University of Idaho  
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
2015-2016 Meeting #8, Tuesday, October 20, 2015

Present: Anderson, Brandt, Brewick, Caplan, Chung, Couture (Boise), Crowley (w/o vote), Flores, Folwell, Foster, Godfrey (Coeur d’Alene), Hiromoto (Idaho Falls), Hrdlicka, Jeffery, LaPrath, Latrell, Mahoney, Murphy, Nicotra, Royer, St. Claire, Stoll, Teal, Wiencek (w/o vote), Wolf. Absent: Adams, Barbour, Boschetti, Brown, Perret. Guests: 10

Chair Teal called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m. A motion (Jeffery/Stoll) to approve the minutes for the October 13, 2015 meeting of the Faculty Senate passed without objection.

Chair's Report: Chair Teal noted that a volunteer to be on the board of the Vandal Strategic Loan Fund was still needed. The person could not be an administrator. Senator Hrdlicka graciously volunteered. With reference to the discussion last week on a proposed task force to look at conflict of interest policies, the Chair noted that they needed a faculty member with a background in federal grants (NSF/NIH), a faculty member from Business or the Humanities, and a faculty member with some experience with a start-up or invention. Chair Teal asked Senators to forward the names of any colleagues that might fit into one of the above categories and be interested in serving on this task force.

Provost's Report: Provost Wiencek thanked all who showed up for the Vandal Ideas Project (VIP) kick-off Monday afternoon. He encouraged people to be patient trying new technology. Trying out such things doesn’t always go as smoothly as we might like. In particular, Yellowdig is a new platform and we are working on developing a secure sign-on. Yellowdig is a tool that is designed to be used for teaching in the classroom. We are also looking into purchasing sli.do, which was used effectively during the strategic plan retreat.

The Provost discussed plans for developing a more open and inclusive budget process. While we might not get all the kinks worked out this year, ideally we want a process that allows units to funnel requests for new funding up through the deans to the V.P. for Finance and the Cabinet. This process will be developed by working with UBFC which will have a central role in helping to prioritize requests. Ultimately the budget process will have to be tied into other processes like the strategic planning process, assessment, and program prioritization. Next week, the Provost will provide information about last year’s program prioritization (Focus for the Future). This summer Faculty Senate Leadership asked some questions about last year’s process so next week we can reflect on that process and discuss how much was saved and where these funds went. This discussion of FFF will be our primary focus next week.

FS-16-008: FSH 3720 Sabbatical Leave and FS-16-009: FSH 1640.74 Sabbatical Leave Evaluation Committee. Vice Chair Brandt noted that last week we had overlooked approving new language proposed for FSH 3720 and FSH 1640. This language dealt with requiring members of the Sabbatical Leave Evaluation Committee to recuse themselves from all votes on applications for sabbatical if they are applying for a sabbatical leave during that year. The added language on recusal for both FSH 3720 and FSH 1640 passed unanimously.

Chair Teal noted that we had been asked to look at the composition of the SLEC and that request has been referred to Committee on Committees.
FS-16-010: University Curriculum Committee. The Chair invited Dean Cori Mantle-Bromley to discuss the College of Education proposal for Ph.D. specialization of Higher Education Leadership—Self-sustaining Fee Request. She explained that this Ph.D. specialization in Higher Education Leadership has been on the books for a while, but the College of Education hasn’t offered any courses in this area in recent years due to budget cuts. The college is now proposing to revive the program with a self-sustaining budget and with a revised curriculum. The proposal is for a fee-based approach using a four-year cohort program. The four-year fee would be $36,000 per student. Senators asked a wide variety of questions:

- **Are we opening a Pandora’s Box by allowing a part-time fee based Ph.D. program?** Dean Mantle-Bromley suggested that a part-time Ph.D. program was not that unusual in this and didn’t think we were creating a problematic precedent.

- **What is the demand for such a program and where will the students come from unless they are able to offer financial incentives?** Dean Mantle-Bromley explained that they have received many inquiries about this degree and that there was no competition in the area since WSU dropped their program. We have offered this program on a trial basis to BYU-Idaho and currently have a waiting list from there. BYU-Idaho has provided subsidies for their students.

- **Is a four-year part-time program sufficient to provide the type of research-intense activities necessary for a Ph.D. program?** She felt they had built enough research courses and opportunities into the program. The students would be doing original data collection and analysis, and writing a dissertation.

- **How many students would be needed for the program to be sustainable and could the program be offered to UI employees?** Dean Mantle-Bromley stated that they would need to have a minimum of 18 students enrolling as a cohort. When the program was available on campus to UI employee’s they were able to take courses using waivers, but this made the program unsustainable. UI employees can enroll in the program, but would not receive reduced tuition. She would be open to UI employees receiving subsidies but the program has to be sustainable.

- **Can the faculty in the college handle this many new graduate students?** She acknowledged that this program would put a heavy load on their faculty, but that it would also create new resources which would allow them to make new hires. The faculty are supportive, but a little nervous.

With no other comments or questions the proposal came to a vote and passed 18-1-3.

University Curriculum Committee – Distance Education Request. The chair of UCC Professor Dan Eveleth was introduced to discuss a request from the SBOE. This request asked UI departments to define what percentage of their programs are delivered by distance education. The Board wanted us to classify programs as fitting into one of three categories:

- **Under 50%;**
- **50% to 99%; or,**
- **100%**

Professor Eveleth explained that this request was a little confusing since it wasn’t completely clear what was being asked. If the requested percentage is of the total degree requirements (120 credits and above), then almost all programs fit in the middle category of 50 to 99%. This is because virtually all general education requirements can be obtained via distance education. Thus very few programs would fail to meet the 50% standard. If most programs fit into the same category it isn’t obvious how useful this listing will be. He hopes that in the future we will collect this data in a way that provides more useful information about the extent to which a program can be obtained via distance.
Several Senators noted that having better information about what courses are available via distance is desirable, but that this attempt at categorization wasn't very useful and could easily be accused of mixing apples with various other types of fruit. A question was also asked about how to count minors. It was generally agreed that the percentage of a minor that is offered through distance education should be computed by only considering the courses required for the minor.

**FS-16-011: APM 35.60. Hazard Communication Program.** Chair Teal introduced Tom Hicks from the Environmental Health and Safety Office. Mr. Hicks was invited to Senate to discuss a new policy statement on Hazard Communication. This policy is intended to ensure that employees are aware of, and know how to properly respond to, all hazards in their workplaces, including chemical hazards. The program is also intended to provide training to employees when new hazards are introduced. This includes maintaining proper labeling and inventories of chemicals.

A Senator worried that this plan would have significant ramifications and hadn't been fully communicated. Mr. Hicks stated he thought there had been attempts to get input from those affected. His expectations would be that principal investigators and teaching assistants and other employees would know where the Safety Data Sheets are and that these are kept up-to-date. He expects that the biggest workload would be in doing the inventories. Responding to a question, Mr. Hicks clarified that this policy doesn't apply to products that a typical consumer might purchase. Also, he emphasized that this policy is intended to address issues across the entire campus and not just the sciences and laboratories. The primary requirement is to make sure that the proper information regarding hazards is available.

**FS-16-012: FSH 3320—Form 2—Administrator Evaluation Form.** Chair Teal introduced two different versions of the Administrator Evaluation Form. He has been discussing this with the Provost’s Office and hoped to create less resistance to filling out the forms. Comments about questions on the forms should be directed to him and ultimately he intends to send this on to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

**Adjournment:** With no other pressing business a motion to adjourn (Latrell/Stoll) passed without objection at 4:53 p.m.

Don Crowley, Faculty Secretary and Secretary to the Faculty Senate