University of Idaho
2014-2015 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #9

3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, October 21, 2014
Brink Hall Faculty-Staff Lounge
IWC Room 390 – Boise
213 – Coeur d’Alene
TAB 350a IF1 – Idaho Falls

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2014-15 Faculty Senate Meeting #8, October 14, 2014 (vote)

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Committee Reports.
   
   Committee on Committees (Teal)
   • FS-15-010: FSH 1640.89 – University Committee for General Education (vote)

VI. Other Announcements and Communications.
   
   • Rebalancing Technology Investments and Videoconference Capabilities (Ewart)
   • Distance Learning Vision (Ratcliff)

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. Adjournment.

Professor Marty Ytreberg, Chair 2014-2015, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2014-2015 FS Meeting #8
FS-15-010 – distributed earlier
The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m. A suggestion was made to add a sentence to the minutes for meeting #7 reflecting the fact that some departments receiving larger F&A returns have devoted significant amounts of those funds to start-ups. The Secretary accepted this addition as a friendly amendment. It was then moved and seconded (Smith/Karsky) to accept the minutes as amended. This motion passed without objection (20-0-3).

Chairs Report: The Chair reported on coming attractions. Dan Ewart has been invited for next week to discuss “Rebalancing Technology Investments and Videoconference Capabilities.” Next week Terry Ratcliff will also be here to discuss Distance Learning. The Chair reminded everyone of the retirement celebration for Bruce Pitman’s this Friday at 4:30 p.m. on the Kibbie Dome turf. The program will begin around 6:00 p.m.

President Staben delivered a State of University address yesterday afternoon. The President emphasized that a top priority is increasing undergraduate enrollment by 50%. President Staben also hopes to decrease the faculty/staff turnover rate and has requested a 4% increase in compensation from the state legislature.

The Chair thanked Senators for their work last week in approving the Academic Freedom language (FSH 1520). He noted that he had received an email from Kent Nelson indicating that the President concurs with the proposed language and will recommend approval once it is passed at the next general faculty meeting.

Provost Report: Vice Provost Jeanne Stevenson gave the Provost Report. The State Board of Regents is meeting in Lewiston this week. The President and Provost, among many others, will be spending a large part of the week down there. This is Homecoming week and there will be many visitors and alumni returning to the University. The Dean of Students interviews have concluded and those interested in stating their views on the candidates should do that on the Provost page by Friday.

As part of the continued emphasis on retention the Vice Provost talked about initiatives Complete College America and Complete College Idaho (http://www.boardofed.idaho.gov/cci.asp). Students who complete 15 credits each semester can complete college in 4 years and are more likely to finish. Those interested can look at the Complete College America site (http://completecollege.org/).

A Senator inquired as to why mid-terms and Homecoming were on the same week and indicated that his students are stressed because of this. Jeanne Stevenson suggested that this concern should be directed to the Provost.

Committee Reports FS-15-012: The Chair introduced the Dean of the College of Education, Cori Mantle-Bromley to discuss the proposed elimination of various teaching major and minors. She suggested that the programs designated to be discontinued did not have many students in them and schools in Idaho were not hiring teachers with these endorsements. Also, in most cases the faculty in the disciplines had
not provided the evidence of student outcomes necessary to maintain accreditation for these teaching majors/minors. The proposed changes were passed by the faculty of the College of Education and by UCC and come as a seconded motion.

A senator wondered about the physical science-life science teaching major and why that was on the list. It was suggested that this teaching major covered too much territory and not in enough depth. There are other options that students interested in teaching in these areas can pursue. Dean Mantle-Bromley said that they were also working to put together a natural science endorsement that would serve these content areas.

Another Senator noted the large number of programs in the arts and liberal arts that were being discontinued. Mantle-Bromley noted that there were few students in these programs and few jobs available. The Senator lamented the decline of support for the Arts in Idaho schools and suggested that the UI should not acquiesce to this trend but should instead be a catalyst for change in this area. Dean Mantle-Bromley agreed that she too was saddened to see this narrowing of curriculum in our schools. The motion discontinuing the programs in FS-15-012 passed 16-3-4.

**FS-15-013:** This proposal involves a name change to a teaching minor. The old name “English as a Second Language” would be changed to “English as a New Language.” Dean Mantle-Bromley explained that many people in this program were not taking English as a 2nd language but instead as a 3rd or 4th language so the new name would be more accurate. This name change also reflects a terminology change occurring around the country. The motion passed 22-0-1.

**Career ladders:** For a discussion of the development of “staff career ladders” the Chair invited Vice President for Finance and Administration, Ron Smith, to the table. Greg Fizzell, Vice Chair of Staff Affairs, joined senate on the phone. Ron Smith noted that the UI had a salary compression issue and a turnover problem. This compression issue has created a concern about fairness and low morale. Since the UI doesn’t have a large amount of money to address these compression issues it is a good idea to look at creative ways to address some of these concerns. One plan would be a succession plan to allow the University to hire from within at least within certain job classifications. A succession plan would help to address salary compression, increase salaries, and lead to better job satisfaction. He is beginning to develop rules and procedures that would govern such a plan and is creating a committee with appropriate representation across campus to develop the details for this plan.

Greg Fizzell indicated his support for such a plan within certain job classifications but he believes that Staff Affairs also hoped that we might go further and develop a step system within a certain job which might be something like faculty promotion or the federal civil service system. With such a system a staff member would be able to demonstrate that they were making meaningful contributions to the University and shouldn’t have to leave the University in order to obtain a higher salary. This step system wouldn’t just be based on time but would be based on time and merit.

In response, Ron Smith suggested that these were two different projects but both were worth exploring. While he isn’t convinced of the idea of a step progression he is convinced that if an employee makes an extra effort and becomes more valuable to the University then that should be recognized and rewarded. He also thinks that the University could provide training and development to enhance an employee’s ability to advance.

A Senator doubted that thinking of staff advancement in terms of faculty promotion would be very helpful. He believes that there has to be a better solution than asking staff to jump through more hoops
which ultimately would not be fair to staff. He would like to see attention paid to providing some quick help to raise staff salaries. It is an ethical issue and we need to pay our staff more.

The Chair and the Faculty Secretary both made the point that Senate leadership has raised these issues with the upper level administration and they know that there are areas of the staff salary pyramid that desperately need attention.

A Senator pointed out that the recent classification process had a strongly negative effect on portions of the staff and led some to question whether the University valued them.

The conversation that followed flowed across a variety of concerns which included longevity raises, percentage raises versus flat amount raises, and concerns about methods of performance evaluation. Ron Smith responded that we do need to look at the performance evaluation system. He further emphasized that making it easier to hire from within would be a positive step. A Senator agreed that it was demoralizing to staff who participated in creating a program and then had to undergo a national search for a position they helped create.

The Chair noted that he had asked UBFC to have a discussion about how we might go about distributing a 4% salary increase assuming we get a 4% increase from the State. As the discussion continued the question of non-monetary compensation was raised. Many interesting, and potentially controversial ideas were mentioned.

Chair Ytreberg volunteered to serve on the committee that Vice President Smith was creating to look at issues of staff advancement. He also summarized today’s discussion by suggesting that there were three main themes that had emerged:

1) investigate immediate ways to deal with staff compensation
2) look at ways to streamline internal searches
3) consider longevity and/or merit type increases which might help salary compression

It was moved and seconded (Teal/Kennelly) to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously at 4:55 p.m.

Don Crowley, Secretary to Senate
Faculty Secretary/Policy Coordinator
Rationale: A significant number of professional staff advisors are employed on campus, yet no professional advisors sit on the Gen Ed committee. These advisors are responsible for helping students understand and comply with gen ed requirements. Without input from this important group, staff advisors feel important information on impact and distribution may be lost in translation. The UIACADA (Academic Advising Association) group felt the seat would best be filled by the director of academic advising, currently Andrew Brewick.

From Andrew Brewick: Ali Bretthauer informed me that Committee on Committees is considering my addition to the University Committee on General Education in a non-voting role. I would be honored to represent advisors in this capacity and I believe this is a critical addition to UCGE for the following reasons:

• Professional advisors are well suited to represent the interests of the students when curricular changes are being considered.
• Professional advisors often understand the specific curricular pathways students navigate when completing their general education and degree requirements. Therefore, a professional advisor would be able to identify possible issues/bottlenecks when changes are being considered by UCGE.
• Since three of the eight undergraduate colleges have some form of professional advising during the first two years, it is vital they stay abreast of emerging changes or initiatives that may come out of UCGE.
• Since intrusive advising and degree pathways are central pillars of the Complete College America agenda (of which Idaho is a member), it is important to have an advising perspective present when any change to the University General Education is considered.

1640.89
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE FOR GENERAL EDUCATION

A. FUNCTION.

A-1. University Committee for General Education serves as the curriculum body for general education by soliciting and approving proposals and courses to be included in general education. The committee also engages in program review and makes recommendations for the continuous refinement of general education in conjunction with the Director of General Education and the Assistant Director of Institutional Research and Assessment. Recommendations for change will be forwarded to UCC, Faculty Senate, and the university faculty. [rev. 4-11, rev. 11-12].

A-2. The committee reports periodically (at least once a year) to the Faculty Senate on the status of general education. [ed. 7-06, 7-09, ren. 4-11, ren. & rev. 11-12].

A-3. This committee traditionally meets on Thursdays at 3:30 p.m. [add. 7-08, ren. 4-11, 11-12]

[Information on University General Education can be accessed at the general education website: http://www.uidaho.edu/class/general-education] [ed. 11-11, 11-12]

B. STRUCTURE AND MEMBERSHIP. Director of General Education (w/o vote), College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences Dean, or designee (w/o vote), College of Science Dean, or designee (w/o vote), Registrar, or designee (w/o vote), Assistant Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, or designee (w/o vote), Director of Academic Advising, or designee (w/o vote), and 11 faculty members selected by the Committee on Committees, one of whom serves as chair, and two undergraduate students, appointed by ASUI. The faculty members shall include one member from the Colleges of Agricultural and Life Sciences, Art and Architecture, Business and Economics, Education, Engineering, and Natural Resources and from the Library, and two members from the Colleges of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences and Science. The student members shall also be chosen to represent two different colleges. [rev. 7-06, 7-08, 7-10, 11-12, ed. 8-12].
Expanding Online Learning at the University of Idaho
Recent events in online program development

• May 2014
  – President’s Leadership Retreat
    • Dedicated more resources to support distance and online learning
    • Committed to hiring an administrator to coordinate distance and online learning
    • Requested proposals for online program initiatives, possible Fall 2015 launch

• Summer 2014
  – Proposals reviewed
    • Showed potential, but tended to be targeted to limited audiences
    • Faculty development suggested to develop strategies to enhance scalability

• September 2014
  – New Executive Director appointed
    • Charged with developing short and long-term action plans
    • To date, have met with numerous stakeholders on and off campus
    • Beginning to analyze data
Current state of online learning at the University of Idaho

• In Spring 2014, 564 students enrolled fully online (~5% of total enrollment)
  – 71% of fully online students enrolled part-time
  – 57% of fully online students are graduate students
• In Spring 2014, 32% of enrolled students took a combination of face-to-face and online courses
• In Spring 2014, 63% of enrolled students took no online courses
• Over 200 online courses offered each semester, generating 3957 credits in Spring 2014
• Courses for 22 complete graduate programs and at least two complete undergraduate majors are available online. Not all undergraduate GEs can be met online.
What trends do we need to address in developing sustainable high quality online programs?

According to a recent study of fully online students (Aslanian & Clinefelter, 2012):

- **Location, Location, Location**  
  - 80% of students live within 100 miles of campus or center

- **Older students prevail**  
  - 75% of students are over 25 years of age

- **Full-time vs. part-time study**  
  - 60% of graduate students study part-time  
  - 60% of undergraduate students study full-time  
    - This statistic skewed by younger students: 2/3 of online undergrads under 25 study full-time  
    - In general, as age increases, preference for part-time enrollment also increases

- **Motivation to complete a degree is career-oriented**  
  - 46% wish to advance in current career  
  - 29% wish to change careers

- **Nationally, 75.8% of fully online students in Fall 2013 were undergraduates** (NCES, 2014)
Collaboration and development of online programs—Tentative (short-term) benchmarks

- **November 3, 2014**
  - Identify Fall 2015 programs to be developed and begin market study
- **November 24, 2014**
  - Academic plan completed, MOU drafted
- **December 8, 2014**
  - Recruiting plan completed
- **December 15, 2014**—Northwest Commission and SBOE notified
- **Spring semester 2015**
  - Program and course development continues
  - Recruitment and outreach begin
  - Online program development workshops for faculty
Developing a long-term plan for online programs at the University of Idaho

- Current budget model scaled to support departments in development on fully online programs
- Centralized vs. decentralized management
  - Decentralized academic functions remain in departments and colleges
  - More centralized administrative/support structures developed for overlapping functions (e.g. marketing, recruiting, faculty/student support, registration)
- Resources
  - Online conversion, technology enhancement, marketing, recruitment...

REPORT/PROPOSAL will be completed by March, 2015