I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2015-16 Faculty Senate Meeting #4, September 22, 2015 (vote)

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.
   • Retention Guide (Dodge/Martinez)
   • Distance Education (Ratcliff)

VI. Committee Reports.

   Committee on Committees:
   FS-16-006: FSH 1640.83 - Student Appeal Committee (Brandt)

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Randall Teal, Chair 2015-2016, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2015-2016 FS Meeting #4
Retention Guide
Distance Education Handout
FS-16-006
University of Idaho  
Faculty Senate 2015-16 Meeting Minutes  
2015-2016 Meeting #4, Tuesday, September 22, 2015

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

Guests: 9.

Chair Teal called the meeting to order at 3:30. Two Senators asked for additions to the minutes of September 8, 2015, as follows:

Enrollment: “A Senator suggested that we need a clearer strategic vision for the University in order to make decisions about tradeoffs necessary when growing enrollment. For example, the market value of degrees might be less important than support for the liberal arts. And our status as the residential campus of choice in Idaho might trump expansion of online program delivery.”

Vandal Strategic Loan Fund: “Another Senator asked whether the payback period could be extended to 5 years? Charles Buck responded indicating that it was a possibility as exceptions had been made in the past and he would look into the possibility of having this part of the fund policy revised.”

Both were accepted as friendly amendments by the faculty secretary. A motion (Stoll/Folwell) to accept the minutes as amended passed with no objections and 3 abstentions.

Chair’s Report: Chair Teal reported on the President’s Retreat last Thursday. He thought it provided a good start to developing the new strategic plan. Professor Teal noted that Charles Buck, who discussed the Vandal Strategic Loan Fund with the Senate last week, was looking for a volunteer to be on the fund board. This would probably involve 5 (or less) hours a year. The fund board considers applications and reviews potential policy or operational changes. Senator Adams indicated that he would be interested. Chair Teal also announced that a website for distinguished scholarships has been created, contact person for this is Holly Lahann at hlahann@uidaho.edu.

Provost Report: After noting the Vandals exciting win in last Saturday’s football game Provost Wiencek reported on the progress of the CALS dean search. The campus visits have concluded and he is in conversations with one of the candidates. He hopes to be able to make an announcement in the next two weeks. While all the faculty that were invited to be on the Spread Pay task force accepted, one administrator declined to serve so that group has been temporarily delayed.

Provost Wiencek then turned to a discussion of the retreat. The retreat tried out a new technology which allowed participants to communicate and register their preferences via laptops and smart phones. The purpose of the retreat was to begin discussion on the development of a new strategic plan. The old plan has expired and the SBOE expects a significant refresh every 5 years. The day progressed smoothly and a lot was accomplished. They have put together some slides that summarize the discussion. He will send those slides to the faculty secretary’s office to post [posted to Faculty Senate home page under informational items].

The Provost noted that the President wants a plan that will be in place until 2025. This will be an evolving or living plan. At the retreat he proposed developing a framework for the plan but wanted to avoid getting into tactics. There will be a process for people to propose tactics through a shared governance model. We have had strategic plans that did not result in tangible results. Provost Wiencek noted that one of the questions floating around the room during the retreat was how will this plan be different. He emphasized that he hoped to make this a living document that would be integrated into our budget and evaluation processes and ultimately be built into everything we do. He hopes that the strategic planning process will be an opportunity for everyone to be engaged and concerned with what we are doing and how we move forward as a team.

The first session of the retreat focused on the vision of the University. This is an attempt to get us back to our land grant mission. Themes that resonated at the retreat were becoming a purpose driven institution that provides an
opportunity for all prepared students to be part of a University that engages in scholarship that makes a difference in Idaho and the world. Past strategic plans tended to emphasize four themes (teaching, scholarship, outreach, and culture & climate). There was discussion as to whether we should keep those themes or significantly revise them.

The next session at the retreat focused on aligning the strategic plan with the budgetary process. The new budget model should be done in a collaborative fashion and be one that provides incentives for desired behavior but doesn’t result in “us v. them”. It should also avoid unintended consequences.

The final session discussed what kind of advice to give to the committee creating the strategic plan. What types of things are we looking for in the process? Was the process transparent and were there plenty of opportunities to provide input?

The last question of the day dealt with whether there were “elephants in the room”? The main concern expressed related to obtaining faculty/staff support. This plan needs to be something we can all embrace. This is an opportunity to change the conversation and the way we do things. There was concern expressed about the timeline which seems pretty tight but the timeline is set by the Board. They are expecting delivery by April.

The Provost will be chairing the strategic planning committee. The committee will have a member from the Faculty Senate and invitations will be sent out seeking nominations for other members. There will also be 2 members from external constituencies. He intends to have an electronic platform which is accessible to all and allows people to post ideas and lets others to see these ideas. People can look at some of the ideas expressed at the retreat by obtaining the free app Sli.Do. The event code can be accessed by entering VandalPlans.

Teaching and Advising Committee – Student Evaluations FSH 2700. The Chair introduced Professor Jennifer Johnson-Leung who is this year’s Chair of the Teaching and Advising Committee. Professor Johnson-Leung provided an overview of where the committee is at regarding student evaluations of teaching after the President’s veto of last year’s proposal. One of the things that the committee has focused on is that the student evaluations of teaching don’t correlate very well with student learning or provide a complete picture of the quality of teaching. Their goal is to improve the forms as a formative assessment tool. What kind of information can we get from students that will help to improve the quality of teaching? Another problem involves the misuse of the summary evaluation scores that appear on the current form.

Professor Johnson-Leung stated that she sent an email to President Staben seeking more information on why he rejected last year’s changes. He suggested that the committee work with Provost Wiencek and Director of Institutional Research Dale Pietrzak in thinking about how to best design the forms. She thought that the main objection to last year’s changes revolved around removing, or at least altering the language of, the two summary questions at the end. Since there seems to be agreement that the current forms don’t measure good teaching there is an important question as to what to do next. She believes that we need to develop assessment tools that provide an opportunity to grow and the University needs to provide some formative resources for those seeking to become excellent instructors. One proposal might be to form a center for teaching and learning. This center needs to come out of the needs of the faculty and support the needs of the faculty.

In three weeks the committee will have a brainstorming session [Tuesday, October 13th, 1:45 p.m. Doceo Center, Bruce Pitman Center] to discuss various ideas on how to improve our assessment of teaching. Responding to a discussion of the summary questions, Provost Wiencek commented that these summative questions were part of our evaluation system and used in a variety of ways. Changing them without careful understanding of why we are changing them could have important ripple effects. Professor Johnson-Leung indicated that the committee would probably be restoring the summary questions.

A Senator noted that we do have people on campus who are experts on pedagogy who should be consulted. The faculty secretary observed that when this issue was discussed last year there was a deliberate choice to remove the summary questions even though it was widely acknowledged that a summary score could be generated from the revised questions. Professor Johnson-Leung noted that she hadn’t fully appreciated the many different ways the evaluative scores were used and their importance to the legal defense of the institution. In response the faculty secretary noted that last year’s Provost never indicated that there was a problem getting rid of the
summary numbers. Senate Chair Teal wondered whether we can decouple the summary questions from other questions on the form that might help obtain feedback from the students on what worked and what didn’t work in the class. The faculty secretary also noted that the return rates of the evaluations were significantly lower with the online forms than the old forms that were handed out in class. Return rates of 35% make the summary scores of questionable value and should give us significant doubts about our reliance on them.

Professor Johnson-Leung’s concluding comments on this complex topic emphasized that whatever assessment tools we create can be misused. We need to use a more holistic approach towards evaluation of faculty teaching and we should also provide narratives that put any summary numbers in context.

Computing and Informatics Task Force. Chair Teal invited Larry Stauffer, the Dean of Engineering (and former Faculty Senator), to provide an update on the computing and informatics task force. Dean Stauffer explained that this task force was created to address difficult questions regarding how the University is organized in dealing with the “big data” and computing information needs of the 21st Century. The task force has focused on three ideas:

- Explore the need for additional undergraduate degree programs in data science and data analytics.
- Develop a formal interdisciplinary collaboration of faculty and staff to conduct research and education in the area of computing and information.
- Plan for the future by considering the reorganization of existing programs.

Professor Stauffer asked the Senate to consider how disruptive our plans in this area ought to be? Not surprisingly Senator’s didn’t rush to answer this question, although one Senator turned the question around and inquired if the task force had considered various scenarios representing different degrees of disruption.

Professor Stauffer indicated that one idea that would be fairly disruptive would be to organize a new school of computing and information systems by comparing parts of existing colleges.

There seemed to be widespread agreement in the Senate that looking into these questions is essential, but how bold we should be wasn’t clear. One Senator suggested we should start small but quickly, while another suggested we pay careful attention to what niche we could serve in the educational market. Several people pointed out that while we were pretty disaggregated, we had significant sources of expertise across campus. Another Senator noted that we ran significant risks of having people with such expertise move on to other places because of the lack of resources here.

The Chair introduced Phillip Scruggs from Movement Sciences to discuss two items approved by UCC.

FS-16-003 (UCC-16-001a)—Education-Discontinue Sport Science and Coaching Minors. This proposal is to discontinue the minors in Sport Science and Coaching. There was no discussion and the proposal passed unanimously.

FS-16-005 (UCC-16-001c)—Education-Separation of Joint Minors. This proposal separates two joint minors currently held by the College of Education with the College of Natural Resources. This proposal makes Movement Sciences the sole administrator of the minors in Outdoor Recreation Leadership as well as the minor in Sustainable Tourism and Leisure Enterprises. There was no discussion of these items and the proposal passed unanimously.

Adjournment: A motion to adjourn (Latrell/Brewick) passed without objection at 4:51.

Respectfully submitted,

Don Crowley, Faculty Secretary
and Secretary to the Faculty Senate
Below is a list of the nationally recognized top reasons students are not retained on a college campus followed by University of Idaho specific resources to direct students who express those reasons. At the end of the summary are the location and contact information for most of these resources.

**Reason 1:** Inadequate Preparation for College Work

- Listen for cues (Can’t finish exams, inability to focus, etc.) – Disability Support Services, University Library, and Counseling & Testing Center
- Academic tutoring needs – Academic Support & Access Programs (Student Support Services, Disability Support Services, & Tutoring & College Success), Residence Life Student Success Center, and Vandal Academic Support Services (Athletics)
- English proficiency – International Programs Office (American Language and Culture Program)
- Explore other academic and professional options and assess whether community college or online offerings might be a better option – College Academic Advisors, Career Center, and College Career Staff

**Reason 2:** Lack of motivation to succeed academically

- For physical and mental health reasons – Counseling and Testing Center, Student Recreation Center, Student Health, and the Campus Dietician
- To find community while here – Student Involvement, Office of Multicultural Affairs, LGBTQA Office, Women’s Center, Native American Student Center, International Programs Office, College Assistance Migrant Program, Student Recreation Center, Housing and Residence Life, Fraternity & Sorority Life, and Steel House
- Unsure about major and career goals – College Academic Advisors, Career Center, Career Finder, and Degree Finder
- To pursue alternative living arrangements – Housing and Residence Life, Fraternity & Sorority Life, and Steel House
- To get involved with co-curricular activities – Student Involvement, Student Recreation Center, Fraternity & Sorority Life, Residence Hall Association, and Associated Students University of Idaho
**Reason 3:**
Indecision about major and/or career goals

- To explore other academic and career opportunities – Career Center, Career Finder & Degree Finder, and College Academic Advisors
- To understand your major and other options – College and Department Faculty and Academic Advisors
- To explore new majors – General Studies Major Advisor, Co-Curricular Activities (Like the CLASS Major Fair), Student Involvement, and Career Center
- To study abroad as a form of personal exploration – International Programs Office
- To volunteer in new fields – Center for Volunteerism and Social Action
- To try out majors not offered at UI or explore new places – National Student Exchange (run by the International Programs Office)

**Reason 4:**
Physical and/or mental health problems

- Dean of Students Office
- Counseling and Testing Center
- Disability Support Services
- Student Health
- Violence Prevention Programs
- International Programs Office (for international students)

**Reason 5:**
Inadequate financial resources

- For increases in budgets, loan opportunities and more – Financial Aid Office
- For multicultural students – Office of Multicultural Affairs Diversity Scholarships
- For international students – International Programs Office Scholarships
- For LGBT students – LGBTQA Office Scholarships
- For student veteran – Veteran’s Assistance Center
- For students in need of food – Local Food Banks
- For work study and student off campus job postings – Financial Aid Office and Human Resources
- For payment plans with UI – Student Accounts
- For declaring residency for tuition purposes – Registrar
- To pursue community and state agency resources, like Section 8 housing, food stamp programs, etc. – Idaho Department of Health and Welfare

78% of students return after freshman year, 22% do not.
REASON 6: Job demands

- To create an academic plan – College Academic Advisors
- For time management help – Academic Support & Access Programs, Residence Life Student Success Center (run by Housing), and Office of Multicultural Affairs
- To develop a four year financial aid plan – Financial Aid Office
- Financial literacy program to understand cost of working vs more time at UI – Financial Aid Office
- Consider on campus jobs with a greater understanding of student schedules – Human Resources

REASON 7: Lack of family support

- To discuss issues with a counselor – Counseling & Testing Center, Dean of Students Office, and Financial Aid Office
- To transition from dependent to independent on FAFSA – Financial Aid Office
- To find community while here – Student Involvement, Office of Multicultural Affairs, LGBTQA Office, Women’s Center, Native American Student Center, International Programs Office, Religious Centers and Organizations, College Assistance Migrant Program, Housing and Residence Life, Fraternity & Sorority Life, and Steel House

REASON 8: Family demands

- If money related – Financial Aid Office
- If child care related – Children’s Center
- If mental health related – Counseling and Testing Center
- If physical health related – Student Health
- If related to violence – Violence Prevention Program and Alternatives to Violence of the Palouse
- For non-traditional students – Student Involvement, and Non-Traditional Student Association (contact through Student Involvement)
- To pursue community and state agency resources, like Section 8 housing, food stamp programs etc. – Idaho Department of Health and Welfare

58% of students graduate in six years and 23% transfer before finishing.
REASON 9:
Distance from permanent home

- For international students – International Programs Office
- For resources to get to southern and southeastern Idaho and Portland on holidays – Dean of Students Office
- To stay connected – Information Technology Services to explore distance technology
- To talk about homesickness and culture shock – Counseling & Testing Center
- To explore UI degrees closer to home – Boise, CDA and Idaho Falls Centers, Distance & Extended Education, and Registrar
- To discuss goals, cost vs benefit analysis of staying at UI – Financial Aid Office, College Academic Advisors and Career Center
- To get your parents to Moscow – Annual Mom and Dads’ Weekends (run by the Alumni Office)
- To connect with other people in your new, temporary home – Housing and Residence Life, Fraternity & Sorority Life, and Steel House
- To find community while here – Student Involvement, Office of Multicultural Affairs, LGBTQA Office, Women’s Center, Native American Student Center, International Programs Office, Religious Centers and Organizations, College Assistance Migrant Program, Housing and Residence Life, Fraternity & Sorority Life, and Steel House
- For help with cultural adjustment – International Programs Office, and Office of Multicultural Affairs
- To explore UI degrees closer to home – Boise, CDA and Idaho Falls Centers, Distance & Extended Education, and Registrar
- To discuss goals, cost vs benefit analysis of staying at UI – Financial Aid Office, College Academic Advisors and Career Center
- To get your parents to Moscow – Annual Mom and Dads’ Weekends (run by the Alumni Office)
- To connect with other people in your new, temporary home – Housing and Residence Life, Fraternity & Sorority Life, and Steel House
- To find community while here – Student Involvement, Office of Multicultural Affairs, LGBTQA Office, Women’s Center, Native American Student Center, International Programs Office, Religious Centers and Organizations, College Assistance Migrant Program, Housing and Residence Life, Fraternity & Sorority Life, and Steel House
- To get involved with student organizations – Student Involvement, Associated Students University of Idaho, and Non-Traditional Student Association (contact through Student Involvement)
- To connect with students in living situations – Housing, Steel House, Housing Theme Floors (Mosaic, LLCs), and Fraternity & Sorority Life
- To meet people in community spaces – Campus Events, Student Diversity Center (run by Office of Multicultural Affairs), Commons, Women’s Center, Student Org Space (run by Student Involvement), Veteran’s Center, Native American Student Center, Student Recreation Center, University Library, Moscow Chamber of Commerce, Moscow Parks and Recreation, and Off Campus Spaces around Moscow and Pullman
- For help with cultural adjustment – International Programs Office, and Office of Multicultural Affairs
- To explore UI degrees closer to home – Boise, CDA and Idaho Falls Centers, Distance & Extended Education, and Registrar
- To discuss goals, cost vs benefit analysis of staying at UI – Financial Aid Office, College Academic Advisors and Career Center
- To get your parents to Moscow – Annual Mom and Dads’ Weekends (run by the Alumni Office)
- To connect with other people in your new, temporary home – Housing and Residence Life, Fraternity & Sorority Life, and Steel House
- To find community while here – Student Involvement, Office of Multicultural Affairs, LGBTQA Office, Women’s Center, Native American Student Center, International Programs Office, Religious Centers and Organizations, College Assistance Migrant Program, Housing and Residence Life, Fraternity & Sorority Life, and Steel House
- To get involved with student organizations – Student Involvement, Associated Students University of Idaho, and Non-Traditional Student Association (contact through Student Involvement)
- To connect with students in living situations – Housing, Steel House, Housing Theme Floors (Mosaic, LLCs), and Fraternity & Sorority Life
- To meet people in community spaces – Campus Events, Student Diversity Center (run by Office of Multicultural Affairs), Commons, Women’s Center, Student Org Space (run by Student Involvement), Veteran’s Center, Native American Student Center, Student Recreation Center, University Library, Moscow Chamber of Commerce, Moscow Parks and Recreation, and Off Campus Spaces around Moscow and Pullman

REASON 10:
Poor social integration
(peer group interaction, co-curricular activities)

- For non-traditional students – Student Involvement, Associated Students University of Idaho, and Non-Traditional Student Association (contact through Student Involvement)
- For help with cultural adjustment – International Programs Office, and Office of Multicultural Affairs
- To find community while here – Student Involvement, Office of Multicultural Affairs, LGBTQA Office, Women’s Center, Native American Student Center, International Programs Office, Local Religious Centers and Organizations, and College Assistance Migrant Program
- To get involved with student organizations – Student Involvement, Associated Students University of Idaho, Residence Hall Association, Fraternity & Sorority Life, and vandalsync.orgsync.com
- To connect with students in living situations – Housing, Steel House, Housing Theme Floors (Mosaic, LLCs), and Fraternity & Sorority Life
- To meet people in community spaces – Campus Events, Student Diversity Center (run by Office of Multicultural Affairs), Commons, Women’s Center, Student Org Space (run by Student Involvement), Veteran’s Center, Native American Student Center, Student Recreation Center, University Library, Moscow Chamber of Commerce, Moscow Parks and Recreation, and Off Campus Spaces around Moscow and Pullman
Contact Information

Academic Advising, TLC 231, 5-6300, advising@uidaho.edu

Academic Support & Access Programs, Commons 306, 5-6307, asap@uidaho.edu

Alternatives to Violence of the Palouse (ATVP), (877) 334-2887, home@atvp.org

Alumni Office, 1212 Blake Ave., 5-6154, alumni@uidaho.edu

Associated Students University of Idaho (ASUI), Commons 302, 5-6331, asui@uidaho.edu

Campus Dietician, Student Recreation Center, 5-6717, mrudley@uidaho.edu

College Assistant Migrant Program (CAMP), 865 W. 7th Street, 5-5173, camp@uidaho.edu

Career Center, Commons 334, 5-6121, careercenter@uidaho.edu

Center for Volunteerism & Social Action, Commons 301, 5-9442, volunteer@uidaho.edu

Children’s Center, 421 Sweet Avenue, 5-6414, uikids@uidaho.edu

Counseling & Testing Center (CTC), Mary Forney Hall 308, 5-6716, ctc@uidaho.edu

Dean of Students Office, TLC 232, 5-6757, askjoe@uidaho.edu

Disability Support Services, Commons 306, 5-6307, dss@uidaho.edu

Distance & Extended Education, Targhee Hall Basement, 5-4024, dee@uidaho.edu

Financial Aid Office, Pitman Center 101, 5-6312, finaid@uidaho.edu

Fraternity & Sorority Life, TLC 232, 5-6757, greek@uidaho.edu

Housing, 1080 W. 6th Street, 5-9361, housing@uidaho.edu

Human Resources, 415 West 6th Street, 5-3609, hr@uidaho.edu

Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, 1350 Troy Highway, Moscow, ID, (877) 456-1233

International Programs Office, LLC Bldg #3, 5-8984, ipo@uidaho.edu

LGBTQA Office, TLC 227, 5-6583, lgbtoffice@uidaho.edu

Moscow Chamber of Commerce, 411 S. Main Street, Moscow, ID, (208) 882-1800

Moscow Parks and Recreation, 1724 East F Street, Moscow, ID, (208) 883-7084

Native American Student Center, 865 W 7th Street, 5-4237, ssamuels@uidaho.edu

Office of Multicultural Affairs, TLC 230, 5-7716, oma@uidaho.edu

Registrar’s Office, Pitman Center, 1st Floor, 5-6731, registrar@uidaho.edu

Residence Hall Association, Wallace Residence Center Basement, rha@uidaho.edu

Steel House, 908 S. Blake, Moscow, ID, (208) 310-1344, delh@uidaho.edu

Student Accounts, Pitman Center, 1st Floor, 5-7447, acctrec@uidaho.edu

Student Health, 623 S. Main, 5-6693, health@uidaho.edu

Student Involvement, Commons 302, 5-6331, getinvolved@uidaho.edu
SIX YEAR GRADUATION RATES ARE LOWER IN MULTICULTURAL POPULATIONS:

39% FOR AMERICAN INDIAN STUDENTS,
25% FOR AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS,
46% FOR LATINO STUDENTS,
53% FOR ASIAN AMERICAN STUDENTS,
AND 54% FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

CENTERS

Boise Center, 322 E. Front Street, Boise, ID, (208) 334-2999, Boise@uidaho.edu

Coeur d’Alene (CDA) Center, 1031 N. Academic Way, Suite 242, CDA, ID, (888) 208-2268, cdactr@uidaho.edu

Idaho Falls Center, 1776 Science Center Drive, Suite 306, Idaho Falls, ID, (208) 282-7900, ui-if@if.uidaho.edu

FOOD BANKS

Moscow Food Bank, 110 N. Polk, Moscow, ID, (208) 882-4813
Trinity Moscow Food Pantry, 711 Fairview, Moscow, ID, (208) 882-2015
Vandal Food Pantry, Commons 301, 5-9442, volunteer@uidaho.edu

COLLEGES

College of Agricultural and Life Sciences, Agricultural Sciences Bldg., 5-7984, aginst@uidaho.edu

College of Art & Architecture, Art and Architecture Bldg., 5-4409, caa@uidaho.edu

College of Business & Economics, Albertsons Bldg., 5-6478, cbe@uidaho.edu

College of Education, Commons 215, 5-6772, coe@uidaho.edu

College of Engineering, Janssen Engineering Bldg. 125, 5-6470, deanengr@uidaho.edu

College of Graduate Studies, Morrill Hall, Room 104, 5-2647, uigrad@uidaho.edu

College of Law, Menard Bldg. 101, 5-2255, uilaw@uidaho.edu

College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences, Admin Bldg. 112, 5-6426, class@uidaho.edu

College of Natural Resources, Natural Resources Bldg., 5-5018, cnradvising@uidaho.edu

College of Science, Mines 321, 5-6195, science@uidaho.edu
The Retention Resource Guide is a product of the Student Recruitment and Retention Committee of the President’s Diversity Council and the Division of Diversity & Human Rights. This piece is the first guide created for use in 2015-16. Corrections, edits, and additions for future versions of the guide should be sent to Jeffrey A. Dodge at jdodge@uidaho.edu. Special thanks to Dr. Carmen Suarez, former Chief Diversity Officer, for her support of this project.
Distance Education defined:

The U.S. Department of Education defines distance education as follows:

Distance education means education that uses one or more of the technologies listed below to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the instructor and to support regular and substantive interaction between the students and the instructor, either synchronously or asynchronously. The technologies may include—

1. The Internet;
2. One-way and two-way transmissions through open broadcast, closed circuit, cable, microwave, broadband lines, fiber optics, satellite, or wireless communications devices;
3. Audio conferencing; or
4. Video cassettes, DVDs, and CD-ROMs, if the cassettes, DVDs, or CD-ROMs are used in a course in conjunction with any of the technologies listed in paragraphs (1) through (3).

For the purposes of our discussion today, “distance education” includes online courses, video courses, hybrid courses, and maybe some other delivery models that we can identify in our conversation.

Organizational Structure

The University of Idaho has a decentralized model for distance education development and delivery, with individual Colleges and departments developing and providing a variety of distance education options.

The University of Idaho has a decentralized model of distance education management, with a variety of units providing support for distance education efforts (e.g. ITS, DEE, Regional Centers, Registrar, Admissions, Financial Aid, etc.).

Regulation

Distance education is regulated by many agencies: e.g. regional accrediting bodies, the Idaho State Board of Education, state agencies outside Idaho, US Department of Education, and professional accrediting and licensing boards.

“Best Practices”

Regulatory bodies expect institutions to show evidence of the use of “best practices” in the development, implementation, and management of distance education activities. The following attachments are examples of regulatory expectations (C-RAC) and best practices (Quality Matters)
Interregional Guidelines for the Evaluation of Distance Education
Council of Regional Accrediting Commissions (C-RAC) (2011)

Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities is a member of C-RAC.
The University of Idaho is a member of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities

Adopted by the National Council-State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements (NC-SARA).
The State of Idaho is a member state of NC-SARA, and the University of Idaho is a member institution.
The first annual report to NC-SARA, which will include a narrative on how UI meets these guidelines, will be due in Spring, 2016.

1. Online learning is appropriate to the institution’s mission and purposes.
Analysis/Evidence: These bulleted points illustrate actions, processes and facts that institutions may use to demonstrate that they meet SARA requirements. They are not specific requirements.

- The mission statement explains the role of online learning within the range of the institution’s programs and services;
- Institutional and program statements of vision and values inform how the online learning environment is created and supported;
- As appropriate, the institution incorporates into its online learning programs methods of meeting the stated institutional goals for the student experience at the institution;
- The recruitment and admissions programs supporting the online learning courses and programs appropriately target the student populations to be served;
- The students enrolled in the institution’s online learning courses and programs fit the admissions requirements for the students the institution intends to serve;
- Senior administrators and staff can articulate how online learning is consonant with the institution’s mission and goals.

2. The institution’s plans for developing, sustaining, and, if appropriate, expanding online learning offerings are integrated into its regular planning and evaluation processes.
Analysis/Evidence: These bulleted points illustrate actions, processes and facts that institutions may use to demonstrate that they meet SARA requirements. They are not specific requirements.

- Development and ownership of plans for online learning extend beyond the administrators directly responsible for it and the programs directly using it;
- Planning documents are explicit about any goals to increase numbers of programs provided through online learning courses and programs and/or numbers of students to be enrolled in them;
- Plans for online learning are linked effectively to budget and technology planning to ensure adequate support for current and future offerings;
- Plans for expanding online learning demonstrate the institution’s capacity to assure an appropriate level of quality;
- The institution and its online learning programs have a track record of conducting needs analysis and of supporting programs.

3. Online learning is incorporated into the institution’s systems of governance and academic oversight.
Analysis/Evidence: These bulleted points illustrate actions, processes and facts that institutions may use to demonstrate that they meet SARA requirements. They are not specific requirements.

- The institution’s faculty have a designated role in the design and implementation of its online learning offerings;
- The institution ensures the rigor of the offerings and the quality of the instruction;
- Approval of online courses and programs follows standard processes used in the college or university;
- Online learning courses and programs are evaluated on a periodic basis;
- Contractual relationships and arrangements with consortial partners, if any, are clear and guarantee that the institution can exercise appropriate responsibility for the academic quality of all online learning offerings provided under its name.

4. Curricula for the institution’s online learning offerings are coherent, cohesive, and comparable in academic rigor to programs offered in traditional instructional formats.
Analysis/Evidence: These bulleted points illustrate actions, processes and facts that institutions may use to demonstrate that they meet SARA requirements. They are not specific requirements.

- The curricular goals and course objectives show that the institution or program has knowledge of the best uses of online learning in different disciplines and settings;
• Curricula delivered through online learning are benchmarked against on-ground courses and programs, if provided by the institution, or those provided by traditional institutions;
• The curriculum is coherent in its content and sequencing of courses and is effectively defined in easily available documents including course syllabi and program descriptions;
• Scheduling of online learning courses and programs provides students with a dependable pathway to ensure timely completion of degrees;
• The institution or program has established and enforces a policy on online learning course enrollments to ensure faculty capacity to work appropriately with students;
• Expectations for any required face-to-face, on-ground work (e.g., internships, specialized laboratory work) are stated clearly;
• Course design and delivery supports student-student and faculty-student interaction;
• Curriculum design and the course management system enable active faculty contribution to the learning environment;
• Course and program structures provide schedule and support known to be effective in helping online learning students persist and succeed.

5. The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its online learning offerings, including the extent to which the online learning goals are achieved, and uses the results of its evaluations to enhance the attainment of the goals.

**Analysis/Evidence:** These bulleted points illustrate actions, processes and facts that institutions may use to demonstrate that they meet SARA requirements. They are not specific requirements.

• Assessment of student learning follows processes used in onsite courses or programs and/or reflects good practice in assessment methods;
• Student course evaluations are routinely taken and an analysis of them contributes to strategies for course improvements;
• Evaluation strategies ensure effective communication between faculty members who design curriculum, faculty members who interact with students, and faculty members who evaluate student learning;
• The institution regularly evaluates the effectiveness of the academic and support services provided to students in online courses and uses the results for improvement;
• The institution demonstrates the appropriate use of technology to support its assessment strategies;
• The institution documents its successes in implementing changes informed by its programs of assessment and evaluation;
• The institution provides examples of student work and student interactions among themselves and with faculty;
• The institution sets appropriate goals for the retention/persistence of students using online learning, assesses its achievement of these goals, and uses the results for improvement.

6. Faculty responsible for delivering the online learning curricula and evaluating the students’ success in achieving the online learning goals are appropriately qualified and effectively supported.

**Analysis/Evidence:** These bulleted points illustrate actions, processes and facts that Institutions may use to demonstrate that they meet SARA requirements. They are not specific requirements.

• Online learning faculties are carefully selected, appropriately trained, frequently evaluated, and are marked by an acceptable level of turnover;
• The institution’s training program for online learning faculty is periodic, incorporates tested good practices in online learning pedagogy, and ensures competency with the range of software products used by the institution;
• Faculty are proficient and effectively supported in using the course management system;
• The office or persons responsible for online learning training programs are clearly identified and have the competencies to accomplish the tasks, including knowledge of the specialized resources and technical support available to support course development and delivery;
• Faculty members engaged in online learning share in the mission and goals of the institution and its programs and are provided the opportunities to contribute to the broader activities of the institution;
• Students express satisfaction with the quality of the instruction provided by online learning faculty members.

7. The institution provides effective student and academic services to support students enrolled in online learning offerings.

**Analysis/Evidence:** These bulleted points illustrate actions, processes and facts that institutions may use to demonstrate that they meet SARA requirements. They are not specific requirements.

• The institution’s admissions program for online learning provides good web-based information to students about the nature of the online learning environment, and assists them in determining if they possess the skills important to success in online learning;
• The institution provides an online learning orientation program;
• The institution provides support services to students in formats appropriate to the delivery of the online learning program;
• Students in online learning programs have adequate access to student services, including financial aid, course registration, and career and placement counseling;
• Students in online learning programs have ready access to 24/7 tech support;
• Students using online learning have adequate access to learning resources, including library, information resources, laboratories, and equipment and tracking systems;
• Students using online learning demonstrate proficiency in the use of electronic forms of learning resources;
• Student complaint processes are clearly defined and can be used electronically;
• Publications and advertising for online learning programs are accurate and contain necessary information such as program goals, requirements, academic calendar, and faculty;
• Students are provided with reasonable and cost-effective ways to participate in the institution’s system of student authentication.

8. The institution provides sufficient resources to support and, if appropriate, expand its online learning offerings.
Analysis/Evidence: These bulleted points illustrate actions, processes and facts that institutions may use to demonstrate that they meet SARA requirements. They are not specific requirements.

• The institution prepares a multi-year budget for online learning that includes resources for assessment of program demand, marketing, appropriate levels of faculty and staff, faculty and staff development, library and information resources, and technology infrastructure;
• The institution provides evidence of a multi-year technology plan that addresses its goals for online learning and includes provision for a robust and scalable technical infrastructure.

9. The institution assures the integrity of its online offerings.
Analysis/Evidence: These bulleted points illustrate actions, processes and facts that institutions may use to demonstrate that they meet SARA requirements. They are not specific requirements.

• The institution has in place effective procedures through which to ensure that the student who registers in a distance education course or program is the same student who participates in and completes the course or program and receives the academic credit. The institution makes clear in writing that these processes protect student privacy and notifies students at the time of registration or enrollment of any projected additional costs associated with the verification procedures. (Note: This is a federal requirement. All institutions that offer distance education programs must demonstrate compliance with this requirement.);
• The institution’s policies on academic integrity include explicit references to online learning;
• Issues of academic integrity are discussed during the orientation for online students;
• Training for faculty members engaged in online learning includes consideration of issues of academic integrity, including ways to reduce cheating
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards from the QM Higher Education Rubric, Fifth Edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Overview Introduction</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Instructions make clear how to get started and where to find various course components.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Learners are introduced to the purpose and structure of the course.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Etiquette expectations (sometimes called &quot;netiquette&quot;) for online discussions, email, and other forms of communication are clearly stated.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Course and/or institutional policies with which the learner is expected to comply are clearly stated, or a link to current policies is provided.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Minimum technology requirements are clearly stated and instructions for use provided.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Prerequisite knowledge in the discipline and/or any required competencies are clearly stated.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Minimum technical skills expected of the learner are clearly stated.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 The self-introduction by the instructor is appropriate and is available online.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9 Learners are asked to introduce themselves to the class.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Objectives (Competencies)</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 The course learning objectives, or course/program competencies, describe outcomes that are measurable.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 The module/unit learning objectives or competencies describe outcomes that are measurable and consistent with the course-level objectives or competencies.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 All learning objectives or competencies are stated clearly and written from the learner's perspective.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 The relationship between learning objectives or competencies and course activities is clearly stated.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 The learning objectives or competencies are suited to the level of the course.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment and Measurement</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 The assessments measure the stated learning objectives or competencies.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 The course grading policy is stated clearly.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Specific and descriptive criteria are provided for the evaluation of learners' work and are tied to the course grading policy.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 The assessment instruments selected are sequenced, varied, and suited to the learner work being assessed.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 The course provides learners with multiple opportunities to track their learning progress.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Materials</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 The instructional materials contribute to the achievement of the stated course and module/unit learning objectives or competencies.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Both the purpose of instructional materials and how the materials are to be used for learning activities are clearly explained.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 All instructional materials used in the course are appropriately cited.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 The instructional materials are current.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 A variety of instructional materials is used in the course.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 The distinction between required and optional materials is clearly explained.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Activities and Learner Interaction</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 The learning activities promote the achievement of the stated learning objectives or competencies.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Learning activities provide opportunities for interaction that support active learning.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 The instructor's plan for classroom response time and feedback on assignments is clearly stated.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 The requirements for learner interaction are clearly stated.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Technology</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 The tools used in the course support the learning objectives and competencies.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Course tools promote learner engagement and active learning.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Technologies required in the course are readily obtainable.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 The course technologies are current.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Links are provided to privacy policies for all external tools required in the course.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner Support</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 The course instructions articulate or link to a clear description of the technical support offered and how to obtain it.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Course instructions articulate or link to the institution's accessibility policies and services.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Course instructions articulate or link to an explanation of how the institution's academic support services and resources can help learners succeed in the course and how learners can obtain them.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Course instructions articulate or link to an explanation of how the institution's student services and resources can help learners succeed and how learners can obtain them.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility and Usability</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Course navigation facilitates ease of use.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Information is provided about the accessibility of all technologies required in the course.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 The course provides alternative means of access to course materials in formats that meet the needs of diverse learners.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 The course design facilitates readability.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5 Course multimedia facilitate ease of use.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Appeals Committee (new)

As some of you may know students may appeal from the Student Disciplinary Review Board to a three person faculty committee comprised of faculty senate members. Generally Faculty Senate members are appointed to these committees based on availability. After reviewing a number of these appeals from last year, Senate Leadership has suggested that we consider the formation of a review panel similar to the Faculty Appeals Panel that could receive some Title IX training and have, the opportunity to become familiar with the appeals process and possibly be composed of a broader group of faculty then those on the Senate. Committee on Committee has discussed and approved the function/structure of this new committee which comes to senate as a seconded motion.

Student Appeals Committee – FSH 1640.83

A. Function. To conduct a review at the request of a student who wishes to appeal a decision of the Student Disciplinary Review Board. Faculty Senate Leadership will make a determination as to whether the student’s appeal meets the qualifications as stated in FSH 2400 C-6 and if so, will form a review panel (see B-1 below) from the committee.

B. Structure and Membership. The committee shall be composed of nine members to include six faculty (at least two will be from the current year’s Faculty Senate) and three students (at least one undergraduate and one graduate student) who will be eligible to serve on a review panel (see B-1 below). The term of membership is three years, with initial terms staggered to form a rotation pattern. Each committee member will be required to participate in Title IX training.

B-1. Review Panel: For each appeal, Faculty Senate Leadership will select a three person review panel from the above committee. If possible, each panel will consist of two faculty (one of whom serves as chair) and one student.