I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes (vote)
   - Minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 10 (October 22, 2019) Attach. #1

III. Consent Agenda

IV. Chair’s Report

V. Provost’s Report

VI. Committee Reports

VII. Other Announcements and Communications
   - Budget and Financial Planning
     Scott Green (President of the University of Idaho)
     John Wiencek (Provost and Executive Vice-President)
     Terry Grieb (Chair Faculty Senate)
     Chad Neilson (Chair Staff Council)

VIII. Special Orders

IX. New Business
   - Committee on Committees Appointments Survey Attach. #2
     Barbara Kirchmeier (Vice-Chair Faculty Senate & Chair of Committee on Committees)

X. Adjournment

Attachments:

- Attach. #1 Minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 10 (October 22, 2019)
- Attach. #2 Committee on Committees Appointments Survey
I. **Call to Order:** Chair Grieb called the meeting to order at 3:30 PM.

II. **Approval of Minutes (vote):** A motion was made to approve the minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 9 (October 15, 2019) (A. Smith/Dezzani). Following a call for discussion, an amendment was proposed by Secretary Sammarruca: on p.3, second line from the top, it should read “non-P&T committee compositions” rather than “P&T committee compositions”.

An additional amendment was proposed: in the fourth paragraph of p.4, include the sentence: *The Senator requested the addition of the following language: In C-1.b, 3rd line, after “accomplishments,” add “or on the timetable for promotion that is typical for the faculty member’s academic field.”*

A motion to approve the amendments was passed unanimously. The motion to approve the minutes as amended passed unanimously.

III. **Consent Agenda:** There was no Consent Agenda

IV. **Chair’s Report**

- The tables in the Paul Joyce Lounge have been moved to a new arrangement, similar to the previous U-shape from previous years. It is hoped that this will provide better sound quality for those participating via Zoom.
- The latest version of the revised P&T policy has been distributed to all faculty. Comments can be posted on the web. The conversation is still ongoing. The Faculty Affair Committee will meet and vote next week. The policy revisions will come back before Senate November 12.
- Bellwood Lecture tomorrow, Ken Salazar, former Secretary of the Interior, 3:30, Pitman Center, International Ballroom.
Sonny Ramaswamy, President of the NWCCU, will host an open forum on Thursday, Oct. 24th, 10:30-12:00 ISUB Horizon. (Note the change of time from 11AM to 10:30AM.)

Tommy Orange, author of “There There”, the 2019 UI Common Read, will be on campus Nov. 5th, 7pm, International Ballroom.

V. **Provost’s Report**

The State Board of Education (SBOE) had its annual meeting in Lewiston last week. Program Prioritization already existed in the Financial Section of the SBOE policy but will be added to the Academic Section as well. The SBOE requires that we go through the process of university-wide program evaluation and rankings at least once every 5 years. They suggest matrix and methods by which we may do it, but there is considerable flexibility.

State Board of Education is also introducing a policy on remedial education. Of interest to our math faculty is MATH 108, a Pre-Algebra remedial course. The Board will allow MATH 108 to be offered but will not allow it to be included within a degree requirement or curriculum. In other words, we cannot mandate students to take it. We must let them in MATH 143 and provide extra instruction as needed. The Math department has expressed concerns about this and is considering options that are responsive to the Board’s new policy.

- Enrollment figures are in (today or tomorrow there should be a press release). Overall, we have an increase of a few percent in first year student enrollment as well as an increase in dual enrollment (high school students taking college courses). The number of continuing students is down. Overall, enrollment is essentially flat.

- The President has shared his thoughts and ideas about the current financial challenges and the path forward with his executive leadership team. Based on this information, I will schedule a meeting with Faculty Senate Leadership soon to jointly develop the needed initiatives. It will be a collaborative effort with the Provost’s office, the Colleges (Deans), Staff Council and Faculty Senate.

A Senator asked how the previous enrollment figures relate to our revenue. Provost Wiencek responded that Brian Foisy would be able to give more details. Our revenue has many components including State appropriations and tuition revenue. Not all students pay the same tuition rate (resident, non-resident and WUE rates for example are different). Our revenue is strongly linked to our undergraduate on-campus full-time enrollment. We have fewer and fewer resident (Idaho) students, while non-resident students are increasing slowly but are not always as financial lucrative as the resident student enrollments. Our expenditures, though, are growing more rapidly than our revenues. The Provost noted that the Argonaut provided good coverage on the matter and addresses this question with more detail.

VI. **Committee Reports:** Chair Grieb suggested to switch the order of the Committee Reports as on the agenda. There were no objections.

- Presentation on the Final Exam Schedule for Academic Year 2020 – 2021, by Associate Registrar D. Hubbard. It was noted that no final exam begins before 8:00 AM Pacific Time. In
response to a question from a Senator, it was reported that final grades next year are due Tuesday, December 22nd, 2020.

The seconded motion from the University Curriculum Committee to approve the Final Exam Schedule as presented to Faculty Senate passed unanimously.

- Presentation by the Information Technology Committee, Information Technology on Campus, by Dan Ewart and Brian Cox.
  An update was provided on the status of the IT Best Use initiatives presented to Faculty Senate in October 2018. A timeline was shown, which highlighted recent accomplishments and future plans.

Starting October 2018, annual IT security was implemented (December 2018). In February 2019, the first IT governance and priority process took place, which is a mechanism to collect university IT initiatives and prioritize them. This happened two more times, up to September 2019.

Last year Vice President Ewart came to Faculty Senate to discuss the “IT Best Use Initiative”. The goal of this initiative is to move the university ahead rather than just remaining functional. A Senator asked to clarify the meaning of “moving the university ahead”. It was replied that it means offering new opportunities for teaching and research. At the moment, we are just baseline, with 85% of the time spent keeping what we have up and going rather than creating new technology.

Brian Cox proceeded to address the Central Device Management Program and the Central End User Technology Procurement. With regard to Central Device Management, UI works with people across the State (Boise, Idaho Falls, CDA) to get visibility. Visibility plays a key role in our understanding of which data can best help in making decisions.

The following updates were provided: Prior to the initiative we had 2,000 devices visible on the network, now we have 5,932, visible and manageable on our network. 34% of computing devices are laptops. We have 750 printers with 250 different models, 52 operating systems, 25% of which are outdated. The majority of our devices are from Lenovo. There is a large complexity to deal with in ITS, therefore it is necessary to prioritize. A Senator asked to clarify the meaning of “visibility”. Director Cox responded that visibility gives us insight into the hardware connected to our network.

The discussion moved on to Central End User Technology Procurement. There are three main goals in this area: 1) improve response and resolution time, 2) protection of data, and 3) better financial stewardship for UI. A Senator reported that his college is very unhappy about technology constraints on research. Often times, the equipment which is provided is not useful for the scientific needs of researchers. Researchers need to be able to decide what fits their needs. Support has been substandard or useless, cost is higher than it would be if equipment were bought outside the university. Director Cox replied that they are not setting standards for researchers on campus, who constitute 20% of the users. Their standards are suitable for 80% of the users on campus. They are currently in a pilot mode. Researchers should be able to submit a request of what they need. The Senator proceeded to say that, in many cases,
purchasing elsewhere is met with resistance. Director Cox said he would like to see the specific data and examples.

A Senator argued that the IT prices are about 5% to 10% higher as compared to purchasing directly with Lenovo or other vendors. Director Cox repeated that he will like to see the data to compare prices and warranties. They work with a consortium. Researcher should be able to purchase what they want with their purchasing card. One must be careful, though, when comparing prices, because prices may include only the device or other costs. As for delivery time, they hope for 3 to 5 days shipping, but sometimes higher prices are charged for quicker delivery.

In response to a question about support, Director Cox responded that they cannot provide financial support to researchers. The best form of support they can provide is by giving the researchers information so they can plan accordingly with their budgets. In response to another question, Vice President Ewart replied that, when a unit is no longer serviced by IT, it is not necessary removed. There does come a time, though, when it may no longer be possible to support a particular system. At ITS they make choices to ensure long lifetimes of the devices. But it must be kept in mind that, as the device gets older, it becomes more costly to maintain it. Using old equipment causes loss of productivity.

The discussion moved to whether Lenovo is the best choice. A senator pointed out again that research exceptions should be considered. A clarification was asked about “exceptions”. It was clarified that exceptions refer to requesting items other than the IT standards. A Senator reiterated that his college felt left out of the process. Vice President Ewart emphasized that they are in a pilot phase. They are in the process of changing standards to accommodate the needs of 80% of the users. They cannot focus on a single research device. A Senator followed up on the approval time for software, which, in his experience, can be as long as 8-12 weeks. Director Cox said there had been challenges with Adobe, but he hadn’t heard anything in the range of 8-12 weeks. Many vendors are changing their pricing and delivery models. In regard to the issue of the Adobe delivery, Vice President Ewart asked to be forwarded the relevant paperwork. The discussion moved back to warranties. Director Cox responded that is different from vendor to vendor. For laptops it is typically 4 years. If the device breaks down, one must go to the local support person, who will dispatch a Lenovo specialist. The Lenovo person will come and repair the equipment in a proper facility. Laptops have 4-year damage protection. Ultimately, a device can be cheaper but come with less warranty. In response to the question as to why Lenovo is the standard, Director Cox responded that UI has been working with Lenovo for a long time. They had excellent support from them and don’t see a reason to change. Furthermore, Lenovo designs and manufactures all of their products. They test components and software before putting them into devices.

Chair Grieb had a follow up question about the IT Committee. Per FSH, the Committee should provide input and guidance, but this does not seem to be happening. Vice-Chair Kirchmeier confirmed that statement from her experience as a former member of the IT Committee. She suggested that items should be brought to the Committee at an early stage so they can be discussed at the committee level before decisions are made, unlike what she has seen in the past.
A Senator asked about personally purchased computers for UI work. Vice President Ewart said that it is not recommended, for security reasons and because, if not backed up, UI data and records may be lost. He cited APM in that regard.

The discussion continued on the exception process. Vice President Ewart ensured the Senators that information will be distributed broadly as they leave the pilot mode. The discussion ended with a comment that this will be a perfect item for the IT Committee to be involved in. Chair Grieb suggested to continue the discussion in the Spring. Items to be revisited include: the tracking of specific requests, sharing the tracking data with the IT Committee, and checking approval time for software. Chair Grieb said that he will reach out to the IT Committee Chair to invite her and Brian Cox to attend a Senate meeting in the Spring.

VII. Other Announcements and Communications: There were none.

VIII. Special Orders: There were none.

IX. New Business: There was none.

X. Adjournment: A motion to adjourn (Jeffery/Schwarzlaender) passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 4:46 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francesca Sammarruca
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
ANNUAL APPOINTMENT SURVEY

BARBARA KIRCHMEIER
VICE-CHAIR FACULTY SENATE
CHAIR COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
TIMELINE

- Survey was sent out yesterday (November 4, 2019)
- Survey will remain open until December 6, 2019
- Committee on Committees will use the results of the survey to build Committees during the Spring Semester 2020
- Faculty will be notified of appointments by May 2020
- Faculty will be reminded of appointments in August 2020
CHANGES TO THE SURVEY

- Asking for additional personal information
  - Primary and Secondary College
- We added time commitment
- TEAC possible split
- Administrators selection
  - Only administrator
  - Faculty and Administrator
QUESTIONS