The Chair called meeting #17 to order at 3:30. A motion (Folwell/Berven) to approve the minutes from February 7th passed without objection.

Chair's Report: Chair Brandt announced that in the last few minutes an email had been sent regarding program prioritization. The email contains a link that would allow those at remote sites to follow the video on program prioritization that will be shown later in the meeting. Chair Brandt stated that she would dispense with a Chair’s report in order to preserve time for the Provost’s presentation of the Program Prioritization Plan.

Provost’s Report: Provost Wiencek stated that the Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Committee had been working hard to get the video on the prioritization plan out to the Senate today. He thanked Chair Brandt and Senator Nicotra for their help. He observed that there were many things going on at the university, but unless there were questions he would defer further comments in order to save sufficient time to discuss the prioritization plan.

FS-17-037 (UCC-17-022a) Education: College name change to “College of Education, Health and Human Sciences”. Chair Brandt introduced Dean Carr-Chellman to discuss the reasons for the name change. Dean Carr-Chellman stated that the college has been having a discussion of a possible name change for years. The current title does not sufficiently capture the range of courses and research activities going on in the college. More than half of those in the college were not involved with the teacher preparation traditionally associated with a College of Education. In particular, she noted that many of their program areas (like Movement Sciences) have health as a primary concern. There is also a strong interest in nonformal and informal learning which better aligns with the idea of human sciences. While no proposed new name was able to obtain unanimous support, this one achieved the greatest consensus. The proposed name follows national trends for colleges that have a broad portfolio. She suggested that faculty and student recruitment as well as the ability to pursue research grants should be enhanced by this name change. The new name also comes much closer to representing the activities actually going on in the college.

A Senator asked whether the name change reflected any curricula changes that might affect the offerings of other colleges. Dean Carr-Chellman stated that they were not making broad curricula changes. They simply wanted to better reflect the activities of the college. A Senator wondered whether it was typical for Colleges of Education to include areas like Movement Sciences. The dean stated that this was increasingly part of a national trend. While teacher preparation has been declining, Colleges of Education have tended to diversify. A Senator suggested that perhaps the term “human sciences” was overly broad and captured things that should not be included in the college. The dean noted that Ohio State University had adopted the title “College of Education and Human Ecology.” This term seemed too broad to the dean. She emphasized that the proposed name change was an attempt to capture the broad activities of the college, but was not an attempt to take in a new portfolio of courses. After more discussion regarding the name change and whether students would know where to look in a catalog, or whether excessive overlap with other colleges was being created, the proposal was brought to a vote. The name change passed 15-2-3.

FS-17-038 (UCC-17-022b) Education: Movement Sciences—Athletic Leadership Certificate. Chair Brandt invited Professors Philip Scruggs and Sharon Stoll to speak to this proposal. The purpose of the proposal is to
create a certificate that provides recognition of a curriculum focused on preparing leadership qualities for those who participate in athletic or recreation administration. Professor Stoll suggested that this certificate will help prepare students for leadership in the field of athletics. A Senator asked about the inclusion of ISEM courses in the certificate. While Professor Stoll taught some of these ISEM’s, the proposal does not require a student to take the specific ISEM that she is teaching. The proposal passed without objection.

**FS-17-039 (UCC-17-022c) Education: Movement Sciences-Degree name change from Recreation to a BS in Recreation, Sport, and Tourism Management.** The department felt the proposed name better reflected the content offered in the curriculum. Professor Scruggs also stated that the proposed name change came about from a recent external review. A Senator wondered how this new degree aligns with the new name for the college. Professor Scruggs stated that the proposed degree did align because it reflected the concern with health and well-being. There was also a question about the use of the term “management.” Are there courses on management offered in the curriculum? Professor Scruggs responded that there were several courses in the curriculum that focused on management. It was also noted that this degree was aimed at preparing students for mid-level management positions in recreation, sport, and tourism. A question was raised about whether the College of Natural Resources still taught courses on recreation and tourism. It was noted that CNR no longer offered this degree. The proposal passed unanimously.

**FS-17-040 (UCC-17-006) Education: Curriculum & Instruction-new emphasis area for M.Ed.** Professor Allen Kitchel was introduced to address this proposal. This proposal adds an emphasis to the M.A. for teacher certification. The program is designed for those who already have an existing content degree. The proposal passed unanimously.

**Program Prioritization.** Provost Wiencek introduced a presentation on program prioritization by noting that this process was aimed at solidifying how the university would satisfy the SBOE’s requirement for program prioritization. He noted that the UI had engaged in program prioritization several times before. When he began as Provost the university had just completed a prioritization process termed Focus For the Future (FFF). Last year at the Senate he reviewed the process and results of the FFF. The Provost stated that then President Don Burnett had captured the underlying philosophy by stating that vacant positions should be captured and reallocated to high priority programs. He noted that at that time the focus was on faculty positions and that all positions should be part of this process.

Provost Wiencek explained that the SBOE expected program prioritization should be an ongoing process. As part of the new strategic plan, an Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Committee was created. President Staben communicated that program prioritization should be an important part of implementing the strategic plan. The Provost noted that one of the consistent concerns that he had heard about past attempts at program prioritization was that there was not a lot of “buy-in” to the process and the criteria for doing the evaluation was not always clear. This time groups of faculty and staff have been working on putting the criteria together. In order to get greater input on these criteria, they have put together a voice over PowerPoint describing the criteria. This should help communicate the proposed criteria and enable the campus community to provide feedback. This feedback can be provided in various ways. A polling tool (Sli-Do) will be used to help collect this feedback.

The Provost noted that the groups that created the criteria had a decision-making rule that 80% of the group had to agree to a particular criterion. He expected that there would be concerns and criticisms. These comments would be used to improve the criteria. However, by the end of the semester we would have to agree on what criteria to use. Every year the criteria would be re-evaluated.

The video was shown to the Faculty Senate and is provided here. It will require you to log-in as an employee. [https://www.uidaho.edu/provost/program-prioritization-ppp?destination=/provost/program-prioritization-ppp/program-prioritization.aspx](https://www.uidaho.edu/provost/program-prioritization-ppp?destination=/provost/program-prioritization-ppp/program-prioritization.aspx). Those at off-campus sites were sent the slides by email so they could follow the presentation. All faculty and staff are strongly encouraged to view this video. March 8th has been
established as a deadline for feedback. IPEC will review the feedback and make any necessary changes towards the goal of President Staben approving the final product by the beginning of April.

After the Senate watched the video, the Provost noted that the website would have supporting documents to help explain how the criteria will be weighted and measured.

The following questions were asked of the Provost:

- **Given that one of the proposed measures of “external demand” was the Bureau of Labor statistics, wouldn’t some academic areas match up more easily with job categories than others? For instance, a Philosophy or English major might qualify for many jobs, but the BLS would not necessarily list the job that way.** The Provost encouraged departments and individuals to address this and similar concerns in their comments.

- **Where did this structure come from?** The Provost stated that when Bob Dixon was President at the University of Northern Colorado, he put together a similar process to help guide them through an economic downturn. His idea was to create a process that allowed them to identify the higher performing programs and the struggling programs. By putting the programs into quintiles, it allowed them to evaluate what programs they wanted to emphasize and which programs would need to be eliminated, or restructured. The Provost clarified that we would be focusing on departments and not individual programs.

- **Can a department that ends up in the bottom quintile be a high priority?** The Provost felt this could happen. A department in the bottom quintile would be asked to propose to UBFC how they could reorganize to become a higher performing department.

- **Would this process depress those in the lowest quintile into a declining path from which they could not recover?** The Provost stated that there were exceptions and that departments could appeal by demonstrating that they are needed across the university. If we begin to see that negative consequences are occurring, they can be adjusted.

- The Vice Chair suggested that the Senate consider expanding UBFC so it can better perform the role suggested by this process. He further wondered whether the workgroups had been looking at hypothetical scenarios. For instance, could a dean invest a position from a 2nd quintile program into a 1st quintile program and thus leave the 2nd quintile in a worse position. The Provost noted that deans could do that now.

- A Senator worried that the process might be structured in such a way that certain departments could never get a high score. The Provost emphasized that this process would be structured by the faculty/staff and that the process would be transparent. A department will know what they need to do in order to improve. He also noted that if we are able to grow enrollment, many of the possible consequences will be minimized. We should recognize that the typical turnover in any year is about 10%. Thus, the resources being allocated will be in the range of 2-3%.

- **A Senator asked whether some departments would be protected?** The Provost stated that he would expect that some departments would be considered so central to the university that they would probably not be allowed to go away. Lower performing departments would lose positions, but be asked to make proposals to improve.

### Adjournment

Adjournment: The Chair encouraged everyone to study the proposed criteria and become engaged by providing feedback before the process is finalized. Given that it was now 5 pm, the Chair entertained a motion to adjourn. The motion (Brewick/Chung) to adjourn passed unanimously at 5:01.

Respectfully submitted,

Don Crowley, Faculty Secretary  
& Secretary to the Faculty Senate