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A quorum being present, Senate Chair Hartzell called the meeting to order at 3:31pm.

Minutes: It was moved and seconded (Stoll, Awwad-Rafferty) to approve the minutes of meeting #24. Motion carried with abstentions by senators Latrell and Wolf.

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

- After last week’s senate meeting, Greg Walters, executive director for human resources, kindly provided information requested by Chair Hartzell, who forwarded the information to senators. Mr. Walter’s data shows that more than 75% of the approved appeals were in facilities and administration positions. Many of the facilities positions were raised from Grade 1 to Grade 2 in an effort to offer a basic living wage and have no UI employees at the Grade 1 level ($10.89/hour).
- A memorial service for Jane Baillargeon will be held on Wednesday, April 16, at the Nazarene Church. Chair Hartzell will attend the service and hopes that others will be able to attend, as well.
- State Board of Education (SBOE)/Board of Regents will be meeting at UI in Moscow on April 16 and 17. They will be looking at student tuition and fee rates on Wednesday. President Staben will give his progress report to the board on Thursday. Meeting materials are available at: http://www.boardofed.idaho.gov/meetings/board/archive/2014/04_16-17_14/index.asp
- Today is Senator Awwad-Rafferty’s birthday – happy birthday!
- Annual Silver and Gold Celebration will be held April 17 and former interim president Don Burnett will receive an Honorary Alumni Recognition.
- Friday, April 18 is the second Vandal Friday event this spring. This will be “the last of its kind” as the Vandal Friday events are being redone.
- Annual Tutxinmepu Powwow will be held this weekend, April 19 and 20. Faculty senate endorses this event. For more information: http://www.uidaho.edu/nativeamericancenter/tutxinmepupowwow
- UI’s Cultural Literacy & Competency Symposium will be held all day on Monday, April 21. This symposium is co-sponsored by faculty senate. For more information: http://www.uidaho.edu/pdl_portal/calendar#/?i=1
- Daniel Trautvetter is a guest at senate today. Mr. Trautvetter, Brian Mahoney, chair of staff affairs, and Chair Hartzell met with the president’s cabinet earlier today to discuss a proposed APM change regarding tobacco-use that is on senate’s agenda today. Chair Hartzell noted that there have been some erroneous reports in the student newspaper stating that the proposed changes have come from faculty senate. These proposed changes did not originate with faculty senate but senate will vote today on whether to endorse the proposed APM change.
- New senators identified to date for the 2014-2015 term include:
  Allan Caplan, College of Agricultural and Life Sciences (CALS), taking over for Matt Morra;
  James Foster, College of Science (CoS), taking over for senate Chair Hartzell;
  Yun Chung, College of Business and Economics (CBE), taking over for Norman Pendegraft;
  Clinton Jeffery, College of Engineering, taking over for Russell Qualls;
  Larry Stauffer, dean representative, replacing Kurt Pregitzer.
Faculty members from the College of Art & Architecture (CAA) have received permission to remove some art from the president’s residence and place it in Brink Lounge for a few years. The art will be gracing these walls in about two weeks.

**Provost’s Report.** Provost Aiken is unavailable today and Vice Provost Stevenson will be joining us later, so there is no provost’s report.

**Legislative session.** Chair Hartzell then invited Joe Stegner, special assistant to the president for state and governmental relations, to provide a legislative update. Mr. Stegner has held this position for two years/three legislative sessions and he is effectively a lobbyist for the president’s office in Boise. Mr. Stegner reported that UI’s focus in legislative sessions is twofold: “playing offense” on financial appropriations issues; and “playing defense” on some policy issues such as the recent concealed guns on campus legislation, which UI and other institutions opposed.

Mr. Stegner responded as follows to senators’ questions and comments:

- **Relative to the change in leadership at UI, do you anticipate any issues or opportunities for positioning ourselves better with the state legislature?** The legislature tends to view UI as having a revolving door in our presidency. Frequent presidential changes invite criticism about “inconsistency” but there is no significant apprehension about it within the legislature. The most recent changes have sent a solid message that UI survives these challenges – and the strong performances by President Staben and interim president Don Burnett further reinforce this message. UI is a very vibrant organization.

- **Now that the legislature has adjourned are there any remaining budget matters still pending with SBOE?** All bills passed by the legislature during this session were signed by the governor, there were no vetoes. There are a couple of items that will be settled by SBOE. The budget for UI is included in the general overall budget for colleges and universities. There are some smaller items that are important to UI and that are their own line-items – and SBOE has discretion over these items. The subcommittee for SBOE has already met and made their recommendations which are consistent with the requests – we are not expecting any surprises in this area.

- **Many UI employees are not PERSI (Public Retirement System of Idaho) members and yet UI continues to pay 2% into PERSI on behalf of non-PERSI members, by law, through 2025. Is there any chance that this will be modified?** No, there is no chance at all as IRS code requires this when an institution moves from a defined-benefit plan to a defined-contribution plan. This has to do with the optional retirement programs at colleges and universities that were put into place in the late ‘80s. UI must pay this amount through 2025. When UI and other Idaho institutions adopted the optional retirement plans, there were accrued costs that needed to be paid to PERSI. Actuaries estimated UI’s share of these costs should be paid at the rate of 1.49% for about 38 years, which is about the length of time it takes to get all of the employees out of the process. This is a recovery cost that is paid by UI and it is not deducted from UI employees’ pay. It shows up on employees’ pay stubs as an employer-paid benefit.

- **What should we expect in CEC (change in employee compensation) this year?** UI presidents Burnett and Nellis had CEC as their highest priority for consideration by the legislature. The universities, through the presidents’ council, were able to convince SBOE to also aggressively ask for CEC in the budget they forward to the governor’s office. Governor Otter, however, did not recommend CEC for public employees in his general budget. The legislature then held an independent CEC committee hearing and this joint house-senate committee unanimously supported CEC. The governor then signed the bills providing for CEC to all agencies, including colleges and universities. This is a 2% merit-based raise, but it breaks down into a 1% ongoing and 1% one-time raise. If the legislature does not reinstate the one-time 1% next year, it will...
amount to a 1% one-time bonus for this year only and an ongoing 1% raise. Additionally, UI gets approximately 60% of its salary costs from the state’s general fund; the other 40% comes from tuition. The legislature could shift all salaries to the general fund but has chosen not to do so. The result is that this choice almost guarantees a tuition increase in order to provide for the full 2% increase for faculty and staff.

- **Will there be an increase in the number of WWAMI seats this year?** Last year we increased the number of seats in the WWAMI program by five, from 20 to 25. We asked for another five this year but it was not in the governor’s budget. The legislature funded the additional five seats and in 2015 we will increase from 25 to 30 WWAMI seats. We will continue to ask for more seats in the future as the WWAMI program has recommended to SBOE to increase to 40 seats.

**FS-14-049: APM 95.13 – Surveillance Cameras.** Chair Hartzell next invited Matt Dorschel, executive director for public safety and security, to talk about proposed policy governing surveillance systems at UI. There has been no policy regarding how cameras are used and configured at UI and now he is recommending standards and protocols for their use. The policy will protect property and privacy rights and deter crime.

Mr. Dorschel responded as follows to senators’ questions and comments:

- **Will the cameras be actively monitored? If not, is it wise to tell people that these cameras are not actively monitored?** We will collect the data but we do not have the staff to actively monitor the cameras 24/7. General Counsel recommended that we be transparent in the policy with regard to how the cameras are used at UI. This is viewed as more important that deceiving potential law-breakers.

- **How many cameras are there and where are they located?** I did not bring the list with me, but we have about 400 cameras. Most of them are in housing and CALS, with some located in the Kibbie Dome, the greenhouses and a few other places. We do not have campus core cameras. This policy regulates what we already have.

- **Do we still have cameras pointed at various UI buildings with images we can view on a university website?** To my knowledge, we do not have those. There may be non-UI entities with surveillance cameras in public places, such as downtown.

- **In APM 95.13, B-1-f, it states “In general, the University will not permit either the installation or use of cameras as a tool to monitor routine performance or management issues involving University personnel ...” Does the term “in general” suggest that there may be cases where this could be done?** I do not recall how we came to use that term, and we could certainly remove that if it causes concern. The cameras are not in front of employees’ work space and it is not considered a reasonable course of action to use these cameras to monitor the performance or comings and goings of employees. That was the intent of that section. The “in general” means that maybe in some cases you could do it – I would think that in those cases you would need prior approval. It seems clear to me that the cameras will not be used for that; and if they are to be used in that way, there will need to be some specific approval.

- **Are these films and digital recordings considered public records? Would they be subject to disclosure?** Yes. We recommend the records be stored for 30 days. The equipment does not have the capability to continuously archive data.

- **What is a “reasonable expectation of privacy” [B-1-i]?** That is another legal term and it applies to your office, restrooms, locker rooms, private areas in dormitory rooms. If you are walking in-and-out of a public access building, campus core or through an academic building, you do not have a reasonable expectation of privacy. We have no plans or resources for installing cameras in classrooms or building an empire of surveillance cameras.

- **Are we violating student privacy?** Public record disclosure is always vetted.
• Does this policy apply only to university units? What is there to prevent non-university organizations from engaging in this behavior? This was not a deliberate omission from the policy. This policy applies to people on campus and we can ask them to leave or remove their camera. There is no other action that we can take that I am aware of.

• A senator then suggested reconsideration of this APM item in order to explicitly extend it to include devices either used on or around UI campus. Other senators suggested that part C and part B-1-g may cover this? The senator suggesting the extension of policy language said those parts do not cover this because part A states that this policy applies to all UI persons and organizations. Others are not explicitly included in this language. Mr. Dorschel offered to review APM 95.13 again with General Counsel and ITS. If this is a concern he will make any recommended changes and bring it back. [N.B.: Mr. Dorschel later reported via email that “Any and all non-approved systems are subject to removal, regardless of ownership or who places them.”]

Gun Task-force. Mr. Dorschel next briefed senators on the Gun Task-force, created by President Staben, to address matters relating to recently passed legislation allowing concealed weapons on college and university campuses. The task-force has broad representation from UI and the community, including faculty, staff, students, administrators, human resources, dean of students’ office, Moscow Police Department and UI centers. The task-force will make recommendations for implementation of this policy and will communicate their efforts widely as they move forward. The task-force has not answered any questions yet about this legislation’s implications for UI. The group wants to develop a series of questions and answers and post those online.

FS-14-050. FSH 3890 – Grievance Procedures for Exempt Employees. Chair Hartzell then invited Kent Nelson, general counsel, to speak about changes to this policy. Mr. Nelson indicated that this policy, like FSH 3840 that was on senate’s agenda last week, requires changes in order to conform to regents’ policy. This item is an FYI and does not require a vote.

Committee on Committees. Approval of 2014-2017 appointments. Vice chair Ytreberg briefly presented the list of committee appointments for senate approval. New appointees will be notified in the next weeks, pending senate approval of the appointments. This item comes as a seconded motion. Motion carried unanimously.

FS-14-045. FSH 1520 – University Constitution. Chair Hartzell next invited Paul McDaniel, chair of Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), to speak about proposed changes to two policies which come from FAC as seconded motions. Professor McDaniel explained that these two changes are interrelated and the process of making these changes began last year. Nick Gier, UI professor emeritus, requested that we consider adding specific language to FSH 3160 regarding academic freedom. FAC is very supportive of this and worked on it last year and again this year. Chair Hartzell, Secretary Eckwright and Professor McDaniel met with Mr. Nelson several weeks ago and concluded that this language appropriately belongs in FSH 1520, Article IV, University Constitution. FAC recommends adding the following: “…faculty are entitled to speak or write freely without institutional discipline or restraint on matters pertaining to faculty governance and university programs and policies.” This language comes almost directly from the BSU constitution. Chair Hartzell invited Mr. Nelson to comment on the proposed changes. Mr. Nelson said that this section of the constitution is the appropriate place to address the importance of faculty governance and faculty participation in faculty governance. Mr. Nelson’s concern is the “king’s X” in this language – “without institutional discipline or restraint”, which is in the preamble to BSU’s constitution. There is nothing else in the UI constitution, including the widely recognized aspect of academic freedom, which does not come with a corresponding set of responsibilities. There should be
an ability to address poor conduct and without the ability to address poor conduct this language will be used as an excuse to disrupt faculty meetings, promotion and tenure meetings and so on.

Senators made the following observations regarding this proposed language:

- In recent cases at ISU and WSU, faculty members were sanctioned for their participation in faculty governance (ISU) and for expressing an opinion about the governance of a particular unit (WSU). It is the awareness of the potential for institutional retaliation or restraint that has led the local AFT chapter to seek inclusion of this language in FSH. This language is a further guarantee of the right to speak freely in forums like senate and department and college meetings, as well as to express opinions about the nature of university policy.
- Other senators supported this statement and some expressed additional concerns:
  - The proposed language, as written, dangerously narrows faculty academic freedom rights by subordinating them to the president and regents.
  - Boorish, rude and insubordinate behaviors are not “academic freedom”, and yet some faculty may use this new language to grant them the right to behave badly.
  - FSH recognizes “collegiality” as an overarching consideration in promotion and tenure decisions.
  - Freedom to express opinions freely leads to collegiality.
  - The words “civility” and “collegiality” are sometimes used to say “do not dissent.”
  - “Gag order” on academic freedom is offensive; we need to go on record about this.
- In response to a senator’s comments about retaliation, Professor McDaniel said that FAC reviewed FSH 3810, Retaliation, and this policy appears to address only those situations that involve whistleblowers.

Chair Hartzell asked Mr. Nelson if there is another way to state this, without seeming to give carte blanche but still protecting faculty’s ability to speak freely. Mr. Nelson feels there should be although he is unsure of what that language might be. Mr. Nelson understands that participation in faculty governance within the confines of the process needs to be recognized by chairs. A senator asked Mr. Nelson “who polices this” and Mr. Nelson responded that there is not a lot to “police” and it would be a function of the disciplinary process.

It was moved and seconded (Brandt, Bird) to amend the language as follows: “Faculty are entitled to speak or write freely without institutional discipline or restraint on matters pertaining to faculty governance and university programs and policies. Subject to the authority of the president and the general supervision and ultimate authority of the regents, the university faculty accepts its responsibilities for the immediate government of the university, including but not restricted to: ...” Motion to amend carried unanimously.

Vote to approve changes to FSH 1520, as amended, passed unanimously, 19-0.

**FS-14-046. FSH 3160 – Academic Freedom.** Chair Hartzell then introduced proposed changes to FSH 3160. Initially the focus was on FSH 3160, but then the faculty secretary suggested that this language belongs in the constitution which delineates other faculty responsibilities in relation to faculty governance. We resolved this difference by adding the language to both FSH 1520 and FSH 3160. Professor McDaniel said that FAC felt strongly that this language should be in FSH 3160, since it is titled “Academic Freedom.” Chair Hartzell asked Mr. Nelson if putting this language into FSH 3160 will put UI out of compliance with SBOE policy? Mr. Nelson responded that in his opinion, yes, this language will put UI out of compliance, because FSH 3160 is intended to mirror SBOE policy III-B on academic freedom and responsibility. FSH 1460 A-2 provides the hierarchy for laws, statutes and regulations and regents’ policy takes precedence over UI policy. It is quite clear that adding this language is outside of current
policy and outside the norm. A number of senators spoke in favor of adding this language, stating that it is important to make this aspirational statement of rights. Mr. Nelson suggested that if this is intended to be aspirational, perhaps it would be better to go to the board and ask them to change their policy on academic freedom.

Like the previous item, this comes as a seconded motion from the Faculty Affairs Committee. Motion carried, 12-6.

**FS-14-048 (UCC-14-057). Online programs.** Chair Hartzell next invited Jeanne Stevenson, vice provost for academic affairs, to introduce a proposed catalog change. Vice provost Stevenson said that these proposed changes are intended to make it clear which degrees and certificate programs are fully available online through UI. Also, UCC amended the list to include an M.A.T. in art, which was mistakenly omitted from the list. This comes as a seconded motion from UCC. Motion carried, 19-0.

**FS-14-047: APM 35.28 – Smoking policy.** Chair Hartzell then invited Daniel Trautvetter, head of UI’s tobacco task-force, to respond to any questions or comments from senators regarding the proposed changes to UI’s smoking policy. Chair Hartzell also asked senators to consider endorsing this proposed change to the APM and she noted that Provost Aiken has requested the following change to the proposed language: end the language at “product” and remove the last sentence beginning with “The intent ... “ and ending with “visitors.” A senator suggested removing the word “non-combustible” that precedes “tobacco product.”

Chair Hartzell reported that the new policy would become effective in August 2015 and will coincide with the effective date of a similar policy at WSU. In response to senators’ questions Chair Hartzell observed that it was her impression that the president generally favors the change in policy and that if we receive approval to proceed with it, we will work to refine the policy over the next 15 months to address matters such as tail-gate parties during sporting events, international students’ use of tobacco and so on. Ceremonial procedures will be exempt from this policy.

It was moved and seconded (Brandt, Wolf) to accept the amended language and endorse these proposed changes. Motion carried, 15-2.

**Adjournment:** It was moved and seconded (Brandt, Bird) to adjourn at 5:09pm. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Gail Z. Eckwright
Secretary to Faculty Senate and Faculty Secretary
August 2012
As a result of numerous faculty conversations with Central Administration, a tour of general classrooms was conducted. This resulted in a call for the formulation of an ad-hoc group of faculty and key personnel from Facilities Management, ITS, and Office of the Registrar to brainstorm options. The Chief Information Officer led the effort to identify and gather interested faculty to assist in defining desired technology and other improvements that would support emerging trends in teaching and learning. After several meetings, a select number of highly visible improvements that would greatly benefit the general classroom pool were identified.

December 2012
On the recommendation of the ad-hoc group, Central Administration approved a budget amount for some targeted classroom improvements. Based on an overarching need for technology equipped classrooms and in an effort to address aging furnishings, three projects were outlined:

1. Renfrew 125 and 126 – fully renovate these rooms with dual projection technology, new tiers, and furniture that will allow for improved collaboration and better student experience.
2. TLC 023 – create an experimental collaborative classroom adding two electronic interactive white boards to the existing multi-media; new chairs that easily transition between lecture, seminar, and group layouts; and provide multiple white boards to enhance group work.
3. AgSci 106 – renovate our oldest auditorium by enhancing the sound system, improving technology, and replacing or refurbishing the seating.

Spring 2013
In an attempt to continue efforts to review and identify needed improvements in general classrooms, the Assistant Vice President of Facilities worked with the Registrar to discuss options for formalizing a workgroup. Efforts were undertaken to research similar undertakings by other institutions, identify a model for UI, and draft a charter.

Summer 2013
Renovations were completed in Renfrew 125, 126 and TLC 023. In addition, the AgSci 106 project kicked off with an expected completion date in August 2014.

Fall 2013
A charter was formalized and the Classroom Strategic Planning Workgroup (CSPW) formed. Faculty Senate sanctioned the charter and approved the workgroup goals. Activities completed Fall 2013 include:

1. Familiarize workgroup with current general classroom inventory, tour older classrooms, review five-year history of work orders, assess multi-media usage in tech classrooms, research and review chalkboard vs. white board usage, and begin to develop improvement prioritization criteria.
2. Developed faculty and student Qualtrics surveys for the purpose of assessing renovated classrooms TLC 023, REN 125 and 126. Administered surveys early December.

Spring 2014 – in-progress
A complete review of the Fall surveys was conducted and a summary of findings developed. Early in January, Central Administration identified a second allotment of funding that might be used for classroom improvements and asked for a recommendation. The workgroup evaluated the collection of classroom data available and determined this funding would best be spent upgrading furnishings in
selected classrooms focusing on creating more flexible collaborative spaces. A proposal was developed and subsequently approved to include improvements in the following classrooms:

1. TLC 223 – purchase new flexible tables and chairs on casters. Current tables and chairs will be used to upgrade furnishings in MINES 306.
2. TLC 247 – purchase new flexible tables and chairs on casters. Current tables and chairs will be used to upgrade furnishings in BEL 346.
3. Admin 326 – add multi-media and new tablet arm chairs on casters. Multi-media will be relocated from JEB 121 which is less than ideal for media as it has tall south facing windows and no air conditioning.
4. Admin 221 (MAC Lab) – Repaint and carpet, purchase new hidden monitor style desks, and chairs on casters. Incorporating these upgrades will make this a more versatile classroom as it can be used as a lab or a regular classroom with tables.

Plans are underway to document activities, create a workgroup web site, and share what has been learned with the broader campus community.

Vers: March 20, 2014
Background

As the university pursues initiatives to improve classroom space, it is advisable to form a group whose primary purpose would be to develop and oversee a systematic approach for evaluating, building and maintaining modern learning spaces on an ongoing basis. This is an essential component in providing faculty and students with the best possible learning spaces that support basic academic functions including teaching, research and related scholarly activities necessary for an engaged and active learning community. Membership should include broad representation from major stake holders in the campus community whose participation is essential to managing and improving classroom space.

With pressure on budget reductions in recent years, classrooms have had limited allocations set aside to meet the needs for the basic upkeep, maintenance and improvements in these critical learning spaces. Although the Office of the Registrar is responsible and accountable for general classrooms, classroom ownership is a shared resource not fully coordinated among university stakeholders including colleges, academic departments, Facilities, and Information Technology Services. Recently some funds have been identified to make some limited improvements to targeted spaces. It is hoped that this trend will continue in the coming years and therefore the time has come to form a collaborative group to focus on the needs in this area.

Charter

In support of the university’s strategic “Teaching & Learning Goal and Critical Resources Plan” (http://www.uidaho.edu/president/leadingidaho), a coordinated and systematic approach for evaluating classroom standards in a changing instructional environment is necessary. The purpose of this group is to review current classroom resources; develop standards and metrics for existing learning spaces; make recommendations guiding decisions for enhancement of existing classrooms; evaluation of current scheduling policy ensuring flexibility in meeting the needs of modern active learning spaces. This group will make recommendations on prioritization of budgeted expenditures for any general or departmental classroom renovation, major maintenance and/or equipment upgrade project.

Charge

A systematic approach for evaluating the creation and/or maintenance of classroom environments that are acceptable, sustainable and which effectively facilitate the teaching and learning processes is essential. Numerous discussions with faculty, administration, and staff point to the lack of coordination among the many people who are involved with classrooms. This has contributed to classroom environments that no longer effectively facilitate the teaching and learning process. A coordinated strategic approach moving forward will ensure that classroom environments effectively support the instructional mission of the University and that policy and procedures are in place to facilitate equitable scheduling practices with good classroom utilization rates.

Phase I – Current State Review - Initial Classroom Inventory, Assessment and Space Ranking

- Assessment of current classroom inventory for general fitness
- Review space and rank based on current amenities and capacities
- Develop consensus on minimum design and technology standards for future upgrades

Outcome - Prioritized list of recommended classroom spaces to target for improvements should funding streams become available in the short term.

Phase II – Future State Planning – Defining Criteria for the creation of Classrooms of the Future

- Evaluation of pedagogical needs and supporting technology
• Re-assessment of Scheduling policy in light of the scheduling needs for active learning spaces
• Review Current inventory and Rank Spaces for future upgrades based on desired amenities, capacities, emerging active learning criteria and other identified pedagogical needs

Outcome – Ordered classroom design recommendations that will inform project planning as funding streams are identified and targeted toward new or improved classroom spaces.

Phase III – Assess workgroup objectives and determine if a permanent group should be formed to evolve these objectives in light of the needs of the University of Idaho’s strategic plan.

Composition

Four (4) appointed faculty members, with the following considerations:
• No college has representation of more than one faculty
• One appointed by and representing the Faculty Senate

Five (5) administrative representatives appointed by the following divisions:
• Information Technology Services
• Facilities
• Registrar
• Distance and Extended Education

One (1) undergraduate student representative appointed by ASUI

It is understood that more stakeholders will need an opportunity to add a voice to the discussion as this group considers the future of classroom space at the University of Idaho. This group should consider strategies for bringing these voices to the table as work progresses in the various emphasis areas.

Approved 10/10/13
### Classroom Strategic Planning Workgroup

**University of Idaho – Classroom Improvements Planning Calendar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom (capacity)</th>
<th>Summary of Completed Improvements - 2013</th>
<th>Associated Costs</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TLC 023 (36)</td>
<td>Node chairs on casters, 2 electronic interactive boards, multiple hanging white boards, new paint and carpet</td>
<td>$48,237 - Central Funding</td>
<td>Summer 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REN 125 (104)</td>
<td>New tiered classrooms with fixed tables, node chairs on casters, white boards, new paint and carpet</td>
<td>$289,927 - Central Funding</td>
<td>Summer 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REN 126 (104)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Fall 2013 – Student and faculty group surveys distributed to collect feedback on improvements made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom (capacity)</th>
<th>Summary of Proposed Improvements - 2014</th>
<th>Projected Costs</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AgSci 106 (375)</td>
<td>Renovated seating, acoustics, paint, and enhanced multi-media</td>
<td>$650,000 - Central Funding</td>
<td>In-progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC 223 (46)</td>
<td>New furniture – 2-person tables on casters, chairs on casters</td>
<td>$25,300 - Central Funding</td>
<td>Approved, Summer 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC 247 (28)</td>
<td>New furniture – 2 person tables on casters, chairs on casters</td>
<td>$15,400 - Central Funding</td>
<td>Approved, Summer 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin 326 (38)</td>
<td>Multi-media and new tablet arm chairs on casters</td>
<td>$14,683 - Central Funding</td>
<td>Approved, Summer 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin 221 (20 - 26)</td>
<td>New hidden monitor desks, paint and carpet = multi-purpose Lab &amp; classroom</td>
<td>$26,200 - Central Funding</td>
<td>Approved, Summer 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mines 306 (42)</td>
<td>Furniture upgrade from existing furniture in TLC 223</td>
<td>$650 - Central Funding</td>
<td>Approved, Summer 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL 346 (27)</td>
<td>Furniture upgrade from existing furniture in TLC 247</td>
<td>$500 - Central Funding</td>
<td>Approved, Summer 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALB 009 (15)</td>
<td>Create new 15 seat seminar style classroom, use tablet arm chairs in the existing general inventory, electronic interactive white board</td>
<td>$3000 - College Funding</td>
<td>Approved, Spring 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Spring 2014 – Fall survey data reviewed and used to inform classroom improvements for next phase of funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom (capacity)</th>
<th>Summary of Proposed Improvements - 2015</th>
<th>Projected Costs</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Potential $150,000 +/- available for classroom improvements</td>
<td>- Central Funding</td>
<td>In-Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Fall 2014 – Student and faculty group surveys distributed to collect feedback on classroom improvements made Summer 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom (capacity)</th>
<th>Summary of Proposed Improvements - 2016</th>
<th>Projected Costs</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED Bldg Renovation</td>
<td>Will include 4 new general classrooms – Capacity estimate = 72 seats, 60 seats, and two 45 seat - design yet to be determined</td>
<td>- Funding source pending</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* |
Background

University classrooms are an essential resource that support multiple learning activities and need to adapt to shifts in teaching style. In 2012, as a result of several tours and discussions about classroom needs, an effort was made to gather some faculty with classroom design interests to brainstorm ideas that would inform the design aspects of future classroom renovation projects. As this work progressed, the University was able to identify and commit funds for a select number of classroom improvements.

During the summer of 2013, three general classrooms were renovated - REN 125, 126, and TLC 023. In addition, a project was initiated for the renovation of AgSci 106, the largest auditorium classroom, with a target completion date of mid-August 2014.

In an effort to continue this strategic classroom review and improvement prioritization work, the Registrar met with the Assistant Vice President of Facilities to discuss formalizing a workgroup. During the Fall 2013 semester the Classroom Strategic Planning Workgroup (CSPW) formed with faculty and administrative representation. A charter was sanctioned by the Faculty Senate and specific goals were identified to be completed by the end of the Spring 2015 semester.

In November 2013, CSPW developed two online surveys (one for faculty and one for students) in an effort to assess the success of renovated classroom improvements. The primary goals were to 1) collect faculty and student feedback on improvements to the classrooms, 2) identify design aspects that may need improvement, and 3) determine if the renovation supported new innovative approaches to teaching.

Key Findings - Renfrew 125/126

Faculty Survey - A total of 9 (36%) of the 25 faculty members invited to participate completed the classroom survey. In general faculty felt these rooms were much improved; the tiers provided good visibility; and the node chairs allowed more space and flexibility for students.

Faculty expressed concern with the positioning of the media cart in the center of the room as this location made it difficult to walk around and engage with students. There was some difficulty with the remote clicker coordinating the advancement of material on the dual projection screens. In addition there was some difficulty with visibly being able to keep track of all students due to the width of the classroom.

Student Survey – A total of 153 (13%) of the 1158 students invited to participate completed the classroom survey. In general students liked the room set-up, felt it was open and spacious with good visibility, and had adequate access to electrical outlets for laptops. Overall students liked the flexibility of the node chairs; felt they were comfortable; and easily moved to accommodate classroom activities.

Students expressed concern with visibility of the white board due to the media cart being positioned in the center of the room; difficulty hearing from the back of the room; and the minimal storage under the node chairs for back packs.
Key Findings – TLC 023

Faculty Survey – All 8 (100%) of the faculty members invited to participate completed the classroom survey. In general faculty liked the easy navigation around the room, the flexibility of the node chairs, and the ability to quickly arrange the room for group work.

Faculty expressed some concern about the need for a second interactive white board; the hanging white boards which they felt were difficult to use; sound projection as it was sometimes challenging to hear students in the back of the room; and they did not like the windows in the back of the room.

Student Survey – A total of 34 (18%) of the 187 students invited to participate completed the classroom survey. In general students were very enthusiastic about the room set-up and felt it allowed for better focus and freedom. They liked the quick transition between classroom styles, ability to work in groups, the removable white boards, and the node chairs.

Students expressed some concern with sound projection, the window in the back of the room, the lack of use of the hanging white boards, and the minimal storage space under the node chairs for back packs.

Workgroup Observations

Overall, the node chairs were appreciated by both faculty and students. They are comfortable, flexible, and with the casters allow for quick transitions keeping students more engaged. The down side of these chairs seems to be that the storage area is too small to accommodate large backpacks and therefore tends to collect trash.

The placement of the media cart in the REN rooms was expressed as an issue by both faculty and students. The dual screens had mixed reviews with faculty, but students liked the enhanced visibility they provided.

The interactive white boards in TLC 023 were not used as much as the design committee had hoped. There was a faculty comment expressing the need to change the course design to incorporate them, and since this classroom could not be guaranteed in the future, it was not an effective use of time. There were comments by both faculty and students about the need for more than one interactive white board in this classroom.
2014 Construction Projects

Integrated Research and Innovation Center (IRIC)  $49M
- 70,000 sf supporting collaborative research. Site of previous Navy ROTC building.
- Construction begins August 2014. Target Fall 2016 occupancy of building.
- Significant project in central campus location will impact localized pedestrian and vehicular travel.

Education Building Renovation  $17.1M
- Demolition and asbestos abatement, followed by whole building renovation to include new exterior cladding and roof. Kiva will not be reconstructed.
- Demolition begins July 2014. Target Fall 2016 occupancy of building.
- Localized pedestrian and vehicular travel impacts. Building must be vacated; relocation process underway. Temporary locations for impacted units include: Commons, Targhee Hall, ITED, Ad Bldg, Ag, SUB, Shoup Hall, Blake House.

Traffic Calming  $640K
- Implement traffic calming measures at both 6th Street Academic Mall crossing, and on Deakin Ave. at the VandalStore and SUB crossing. Includes crosswalk ‘tables,’ raised planters, enhanced lighting.
- Deakin Ave. crossing to be reconstructed summer 2014 (May – Aug); 6th Street crossing in summer 2015.
- Localized pedestrian and vehicular travel impacts.

Student Health Center  $1.1M
- Replace piping throughout building (water, heating, waste, vents)
- Construction May – Dec 2014
- Building to be largely vacated; WWAMI relocated to WSU; Clinic operations off campus; Psychology to McClure, Ad Bldg, JEB, BEL, McClure, EngrPhys, Facilities Annex; pharmacy to remain in operation at Student Health.

Classroom Improvements  $710K
- Renovation of large auditorium, Ag 106. Work includes seating refurbishment, enhanced audio/visual technology, and surface finish improvements.
- Separate project to enhance collaborative learning through furnishing upgrades in a number of classrooms: TLC 223/247 and Ad 326. Existing furniture shifted to upgrade other classrooms in BEL and Mines. Ad 221 to receive computer table and chair upgrades.
- Construction/Upgrades ongoing (Ag106); all to be completed by August 2014
- Classrooms off line for summer. Next campus auditorium to be addressed is LSS 277. Timeline and scope yet to be established.
Campus Gateways  $800K  
- Construct enhanced entry gateways at Hwy 8 entrances (Perimeter Dr., Stadium Dr., Line St.)
- Construction summer/fall 2014
- Localized pedestrian and vehicular travel impacts

Perimeter Drive Lighting, Phase 2  $415K
- Installs lighting on Perimeter Drive from 6th Street to Nez Perce Drive; completion of sidewalk along north side of 6th Street, east of Perimeter
- Summer/Fall 2014 construction
- Very limited impacts in localized areas

Campus Signage, Phase 4  $200K
- Continues implementation of campus signage master plan. This phase focuses on parking lots and remaining building identification signage
- Underway now; target August 2014 completion
- Very limited localized impacts

Bike Shelters  $200K
- Provide new covered and uncovered bike parking in campus core (just north of Renfrew)
- Construction ongoing; completed by August 2014
- Localized pedestrian travel impacts

Delta Zeta  (?)  
- Although not a UI project, the Delta Zeta sorority looks to build a new home on Elm Street, at the site of the small parking lot just west of the SUB
- Construction targeted for summer 2014 through summer 2015; occupancy in Fall 2015
- Construction impacts in the immediate area. Broader UI ‘purple’ parking assets will absorb the loss of parking at this site.

Other Projects
- Various other UI and state funded projects are currently or soon to get underway
- Most have very limited impact, often solely to nearby building occupants. Projects include:
  - Engineering-Physics; replace fire dampers
  - Expand and relocation College of Business Trading Room
  - Construct Vandal Athletic Center restrooms
  - Emergency eye-wash stations, various campus locations
  - Replace Ag Science roof
  - Demolish one family housing unit, Sweet Ave
  - Demolish one outbuilding on Poultry Hill
MEMORANDUM

University of Idaho
Teaching and Advising Committee
November 22, 2013

Committee members: Jane Baillargeon (non-voting), Andrew Brewick (non-voting), Rodney Frey, Shannon Gill, Karen Gillespie, Stacy Isenbarger, Michael Kyte, Heather Page, Steve Saladin, David Sigler (committee chair), Bernhard Stumpf, Christine Lighty (non-voting), Jeanne Stevenson (non-voting), Taylor Williams, Darryl Woolley.

REVIEW OF STUDENT TEACHING EVALUATIONS, 2013
WITH RECOMMENDATIONS

Context:
One of the tasks of the Teaching and Advising Committee, per FSH 1640 87, A-4, is: “To monitor the processes and content of Student Teaching Evaluations . . . and to advise on the design/content of reports to the Vice Provost, Faculty Senate, Deans, Unit Leaders, and Faculty.” The Committee is required to review the system every five years. Review of the course evaluation system was most recently conducted in 2008. Per this policy, the Committee began a review in Spring 2013.

The Committee has surveyed students, faculty, and unit administrators, seeking input on the current system and soliciting advice for needed changes; we reviewed published peer-reviewed research on student evaluations of teaching; we reviewed course evaluation practices at peer institutions. During the Fall 2013 semester, we have worked from our findings to evaluate the current system and develop a set of recommendations. We presented our work in progress to Faculty Senate on April 23 and October 22, 2013, soliciting feedback from Senators as we conducted our research and developed our recommendations.

Analysis:
We have identified four areas of concern with the current course evaluation system:
1. There is a low response rate;
2. An outlying score can significantly affect the numerical averages;
3. The questions are too general, so aren’t especially informative;
4. The questions aren’t tied to learning outcomes.

The committee determined that, problems 1 and 2 being related, the best way to mitigate the effect of outlying scores would be to boost the response rates. We determined that a revised and expanded questionnaire for student evaluations would address problems 3 and 4.
Recommendations:
With this in mind, we recommend by majority vote the following changes to the Student Evaluation of Teaching system:

- The course evaluation questionnaire should be revised, as outlined on the following page.
- The questionnaire should be built into the existing University of Idaho mobile app, which already interfaces with VandalWeb data. With students having an easy way to complete course evaluations on their mobile devices, instructors will be able to designate class time, once a semester, for students’ completing course evaluations. If the app is widely downloaded, this should replicate the high response rates of paper evaluations but generate electronic data. Students could still elect to complete course evaluations directly through VandalWeb via the conventional portal.
- The IT portion of the orientation process for new students should assist students in downloading the expanded University of Idaho app onto their tablets and smartphones.
- The course evaluation window should be extended by a week, to midnight of the last day of final exam week;
- The Student Evaluation of Teaching website, maintained by the Institutional Research Office, should be linked more extensively to online resources for faculty; the “Best Practices” page should continue to be upgraded and regularly maintained; faculty should be directed by their unit heads to note the “Best Practices” page.

Respectfully submitted,
David Sigler
English
Chair, Teaching and Advising Committee
Teaching and Advising Committee

Proposed Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
University of Idaho

1. How often did you attend class? [90% 80% 70% 60% <60%]

2. How often were you fully prepared for class? [90% 80% 70% 60% <60%]

3. What grade are you expecting to receive? [A B C D F]

4. The instructor expressed clear expectations for my learning, for instance by explaining course learning outcomes. [Strongly Agree  Somewhat Agree  Somewhat Disagree  Strongly Disagree]

5. The instructor’s teaching methods were effective. [Strongly Agree  Somewhat Agree  Somewhat Disagree  Strongly Disagree]

6. The assignments for the course helped me learn. [Strongly Agree  Somewhat Agree  Somewhat Disagree  Strongly Disagree]

7. The instructor was helpful to me outside of class time, such as in office hours, by email, or through BBLearn. [Strongly Agree  Somewhat Agree  Not Applicable  Somewhat Disagree  Strongly Disagree]

8. The instructor challenged me to think. [Strongly Agree  Somewhat Agree  Somewhat Disagree  Strongly Disagree]

9. Overall, how would you rate the performance of the instructor in teaching this course? [0 1 2 3 4]

Comment:

10. Overall, how would you rate the quality of this course? [0 1 2 3 4]

Comment:
Current:
FSH 1520

ARTICLE IV—RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY.
Faculty are entitled to speak or write freely without institutional discipline or restraint on
matters pertaining to faculty governance and university programs and policies. Subject to the
authority of the president and the general supervision and ultimate authority of the regents, the
university faculty accepts its responsibilities for the immediate government of the university,
including, but not restricted to:

Proposed:
Subject to applicable laws and policies, faculty are entitled to speak or write freely without
institutional discipline or restraint on matters pertaining to faculty governance and university
programs and policies. Subject to the authority of the president and the general supervision
and ultimate authority of the regents, the university faculty accepts its responsibilities for the
immediate government of the university, including, but not restricted to: