Present: Anderson (Miranda), Arowojolu, Baird, Barbour, Brandt (w/o vote), Brown, Bugingo, Tutino for Cannon (Boise) (w/o vote), Caplan, De Angelis, Ellison, Dezzani for Foster (w/o vote), Frost for Ostrom (Idaho Falls) (w/o vote), Grieb, Hrdlicka, Jeffery, Johnson, Kern (Coeur d’Alene), Mahoney, Morgan, Morrison, Panttaja, Seamon, Tibbals, Watson, Wiencek (w/o vote). Absent: Anderson (Mike), Cannon (Boise), Foster, Leonor, Ostrom (Idaho Falls), Nicotra, Vella. Guests: 12

Call to Order and Minutes: The chair called the meeting to order at 3:31. He introduced a new member of Senate, Brian Mahoney replacing Irma Sixtos and representing Staff Council. He also introduced several proxies who were sitting in for absent senators and reminded them that they participate without vote. A motion (Johnson/Baird) to approve the minutes of Senate meeting #3, September 5, 2017, was approved with three abstentions.

Chair’s Report: Chair Hrdlicka made several announcements:

- The fall University Faculty Meeting will be held on September 20th at 3:00 pm. Provost Wiencek will be presiding at the meeting on behalf of the president. New faculty will be introduced and the provost will make remarks.
- Training on Zoom for interactive classes and meetings will be offered by the DOCEO center on September 18th and 21st.
- Senate Leadership forwarded two nominations for the NWCCU advisory committee, Dean Panttaja and Jennifer Johnson-Leung. Both have been invited to participate on the committee.
- Savannah Tranchell, Internal Communications Manager, is spearheading UI’s involvement in the Idaho Charitable Giving Campaign. A faculty member is needed to serve as a member of the coordinating group. Please solicit involvement from your colleagues and forward nominations directly to Savannah at stranchell@uidaho.edu.
- Early warning grades are due on September 19th. These grades are an important part of our efforts to retain students.
- We have received positive feedback on the talking points distributed by the Faculty Secretary. Chair Hrdlicka encouraged Senators to forward the talking points to their constituents.

Provost Report: The Provost reported that the university has concluded the current process of Program Prioritization. Deans and vice presidents have had an opportunity to see the results and have shared them with unit leaders. The results are also available on the Program Prioritization website. Two open forums were held on Monday, September 11, 2017, for faculty and staff to provide comments and input on the process and results. As a result of initial communication about the results with the Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Committee (IPEC) and the deans and unit leaders, the decision has been made to move away from the position control model that had originally been envisioned. 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 areas. Each vice president, in collaboration with deans and unit leaders, will make decisions about how to meet their assigned reallocation target. The vice presidents and deans were comfortable with this approach as it allows for nuance and more ability to plan for and manage the budget impacts of reallocation.

It was clear at the open forums that faculty and staff were upset and thought that the process cast a negative light on their programs. This reaction was acknowledged by IPEC. The Provost indicated that the university will not go through a program prioritization annually. As a result, we will have more time to plan for the next reallocation, which will likely occur in three years at the next Strategic Plan Waypoint. He explained that the deadline this past year was externally imposed by the state board. It had been several years since the university had engaged in a prioritization process, and the provost was informed that the last process was unacceptable. Thus, the state board mandated that the UI complete a program prioritization process last year. The Provost stressed the extensive efforts that have been made to be inclusive, transparent and open about the program prioritization process. The evaluation criteria were developed by work groups comprised of faculty and staff. He cautioned that we ensure that criticism of the process not become of these colleagues. The Provost also stressed his belief that the program prioritization process will help the university move forward.
In addition to the forums, the program prioritization process was also discussed at the Presidential Breakfast earlier in the day on Tuesday September 12, 2017. A slido poll taken at the breakfast indicated that most people believe that program prioritization was a difficult but necessary process; that we need to focus on addressing the morale issues arising from the results and on how to continue to move forward.

The Provost concluded his comments by emphasizing that the best way for units and departments to improve and move forward is to focus on the strategic plan, and more specifically on their cascaded plans. These cascaded plans need to be closely aligned to the institution’s strategic plan and metrics.

A senator commented that he found discussion of process at the open forum enlightening and believed that the critical analysis of the process was good. He asked what positive things could be done to alleviate some of the concerns. His suggestions included allocating Teaching Assistants (TA’s) to programs that do not currently have TA’s and providing a coach/manager to help struggling programs devise approaches to improve over the next three years. The Provost commented that these are both good ideas, but also pointed out that each idea would require additional resources. Another senator pointed out that because many programs use shared resources, addressing TA compensation in one program will sometimes benefit related programs. The Provost added that initially our institutional focus was on providing in-state tuition waivers for TA’s. But as the university investigated how to recruit and retain high quality graduate students, it became clear that tuition waivers were only part of the problem. This realization led to the current initiative addressing TA compensation more broadly. Even so, the initiative does not address the cost of health care for TAs. The Provost also pointed out that most of the funding to support TAs is already being invested by colleges and departments. The $2.3 million that is part of our current reallocation process is the additional amount needed to offer competitive compensation.

A senator offered a compliment on two aspects of the process. 1) He appreciated the administration’s transparency with respect to the data gathered as part of the process and pointed out that in past years; the background information was never released to the university community. 2) He also appreciated that the administration is holding itself accountable as well as the colleges, something that has not happened in the past. He asked how the program rankings will be used to establish the specific “tax” on individual units. The Provost stated that the rankings were used to calculate the overall amount for which each vice presidential area is responsible. He stressed that every program in the institution will contribute to the reallocation, but a share of the reallocation amount is not being assigned to individual departments and units. Rather, the vice presidents will manage the impact across an entire vice presidential area. The Provost is working with administrative and college leaders to develop a set of guiding principles regarding how responsibility for the reallocation will be determined.

A senator asked whether the current program prioritization information will guide reallocation decisions in future years until we do another prioritization. The Provost answered yes, but stressed that the level of reallocation will vary from year to year. It could be larger or smaller. He again emphasized that the guiding principles he referred to earlier would be the mechanism to assist vice presidents in the reallocation process within their units. He stressed that we must get started and when necessary make mid-course corrections.

A senator asked whether the detailed results are available to the public. The provost answered that they were available upon request from his office.

A senator pointed out that under the old position control approach to program prioritization, the provost had made assurances that only funds from open positions would be used. Having moved away from the position control model, he asked whether any employees are at risk of losing their jobs under the new approach. The Provost responded that while he cannot make such a commitment for each vice presidential area, there is no appetite or interest in taking positions from current employees. He indicated that some employees may be reassigned and that not filling or eliminating empty positions created by turnover might be a logical way to meet an area’s assigned reallocation. He stated that terminating the employment of existing employees is not part of our institutional culture. The senator suggested that the provost provide whatever assurances are possible to employees about job loss.

**Great Colleges to Work For Survey.** The chair introduced Rula Awwad-Rafferty and Ro Afatchao to discuss the university’s efforts to understand and address the initial results from the Great Colleges to Work For survey. As part
of the President’s Council on Diversity and Inclusion, they followed up on the 2016 survey results. The 2017 results are available and are currently being analyzed. Their charge was to assess campus climate and make recommendations that are framed by the strategic plan and serve campus priorities. Awwad-Rafferty pointed out that there is a disconnect between how we perceive our work, the work of others and what our role on campus is. Administrators had a much more positive view of their work environment and of the institution than did staff and, particularly, faculty. The university needs to address the overall results as well as this disconnect in order to improve campus climate and culture. The council developed listening sessions at which people sat around the table and talked about their feelings and experiences as an employee at the university. They provided at least two different times and days to meet for faculty, staff and administrators. They also held listening sessions in Coeur d’Alene, Idaho Falls and Boise. Each session began with a brief introduction and questions about the focus group tool that would be used to assess each session. One or two members of the committee were at each session as facilitators. The sessions were very positive with a high energy atmosphere. Participants felt valued and heard. They often stayed after the sessions to continue to talk. Faculty representation was low. A detailed summary and report was developed and will be available soon.

The council reported on a number of common themes that stood out in the listening sessions:

- Communication –poor culture of communication, strained, ineffective, lacking transparency
- Poor behavior –microaggressions, ineffective feedback or evaluation, need for more training on workplace behavior
- Teaching –not properly valued, not resourced, quality
- Shared governance –current system not working, staff feel unheard and excluded, decisions made without adequate/appropriate voice
- Respect –issues with classification and compensation
- Mistrust of senior leadership

The council made ten summary recommendations:

- Replicate survey at a full scale. The first year we participated in this survey we only utilized the free portion available to all institutions. The committee recommended investing in a more full survey. In 2017, the university invested in the full survey.
- Embrace an evolution. Culture and climate cannot be changed on a dime. It takes sustained effort.
- Commit to authentic conversation.
- Continue cultural competency training. The committee recommended the continuance and expansion of training provided by the Office of Equity and Diversity.
- Demonstrate ways a positive climate makes a difference. The council encourages recognition of employees at every level of the institution.
- Ensure everyone participates in building inclusivity. Employees should understand that building a better workplace is not just the job of a dean, chair or designated person.
- Continue to disseminate results.
- Record and celebrate wins!
- Acknowledge past failures and the pain/distrust they caused. Saying get over it isn’t enough - we must act.
- Be realistic. Do what we can. There are some things we cannot control, but we can always do SOMETHING.

Awwad-Rafferty highlighted that the process of shared governance at the university was not viewed positively in the survey or in the listening sessions. Communication and lack of transparency at the level of committees, faculty senate and university administration were identified as issues. The view was also expressed that it does not matter what faculty committees do because senior leadership will ignore them.

Chair Hrdlicka responded to the comments about shared governance that Senate Leadership participated in spring administrative leadership retreat at which the preliminary results of the council were first released. In response, we have instituted efforts to encourage more transparency and better communications by committees and by senate. A senator asked whether the report is being presented to Staff Council. Awwad-Rafferty and Afatchao expressed interest in such a presentation if invited.
American Language & Culture Program and International Marketing, Recruitment & Retention. Mary Ellen Brewick, Director of International Marketing and Recruitment and Katie Schiffelbein, Director of the American Language and Culture Program, reported that international student enrollment appears to be up about 8%. This is the result of concerted efforts of our recruitment programs, our new pathway program with Navitas, and articulation agreements with partners overseas. The university has 22 Chinese students in electrical engineering this fall as a result of one of our articulation agreements. They also reported that a new registration form has been made part of the travel request process for international travel. Faculty and staff travelling internationally on university business will get an emailed travel registration request for information about their travel. This will help the International Programs Office to keep track where faculty and staff are travelling and might assist in the university’s international recruitment efforts.

The American Language & Culture Program (ALCP) is an intensive English language program on campus. It provides an avenue for qualified students to attend the University of Idaho. Students who are qualified academically; but, whose English language skills are not strong enough to succeed at the University of Idaho, may be conditionally admitted. They then participate in ALCP to improve their language skills, and acquire an understanding of American academic values and skills to be successful in our programs. ALCP has 65 students currently enrolled. There are two cohorts each semester and a third during the summer. 14 countries are represented in ALCP. ALCP wants to be a resource to faculty. The program encourages faculty to contact ALCP if they are working with a struggling international student. Not all international students participate in ALCP. Some have qualified for admission by taking TOEFL, IELTS or other tests. These students may not understand the nuances of language or culture issues and could benefit from contact with ALCP. Finally, ALCP works with faculty and TA’s to help them work with English language learners. Schiffelbein also advocated that graduate programs think about conditional admission to help international students transition to American graduate school. In addition to providing this transition, such students are then able to make advance contact with major professors. International graduate student enrollment increased by 80% this year.

A senator asked whether the university is doing everything we can to help international students succeed? The senator commented that sometimes the students’ language abilities are not strong enough, even when they have succeeded in ALCP. He also commented that he has observed a higher level of academic dishonesty. Schiffelbein commented that this is good feedback; it helps inform the ALCP curriculum which is updated each academic year. She encouraged and welcomed this dialogue saying she would love to meet with anyone. ALCP also has done a recent survey of faculty to improve its programs. Another senator commented that it is difficult for graduate programs using GRE scores as part of their admission criteria to grant conditional admission to international students via the ALCP program. Students are unlikely to perform well on GRE’s if they do not have strong English language skills. It is a chicken and egg problem.

A senator asked whether ALCP encourages students to get involved in social and club activities. ALCP has an “activity passport” to encourage students to engage in extracurricular and community activities. The program also provides individual counselling to assist. Another senator pointed out that fees that ALCP student pays aren’t necessarily like the UI tuition and fees and thus do not include campus recreation fees. These activities are a place where we see many common activities – maybe we should sponsor SRC membership for ALCP students. Finally a Senator pointed out that ALCP is completely self-funded.

The presentation about the Green Dot program and Campus Sexual violence grant program will be scheduled for a future meeting.

A motion (Panttaja/Tibbals) to adjourn was unanimously approve and the meeting was adjourned at 4:56pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Liz Brandt, Faculty Secretary &
Secretary to the Faculty Senate