

Mr. Ickes then referred senators to the handout titled “Summary: Proposed Off-Campus Centralization and Base Budget Allocation Plan” which deals with outreach programs. Outreach tuition includes web-based courses, other forms of distance instruction and traditional face-to-face instruction at a site other than Moscow. The process under that model has been direct revenue attribution on a per-credit-hour basis of $129 per-credit-hour in tuition and $26 per-credit-hour in fees with the department receiving a total of $155 per-credit-hour for outreach instruction. This current process takes that from a revenue attribution (per-credit-hour distribution) and creates permanent base budgets in each of the colleges (column labeled “Proposed Allocations – College/Unit”). These figures were arrived at by reviewing a three-year rolling average of outreach tuition and FY2013 was weighted double thus giving emphasis on direction of change which resulted in a weighted average. Central administration collects 17% of the weighted average and that 17% is equal to the $26 fee formerly collected by colleges. Additionally:

- There is no further revenue attribution, although footnotes 4 and 5 indicate revenue attribution will continue for the College of Education but this is not strictly true. Revenue attribution to the accounting system has been changed and is no longer functioning.
  - CoE outreach revenue has been dropping which made it difficult to determine a base.
  - CoE and the provost reached an agreement for this coming year. A budget will be set for the College of Education (CoE) and it will be lower than any of the figures earned in current years. If at the end of the year CoE exceeds that base, it will get the additional revenue.
  - CoE has three years to turn this decline around and establish a new base.
- Credits can go up or down and colleges will continue to receive the base budget.
- Programs that are predominantly web-based instruction will be brought forward for distance education.
  - Those programs will be funded in a different manner, i.e., not revenue attribution basis.
  - Colleges that propose programs will create a budget that will be base-funded for the first couple of years of the program with all revenue collected centrally.
  - This provides an incentive for developing programs because they will receive base funding and this approach discourages the development of one-off courses that are not systematically incorporated into a program. The goal of this model is to incentivize the completion of programs both at the undergraduate and graduate levels.
- Total collection by central from this process is $460,000 which would have been used to initiate new things. Now we need to use these funds plus another $1 million in reallocation to the base budget in order to cover the shortfall in tuition for this and future years.
- The state of Idaho is not providing more funding for those who may choose to focus on the Complete College Idaho plan. The state has one way of funding institutions and that is through the enrollment workload adjustment model based on weighted credit hours.
- College of Science participates in the College of Engineering’s engineering outreach program. Engineering outreach is a “sidebar” program to all of the other outreach programs and it is
available to those who teach courses that can be marketed through engineering outreach. The supplemental engineering outreach data has not yet been added to this model.

At Chair Bird’s request, Vice Provost Stevenson spoke broadly about the status of efforts to develop a degree available entirely through distance education. A workgroup met earlier this year to review possibilities and worked to make a general studies degree available in a fully online working model. This model does not assume that students have ultimate choice. By the end of summer it is likely we could enroll students in fall and offer the degree – we just need to fill a few gaps. Dean Aiken pointed out that the College of Science received the smallest impact from the changes to the outreach model, whereas “a certain college” was on the receiving end of the “largest impact” from these changes. Chair Bird noted that the University Budget and Finance Committee (UBFC) had discussed this at length a week ago and Senator Budwig, chair of UBFC, had planned to provide additional commentary but he was unable to continue at the meeting due to the lateness of the hour. Chair Bird will invite Senator Budwig to review the minutes from today’s meeting and provide any additional information to senate that would summarize the UBFC’s discussion of this matter.

Adjournment: Senators enthusiastically embraced the last item on the agenda and it was moved and seconded (Smith, Qualls) to adjourn at 5:32pm. Approved unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Gail Z. Eckwright
Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Senate
Hello Kenton – Great to see you here in Boise and thanks for traveling around the State.

Good to be able to review the minutes. I have few points that I think are quite relevant:

1. Assuming the “Off-Campus Centralization and Base Budget Allocation Plan” is implemented - it is very important to note that the settlement base funds will be remitted to each respective College. Thus it will be the Dean who will decide what will be done with the settlement base funds. Unit leaders and/or faculty who were receiving off-campus fees need to be aware of this. They will need to contact their Dean if they want to request a part of the base fund settlement in lieu of the off-campus fees that have vanished.

2. Keith talked about the opportunity to fund new distance education programs. But what about existing ones that grow. Is there a model to provide additional funds to these beyond the proposed “settlement base funds”?

3. During our April 9th UBFC meeting I specifically asked Keith about returned fees from Summer Programs. I recall him saying that changes are being considered for the future but there will be no changes for summer of 2013. We need clarification on this point.

Please feel free to wordsmith these points and follow-up with me if you need clarification.

Best - Ralph
President’s Diversity Council: 
Campus Culture & Climate Assessment & Continuous Improvement Committee

Co-Chairs: 
Rula Awwad-Rafferty 
Jane Baillargeon 
Brian Hopper

http://www.uidaho.edu/diversityandhumanrights/diversitycouncil

"Assess campus climate and make recommendations for improvement framed by the University strategic plan and presidential priorities”.

- Definitions
- Measurements
- Intersections
- Goals and Impacts

2012-2013

- Growing the subcommittee
- Focus on lessons from survey findings shared in 2012
  - Address gaps from 2012 results
  - Staff surveys spring 2013
  - Focus groups fall 2013
- Points of convergence
- Appreciative inquiry and assessment

We have revised and administered the Staff Survey spring 2013.
- Data and report will be available sometime in June.
- The revised survey included areas which the committee determined last year needed additional data collection.

Ongoing and Proposed

- Strategies to effectively contribute to assessing and making improvements to campus culture and climate relative to diversity
- Appreciative Inquiry Perspective
  - Ripple Mapping: implementation in Fall 2013
  - Multiple capitals framework
  - Reward system
- Solicitation of feedback & recommendations for future directions
  - Presentation to faculty senate, spring 2013
  - Cultural Competency Training with Faculty Senate at their retreat in the fall
  - Research into microaggressions
- Recommend articulating “Diversity goals and action plans”