University of Idaho
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
2017-2018 Meeting #3, Tuesday, September 5, 2017

Present: Anderson (Mike), Anderson (Miranda), Arowojolu, Baird, Brandt (w/o vote), Cannon (Boise), Caplan, De Angelis, Ellison, Foster, Grieb, Ostrom (Idaho Falls), Hrdlicka, Jeffery, Johnson, Kern (Coeur d’Alene), Morgan, Morrison, Nicotra, Panttaja, Seamon, Tibbals, Vella, Watson, Wieneck (w/o vote).

Call to Order and Minutes: Chair Hrdlicka called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm. He reminded senators that two last minute revisions to the draft minutes were circulated earlier in the day and summarized the changes. A motion (Mike Anderson/Foster) to approve the minutes of 2017-18 Senate meeting #2, August 29, 2017, was approved unanimously.

Chair’s Report: Chair Hrdlicka made three announcements:
- The University Faculty Meeting at which President Staben will address the faculty will be on Wednesday, September 20th at 3:00 pm PDT/4:00pm MDT.
- Training on Zoom for interactive classes and meetings will be offered by the DOCEO center on September 18th and 21st.
- Senate Leadership has received several nominations for the NWCCU advisory committee. If senators still wish to make nominations they must do so by the end of this week, at which time nominations will be forwarded to the Provost.

After these reminders, Chair Hrdlicka emphasized the important communication role played by Senate. In addition to reporting on Senate activities to our faculty colleagues, he asked senators to consider including staff from their colleges in the communiques. Senate’s staff representatives do not have a good mechanism for reaching staff across the campus. Faculty Senators can help fill this communication gap by including college staff in their communications.

Provost Report: Provost Wieneck announced that the process of communicating the results of the Program Prioritization process has begun. Deans and vice presidents have had an opportunity to see the results and have been asked to share them with unit leaders. The results will be available to the university community by the end of this week. On Monday, September 11, two open forums to discuss the results will be held. Information on the results and the specifics of the forums will be available soon. The Provost emphasized that, as a result of initial communication about the results with the Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Committee (IPEC) and the deans, the decision has been made to move away from quintiles. Rather, individual department/program scores have been normed to indicate how programs are performing relative to each other. Reallocation targets have been provided to the vice presidents who will make determinations about how to implement the reallocations for their area. He also advised that a conversation is underway about how to improve the process in future years.

A senator asked what would happen to the position control policy, if the concept of quintiles is abandoned? The Provost explained that the quintile/position control idea had the potential to create difficulty for vice presidents and deans by undermining their ability to manage their own budgets. Under the new approach the vice presidents will work at the college and unit level to implement an area-wide reallocation. For example, academic departments will work with the dean to determine how the college will meet its reallocation target. An additional benefit of the re-configured approach is that it will allow time for units to plan how to meet their share of the reallocation. The Provost emphasized that most units will come out of the process with a net positive change in their budgets. He noted that the revenue generated through this reallocation will be returned in the form of increased market-based compensation for faculty and staff, and stipends/tuition waivers for TAs.
Another senator asked how the process of investing in units to build them up will move forward? The Provost responded that units will be able to make proposals for reinvestment and expansion through University Budget & Finance Committee (UBFC). A Senator expressed concern that because we do not have sufficient resources to fully fund our initiatives this year, would the UBFC resources for next year already be obligated to completing this year’s priorities? The Provost responded that he believes we can fund most, if not all, of the TA initiative in the first year. Market-based compensation may take multiple years to fully implement and will remain on the radar as a funding priority in years to come. How this impacts our ability to fund additional future projects, through the UBFC process, will depend on whether we are successful in increasing enrollment.

The references to market-based compensation led to a number of specific questions on that initiative. A Senator asked how faculty will know what their target market salary is? The Provost stated that Human Resources is developing a web-based tool where each employee will be able to view their market salary target. Vice President Ewart offered that the tool for staff will be available on 10/1. The process is not as far along for the faculty. However, the provost’s office is developing a master spreadsheet with compensation targets that enable deans to answer such questions in the near future. Another Senator asked whether we will know the salary targets for others in our department? The Provost emphasized that we will have access to the data for our positions. The information we get will be based on the national market information for our discipline. Aggregated data for the UI will eventually be available, but it will not be specific to individuals. A Qualtrics survey is being developed through which each faculty member will have the ability to determine the CIP code that best describes them. Deans will also weigh in on these selections and a decision will be made by the provost after reviewing the recommendations by the deans, chairs and faculty. The process will be documented for future use and/or revision. A senator asked how faculty working in interdisciplinary areas will be assigned CIP Codes? The Provost indicated that CIP codes for faculty assigned to more than one department would be employed and weighted consistent with the time allocation in the contract. Informal interdisciplinary teaching assignments would not impact the determination of market salary for a given position. The Senator stated that we must be certain to ensure that we do not discourage interdisciplinary work through this compensation process. The Provost agreed and thanked the Senator for this insight.

Migration of Information Technology Help Services to the new Technology Solutions Partners (TSPs).

Vice President Dan Ewart thanked Senate for their time. He noted that through feedback from faculty, staff and students, and as part of its strategic planning process, Information Technology Services (ITS) identified a need to be more responsive to these groups, including specific units/areas on campus. As a result, ITS has launched a new model this semester. Tech support provided within individual units will remain available and will be the point of entry for those units for tech support. In addition, ITS has embedded tech support personnel in eight regions around campus. These embedded IT support personnel will be known as TSPs. They are part of a new group within IT named the Customer Experience and Engagement group that is headed by Brian Cox. He then turned the presentation over to Mr. Cox to explain this new model. Mr. Cox explained that the TSPs have been provided specialized training to enhance their ability to support staff and faculty. ITS has produced a number of communications to ease the transition to this new system. First, they are not turning people away who contact the helpdesk or other IT support access points, but rather are funneling those requests to the applicable TSP. In addition, ITS has developed signage and reference cards that should assist faculty and staff to reach their assigned TSP. The latest information is available on uidaho.edu/tsp. In the end, the biggest change is that faculty and staff will not access tech support through the Helpdesk. The Helpdesk will transition to support only students.

A senator asked whether the TSPs will be at their physical office locations from 8-5. VP Ewart answered that they will be available during normal business hours. However, while their office is home base, they
may often be out providing support. Cox elaborated that faculty and staff will have phone numbers (including cell phone numbers) and emails that are all interconnected and will be routed directly to their TSP. A senator asked whether support would be available during weekends? Cox indicated that currently, ITS is not officially staffed for weekends. The TSPs will take advance requests for weekend support and will endeavor to meet those needs, where possible. A senator asked why some of the buildings on campus were not included in a TSP region on the map? Mr. Cox explained that those colleges/units have their own specialized tech support staff. Finally, a senator asked how the TSP program would work for off-campus faculty and staff at the Centers. Center tech support staff will be primarily responsible for supporting Center faculty and staff. Each Center has also been assigned a backup TSP support person. At some point in the future, ITS expects to reach out to remote sites to determine needs and potential for additional support.

**Academic Initiatives.** Chair Hrdlicka introduced Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives, Dr. Cher Hendricks by stating that her position is the result of a recent change of structure in the Provost’s area to focus on faculty development, new programs and student recruitment.

Dr. Hendricks summarized her initial priorities and responsibilities as: 1) assisting with the development of new academic programs, 2) fostering undergraduate education, 3) advancing the new Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, and 4) supporting student success initiatives, as well as other duties as assigned.

Regarding academic program development, she indicated the university has begun investing funds in market analysis for new programs. This analysis will become a regular part of the determination on whether to move forward with a particular program. She is also looking at ways to proactively identify possible markets into which the UI might move with a new program. The challenge is to balance the creative efforts of faculty against the shrinking resources for higher education. UI needs to be more strategic in our creative program development efforts. Hendricks also stated that changes are taking place in the state that make it prudent for the UI to focus on market analysis. The State Board of Education is committed to making sure new programs are likely to be of interest to students, that students actually enroll, and that the students are retained at the university.

Regarding undergrad education, Dr. Hendricks stated that she is responsible for a number of disparate programs – general education, undergraduate research, service learning, and the honors program. This is a somewhat disconnected portfolio and she is seeking how to share resources efficiently.

Dr. Hendricks did not focus on the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning because the new director of the center, Brian Smentkowski will be presenting to Senate soon.

Hendricks also plans to focus on student success initiatives, including looking at how undergraduate students get through programs in a timely way. In addition, she will address under-preparation for college level study through the lens of state expectations.

A senator asked whether Dr. Hendricks plans to focus on graduate students. She pointed out that graduate student education is the primary focus of the College of Graduate Studies. However, she will direct her efforts toward new programs aimed at moving the strategic plan forward. She will be collaborating with Dean Jerry McMurtry on these efforts. In answer to a question about student involvement, Dr. Hendricks indicated that she is looking at ways to bring students into the process. The questioner suggested using ASUI as a resource.
In answer to further questions, Dr. Hendricks stated that given the cost and our current resources, market analysis would be conducted for new programs, but not for program enhancement. The analysis is expensive and she will be exploring how to make market information available more broadly throughout the program planning process. She emphasized the need to work collaboratively with faculty who propose new programs and with processes of the UCC to improve the quality of proposals and their eventual success.

Regarding distance learning she will be coordinating together with Vice Provost Kahler who has recently hired a new director of distance and extended education. Her focus will be on the curriculum, teaching and program development aspects of distance education.

A senator asked about how the university plans to address writing across the curriculum. Hendricks responded that she plans to address writing across the curriculum as part of an overall evaluation of General Education.

**Title IX:** Jim Craig, Associate General Counsel and Erin Agidius, Director of the Office of Civil Rights and Investigations gave senators an overview of Title IX issues confronting the university. Mr. Craig reviewed the requirements of Title IX and stressed that they are far broader than ensuring equality for student athletics. In particular, Title IX governs the UI’s responsibility to address sexual harassment (including sexual assault). Craig also addressed the due process expectations imposed on the university when addressing sexual harassment and assault issues. He summarized the law stating that the UI must give notice and an opportunity for a hearing to individuals accused of sexual harassment. However, the law is vague on the specific minimum requirements. These requirements – to address sexual harassment on campus and to provide due process to those accused of harassment – can be in tension with each other.

Ms. Agidius addressed the application of these requirements to the UI. She stressed that all employees have an obligation to report instances of sexual harassment that might fall under Title IX. Reports should be made to the Office of Civil Rights and Enforcement within 24 hours. She stated that once a faculty or staff member knows of a situation, the law assumes that the UI as a whole knows. The timeline for taking action on possible instances of harassment is short. The Department of Education guidance suggests we must act within 60 days. Because of this compressed timeline, the institution needs to begin an investigation as soon as possible. Ms. Agidius also emphasized that because employees must make reports of possible sexual harassment, we cannot promise confidentiality to any individual who speaks to us. We can, however, try to keep issues as private as possible. Faculty and staff do not have to be the investigator or counselor. Agidius suggested that we take a non-judgmental approach and that we work to provide resources to individuals who come to us.

Senators asked Agidius to provide more specific guidance on what sorts of situations should be reported. A Title IX statement for inclusion in course syllabi was also suggested. Agidius promised to provide such information along with other resources to assist faculty with Title IX compliance issues.

The time for the meeting having come to an end, a motion (Foster/Vella) to adjourn was unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Liz Brandt, Faculty Secretary &
Secretary to the Faculty Senate