Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
2016-2017 Meeting #15, Tuesday, January 31, 2017

Present: Anderson (Mike), Anderson (Miranda), Berven, Boschetti, Brandt (Chair), Brewick, Brown, Cannon (Boise), Caplan, Chung, Crowley (w/o vote), Donohoe, Fisher, Godfrey (Coeur d'Alene), Hrdlicka, Johnson, Markuson, Nicotra, Wilson, Stevenson for Wieneck (w/o vote), Wright. Absent: Adekanmbi, Barbour, Folwell, Ostrom (Idaho Falls), Morrison, Payant, Pregitzer, Sixtos, Wieneck (w/o vote), Guests: 9

The Chair called meeting #15 to order at 3:31. A motion (Johnson/Miranda Anderson) to approve the minutes from January 24th passed without objection.

Chair’s Report: Chair Brandt recognized the new members of the Senate. Miranda Wilson will be replacing Dean Panttaja as a Senator from CLASS while Professor Panttaja is engaging in scholarly activity in Egypt. Aaron Johnson will be representing CALS—Kat Wolf had been substituting for him last semester. Christine Berven will be substituting for James Foster as a Senator from Science. Lee Ostrom will be taking the place of Bob Hiromoto as our Senator from Idaho Falls. Finally, Cooper Wright will be stepping in as the representative from the Student Bar Association. Chair Brandt thanked all of these new Senators for their willingness to serve.

Chair Brandt asked Senators to note the attachment to the agenda. QPR (Question, Persuade, Refer) is a training program that teaches participants how to respond to someone having a mental health crisis and thinking about suicide. Professors might consider using this service as a substitute if they are going to miss a lecture. Chair Brandt also announced that Faculty Secretary Don Crowley has decided to retire at the end of this semester. Professor Crowley noted that he had decided to try retirement again after serving a three-year term as Faculty Secretary. Crowley stated that he has enjoyed his term as Faculty Secretary and expressed his continuing belief in the importance of the Senate and its various committees in fostering faculty governance. Chair Brandt thanked Professor Crowley for his commitment to the governance process and further noted that Vice Chair Hrdlicka will be forming a search committee to appoint a new Faculty Secretary.

Before moving on to the agenda Chair Brandt asked for permission to amend the agenda to add a short presentation by Professor Evans from the law school regarding students and colleagues on campus who might be affected by President Trump’s recent executive order on immigration. A motion (Nicotra/Brewick) to amend the agenda to allow for this discussion as new business passed unanimously.

Provost’s Report: Vice Provost Jeanne Stevenson provided a list of announcements:
- A Center for Teaching & Learning is being developed. There will be opportunities this semester for faculty to participate in activities related to this new center.
- There will be sessions on campus and throughout the state for faculty and staff to participate in discussions related to the “Great Colleges to Work For” survey. The purpose of these discussions is to explore possible areas of growth for the University.
- UBFC is reviewing budget requests and will be making recommendations later this semester.
- The workgroups working on Program Prioritization will be making presentations during this semester.
- A search for a Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives has begun. Jeanne Stevenson reported that her position has been retitled Vice Provost for Faculty. Please encourage good candidates to apply.
- The next meeting for the Vandal Ideas project will be Monday February 13th in the Pitman Center, 3:30-5 pm.
A Senator asked whether there might be some other opportunities for input on the Great Places to Work Survey other than the scheduled meetings. Provost Stevenson promised to get back to the Senator on that matter.

**FS-17-030 (UCC-17-024) Upper Division Credits J-5-a limitations on Community College transfer credits.**
Registrar Heather Chermak, Patricia Hart, Chair of University Curriculum Committee, (UCC) and Kenton Bird, Director of General Education, were invited to discuss proposed changes passed by UCC. Ms. Chermak discussed the proposed removal of the limitation on the number of credits that could be transferred to the University of Idaho (UI) from a community college. Previously the limit was 70 credits but we are now the only university in the state that has such a limit. Ms. Chermak commented that when this proposal was presented at UCC, there was a concern about only requiring 36 upper-division credits to graduate. A student could take 84 credits at a community college and 36 upper-division credits at the UI and graduate with a UI degree. Some faculty felt that removing this limit on community college transfer credit would weaken a UI degree. In response, a proposal from CLASS was offered to raise the required number of upper-division credits to 42. Professor Hart stated that this was an attempt to make the UI’s upper-division requirements more consistent with our peer institutions. UCC amended the suggested 42 credits to 40 and passed the two proposals together. The number of credits required in residence at the UI would remain at 30, but overall 40 upper-division credits would be required. A Senator asked how many programs required less than 40 upper-division credits. The answer to this question wasn’t readily apparent, although at least one Senator thought there were programs that required less than 40 credits. A Senator wondered why these two provisions were linked, since he did not see the two provisions being clearly connected. Professor Hart commented that the increase in upper-division credit was designed to ensure the integrity of a UI degree. We are unable to vet the quality of a community college course, but we can vet the quality of our upper-division courses.

There was a motion (Brewick/Johnson) to vote on the two proposals separately. This motion would mean that the Senate would first vote to remove the limit on community college credits followed by a vote on whether to increase the required number of upper-division credits to 40. This proposal to separate the two proposals passed 13-4.

The Senate began discussing whether to remove the credit limitation in J-5-a. A Senator asked for clarification on the purpose of this change. Dwaine Hubbard from the Registrar’s Office suggested that one possible reason was to help place bound students who could take an extra semester at a local community college. A Senator expressed concern that this would allow students to take up to 84 credits at a community college. This Senator wondered if UCC had discussed moving the limit up, but not entirely removing it? It was noted that this had not been discussed. After further discussion and clarification about what exactly the Senate was voting on, the issue came to a vote. The vote to remove the limit on community college credits passed 12-1-4.

The Senate was then asked to vote on the rest of the original motion as to whether to raise the number of required upper-division credits to 40. A Senator asked what arguments had been made regarding the difference between 42 & 40. Professor Hart suggested that the preference for 40 credits was primarily related to allowing programs greater flexibility. The proposal to raise the number of required upper-division credits to 40 passed 12-3-2. Thus, after splitting the seconded motion from UCC, both proposals passed.

**FS-17-032 (UCC-17-032). College of Law. 3 plus 3 program for BA/BS and JD.** Chair Brandt introduced Jeff Dodge as the Associate Dean of the College of Law to discuss this proposal. Professor Dodge stated that the College of Law had offered this program in the past, but somehow the program had become dormant.
without their conscious knowledge. The college had certainly not planned to move the program to the inactive list. The proposal before the Senate today is to reinstate the program. This program allows students who qualify to complete the last 30 credits of their BA/BS while attending law school. A Senator asked how common this program was. Professor Dodge stated that many schools had such a program, but it was not a heavily used program. He suggested that students have not taken advantage of such programs because it takes a great deal of advanced planning. He expressed optimism that the program would be used more frequently in the future. In response to a question, Professor Dodge stated that the first-year program in law (30-32 credits) would be used to satisfy the last 30 required credits of a student’s undergraduate program. For instance, a student in History or Political Science would have to complete 90 credits (and all the required courses) in their first three years and then complete their program with the 30 credits taken in the first year of law school.

A Senator asked about graduate rules limiting the ability of students to take courses towards their MA/MS while an undergraduate. The general response was that programs wishing to create some version of a 3 plus 3 program for MA’s would need to propose a revision and work with Graduate Council and UCC.

A Senator suggested that many programs on campus might want to look at developing such options. Asked about the social benefits of this program, Professor Dodge suggested this would lower the amount of debt accumulated by some law students. By lowering this debt load, students can make career choices that have social benefits (non-profit organizations, legal aid clinics) rather than being led to take jobs designed to pay off their debt. The proposal to approve the 3 plus 3 program for the law school passed 16-1.

Efficiencies and Effectiveness Centralization Subcommittee. Chair Brandt introduced Greg Fizzell, Chair of Staff Council, in his capacity as Chair of the Efficiencies and Effectiveness Subcommittee to discuss opportunities for centralizing services on campus. Mr. Fizzell explained that he was not at Senate to make a report, but rather to seek information regarding opportunities for centralization that might lead to achieving greater efficiencies on campus. He noted that areas like IT and Finance are services sometimes mentioned as possibilities for centralization. It is possible to propose hybrid models that involve various degrees of centralization. A Senator commented that this year she was pleased with the greater degree of centralization in the area of video conferencing. She further commented that while she could see the need for greater centralization of IT, not if that meant units would have to wait longer periods to get service. Centralization of services is fine, if there is enough support to provide prompt service to units.

A couple of Senators noted that centralization can lead to savings, but the costs (other than financial) also need to be considered. There are trade-offs. Different areas frequently have different needs, which can be difficult to satisfy from a centralization office. There seemed to be considerable support in the Senate for exploring hybrid models that involved centralized training, followed by a person being assigned to a particular program. A Senator suggested that centralized training of advisors, followed by embedding advisors in colleges, has led to significant improvement in advising and fewer disqualified or probationary students.

A Senator raised the problem of charging for centralized services. The fact that some units have greater resources to pay for services that are centralized while others do not have the resources, can also be a problem. Departments with fewer resources are at a significant disadvantage, when they are required to pay for needed services. Chair Brandt noted that we were approaching the end of our normal meeting time, but urged Senators to email any further thoughts on this issue to Greg Fizzell at gfizzell@uidaho.edu. Chair Brandt also hoped that Senators would stay for a short presentation on issues related to President Trump’s Executive Order on Immigration.
Effects on the UI of Executive Orders on Immigration. Chair Brandt invited Professor Kate Evans, Director of Immigration Clinic, and law student (and former Senator) Joe Dallas, to discuss the executive orders. She asked Professor Evans to focus on issues that faculty and staff might consider in dealing with the immigration order. Professor Evans explained that the executive orders sought to provide incentives for state and local actors to cooperate with immigration enforcement. These measures seek to obtain cooperation with immigration officers to identify immigrants who have been charged with any crime, including such offenses as driving violations and other misdemeanors. This expectation of broader enforcement will reach many foreign-born individuals, who have not been targeted in the past. Many higher education institutions are seeking ways to protect their students and reassure them that the school is there for educational purposes and not for enforcement. She introduced Joe Dallas to discuss some of the “best practices”. Mr. Dallas noted that many students who were protected under DACA (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals) are afraid that the information they provided to the federal government will now subject them to deportation. Mr. Dallas emphasized three principles that universities might follow to protect their students:

- Universities have a FERPA obligation to protect information
- Campus Security need not ask or document immigration status
- Universities do not need to voluntarily cooperate with immigration enforcement

A question was asked about proposed penalties on sanctuary cities who choose not to cooperate. Professor Evans stated that there were provisions which sought to penalize sanctuary cities. These provisions suggested that federal funds might be withheld from those jurisdictions that sought to restrict information about immigration status. She felt that educational institutions faced a much lower risk of losing federal funding, because of constitutional limitations on what type of conditions can be placed on funding for educational purposes.

Adjournment: Chair Brandt voiced her regrets that given the late hour, there was not more time to continue this discussion. She suggested that a task force be formed to consider how the UI might implement some of these best practices. Andrew Brewick, Don Crowley and Elizabeth Brandt all agreed to meet with Professor Evans and Joe Dallas to continue this inquiry. Since it was now obvious that there was no longer a quorum, the Senate adjourned at 5:14.

Respectfully submitted,
Don Crowley, Faculty Secretary &
Secretary to the Faculty Senate