University of Idaho

2019 – 2020 Faculty Senate Agenda

Meeting # 4

Tuesday, September 10, 2019 at 3:30 pm

Paul Joyce Faculty- Staff Lounge & Zoom

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes (vote)
   • Minute of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 3 (September 3, 2019) Attach. #1

III. Consent Agenda

IV. Chair’s Report

V. Provost’s Report

VI. Other Announcements and Communications
   • University Faculty Meeting held on Wednesday, September 18, 2019 from 2:30 pm to 4:00 pm at the International Ballroom, Bruce Pitman Center.
   • UI Policy - Creation and Changes Presentation
     o (Diane Whitney, Policy Coordinator & Compliance Officer) Attach. #2
   • Guidelines for choosing peer institutions for Idaho public four-year institutions
     o (Cher Hendricks, Vice Provost of Academic & Initiatives) Attach. #3

VII. Committee Reports

VIII. Special Orders

IX. New Business
   • Memo: Off- campus participation in the UFM Attach. #4

X. Adjournment

Attachments:

• Attach. #1 Minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 3 (September 3, 2019)
• Attach. #2 UI Policy - Creation and Changes Presentation
• Attach. #3 Guidelines for choosing peer institutions for Idaho public four-year institutions
• Attach. #4 Memo: off- campus participation in the UFSM
I. Call to Order.

The chair called the meeting to order at 3:34 pm and welcomed everyone.

II. Approval of Minutes (vote).

The first item on the agenda is to approve the minutes of the last 3 meetings.

- Minutes of the 2018-2019 Faculty Senate Meeting # 28 (April 30, 2019).
  - A motion to approve the minutes passed unanimously.

- Minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 1 (April 30, 2019).
  - A motion to approve the minutes passed unanimously.

- Minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 2 (May 7, 2019).
  - A motion to approve the minutes passed unanimously.

III. Consent Agenda.

Approval of Summer Graduates.

- Chair Grieb explained that consent agenda items go directly to vote without discussion. If anyone requests discussion on a consent agenda item, that item is moved from the consent agenda to another appropriate location in the agenda.

- A motion to approve the Summer Graduates passed unanimously.

IV. Provost’s Report (John Wiencek).

- President Green has been very active around the state, generating a lot of energy and enthusiasm.

- There are still open questions around the “working groups” that President Green is putting together. Provost Wiencek is involved with the Finance Working Group for which the membership is being selected. The membership will be announced in a memo this week. A facilitator has been brought on board to help with those discussions. This person is a neutral party from outside of the university. The membership will include alumni, one dean, faculties. Brian Foisy and the Provost himself are serving as advisors and co-chairs of the committees.

- During the provost’s report, some questions were raised about UBFC and its role within the current need to decrease the budget overall. The Provost reported that Scott Green thinks UBFC is a very important resource. Possibly, UBFC will look at outputs generated by the appropriate
working groups, but this is still speculative. Provost Wiencek will continue to communicate with President Green on the matter. He encouraged FSL to continue placing good people on the UBFC.

- There is a “hanging” item from the minutes of the last meeting. The Provost reported that he prepared a formal memo in response to the question raised last Spring by former Senator Morgan. The memo was circulated within FSL and others for input and edits. The provost anticipates that the memo will go out next week.

- There is good news: Jerry McMurtry and Yolanda Bisbee have written a grant which has been funded by the NSF in the amount of $1M for a period of 2 years (renewable) to recruit and support minority graduate students in STEM. The intention is to first focus on Native American students who wish to pursue a doctoral program. Provost Wiencek is the PI on the grant, but he acknowledges that a lot of the work was done by Jerry and Yolanda.
  - In response to a question from Senator Kern, the Provost replied that the grant is specifically to recruit new graduate students in STEM related field. This program is for recruitment purposes and not to support current students.
  - After some audio problems, the question from Senator Kern concerning program eligibility continued. Provost Wiencek suggested to ask Jerry for more information. In his understanding, the funded program is for recruiting new students, not to support current ones. After a two-year support from the grant, the students’ dissertation advisors are expected to pick up the support.
  - Senator Kern asked whether this is like another program. Provost Wiencek replied that it is not, and that he is not familiar with that program.

V. Chair’s Report (Terrance Grieb).

- This year Senate is not electing the Faculty Secretary as Secretary to the Senate because that is already implied by FSH 1570. Francesca Sammarruca is the new Faculty Secretary, and under the former policy she would have to be elected as the Secretary to the Senate. This is no longer necessary under the new policy.

- Quick update on the Faculty Senate Website. The website is in the process of migrating to Sitecore. Thanks to Mary, Francesca, Celi, and the ITS team. They are hoping to have the new website running by next week.

- Talking Points: The Senate has been using them for the last 3 years. They got universally positive response. They are very important! They are produced after the meeting and then distributed to the senators who send them to their respective colleges.
  - Question by Senator Kern: she represents the Coeur d’Alene Campus. In her understanding the Talking Points document goes to Faculty and Staff only through departments and colleges. She is aware of individuals who do not receive the document. In her experience, David Paul, who is the representative for CEHHS, is also not receiving the information. Can we make sure that this information gets to everyone? The same problems happens with Boise.
    - Chair Grieb responds: Yes, FSL will make sure the Talking Points are sent to all campuses and extensions. Please send it to all the Faculty and Staff at your site.
  - Secretary Sammarruca: They also appear on the Daily Register.
  - Chair Grieb: If anybody has other ideas on how to distribute the Talking Points broadly, let us know.

- New York times – we can get free access.
  - Link: https://libguides.uidaho.edu/nytimes
  - All Faculty, Staff and Students at UI can get the New York Times for free.
SBOE changes to retirement plans. Sept. 10th: there will be representative on campus.

- The State Board is making some changes to our retirement plan, especially with regard to investment opportunities.
- Please note that on September 10th there will be representatives on campus to answer more questions regarding the retirement plans.
- Link: [https://boardofed.idaho.gov/data-research/finance-administration/retirement-plans/?utm_source=University+of+Idaho&utm_campaign=5fc119a1b5-daily_register_042219_COPY_01&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_18a9cb4835-5fc119a1b5-77923641](https://boardofed.idaho.gov/data-research/finance-administration/retirement-plans/?utm_source=University+of+Idaho&utm_campaign=5fc119a1b5-daily_register_042219_COPY_01&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_18a9cb4835-5fc119a1b5-77923641)

Alumni Award for Excellence Nominations.

- This is a great time to reach out and highlight our best students. The Alumni Award for Excellence is presented to approximately 40 undergraduate senior level students and an additional 15 graduate and law students.
- Award for Excellence Nominations are due on September 13th at 5:00 pm.
- Link: [https://www.uidaho.edu/alumni/awards/award-for-excellence](https://www.uidaho.edu/alumni/awards/award-for-excellence)

Professor Robert V. Percival, the Director of the Environmental Law Program at the University of Maryland Carey School of Law, will speak on the topic of “China’s Environmental Courts: An Assessment”, September 5, 2019, 3:30-4:30 Menard Law Building Room 104.

Bias Response Team (Contact Krisin Haltinner, Assoc. Prof. of Sociology, Director or the Academic Certificate in Diversity and Inclusion, and the Director of Africana Studies Program). The Bias Response Team responds to bias incidents on campus and provides support for students, staff, and faculty who may need it. The incidents we work on include “any non-criminal act motivated...by the victim’s actual or perceived race, religion, ethnic background, sexual orientation, gender identity/expression, disability, or nationality”.


- FYI (non-voting matter): 2018-2019 Annual Report (attached to the agenda), to be included into the records.

VI. Other Announcements and Communications.

Update on Student Evaluation System (Dale Pietrzak).

- Chair Grieb: Dale P. is going to talk about Student Evaluation System and NWCCU Accreditation.
  A PDF document was emailed in the morning with the information that Dale P. provided.
- Dale P.:
  o **Student Evaluation System**: He sent a letter earlier this Spring to the Senate and ask for the opportunity to give an update on what is happening. About one or two years ago it was announced in our area that the system which supports our current Student Evaluation System, student outcomes, graduating senior survey, etc. was going to be obsolete. We would need to have a new one in place by this Spring, this was the hard deadline that was given initially. At that time, they started to look around. They reviewed what was available nationally and got some ideas from peers and other colleges. They checked with professional listservs, and workgroups online. Then they went through the RFP process where they had representation from faculty and students from various places around the University. It was clear that one product that largely covered everything that needed to be done most effectively was CampusLabs, The RFP was finalized, and everything was ready to begin the initial implementation (January last year). It was one of the smoothest implementations he has ever seen. They are ahead of schedule. The program will be live by fall or spring depending on what we will be able to accomplish for training this year. The
next part of the system that will roll out will be the student evaluation part. Like all technology, this area is continually evolving making everything obsolete. Changes in systems also necessarily bring with them transition. This system is user friendly and they will be providing all necessary support.

- **Accreditation (NWCCU):** Our Federally approved accreditation body is NWCCU. It is what allows us to collect federal dollars such as financial aid, and grants. It goes through a national review by the US Department of Ed every 7 years and typically revises their standards on that 7-year cycle. This cycle we didn't anticipate the extensive nature of the revisions. There were 5 standards in the old set standards, now there are only 2 standards. This is a dramatic change and they are still sorting things out. Certainly, one of the things that has changed is the centrality and importance of program learning outcomes. CampusLabs has us well positioned for this transition in standards. That part must happen relatively rapidly, because we need to have 3 or more years of data, is the implementation of program learning outcomes assessment. He anticipates that they will have 2 years of data. We are going to be compared with peer institutions (we do not know who they are).

- In the accreditation process, they will be looking at the equity gaps and performance of students relative to retention and graduation. (Key elements of the accreditation process.) It's not clear how they are going to wrap the equity in the context of the program assessment process, but they are anticipating doing that.

- There will be a training session for the initial roll out of the standards in November in Seattle (a three-day event).

- You can look up NWCCU on the website and read the new standards (15 pages document).

- **Question:** is there a way to appeal if we don’t like the chosen peer institutions?
  - Dale P. response: there is always an appeal process.
  - Provost Wiencok: we do have a process to select what we think are a better choice for “peer” or “benchmark” institutions.

- **Chair Grieb:** As the system rolls out, can we have you back for more updates?
  - Dale P.: yes.

### VII. Committee Reports.

- There were no Committee Reports.

### VIII. Special Orders.

- This is done every year at the first meeting of the year. It consists of elections for special committees who require a Senate representative on their membership.

- **Election to Specific Senate Committees (vote).**
  - Campus Planning Advisory Committee (CPAC) (2020).
    - Two vacancies. One to replace Penny Morgan and one 3-year appointment (until 2022).
    - For the one-year term: Charles Tibbals volunteered and was elected.
    - For the 3-year term: David Lee-Painter volunteered and was elected.
  - University Budget and Finance Committee (2022).
    - Tenuto (via Zoom) volunteered and was elected.
  - Presidents Athletics Advisory Council (2020).
    - (Needs replacement for Richard Seamon). David Paul volunteered and was elected.

- **Auxiliary Services Committee Request.**
  - Food Service Committee (volunteer).
    - (Chair Grieb gave a brief review of the functions of this committee).
There were no volunteers. We can ask FAC or perhaps revisit the issue later.

IX. New Business.
   ➢ No new business.

X. Adjournment.
   ➢ Motion to adjourn: C. Tibbals; second: M. Schwarzlaender.
   ➢ Meeting adjourned at 4:29PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francesca Sammarruca
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate
UI Policy: Creation and Change
The Role of the Policy Coordinator

- IS to facilitate policy development
- Is NOT to act as an advocate
Benefits of Early Consultation

- Spot potential legal issues
- Identify conflicts with other policies
- Find the best home for your policy
- Get help with drafting
1. Notify the Policy Coordinator of Your Plan

The Policy Coordinator can help with:

- Early input and advice
- Drafting
- Ensuring all policies are reviewed by appropriate constituencies
2. Request the official document of an existing policy

- Ensures that
  - You are not unknowingly working on a policy at the same time as another party.
  - You are working with the most recent version of the policy.
  - The Policy Coordinator is able to
    - Track the progress of your policy,
    - Keep the process transparent, and
    - Manage the policy workflow.
Drafting Tips

1. Read the Policy Manual!
2. See #1.
3. Once Your Committee Has Approved the Policy

Email the policy and cover sheet to the Policy Coordinator. The Policy Coordinator will

- Review the draft policy for ambiguities, errors, and conflicts with other policies
- Send a copy to General Counsel for legal review

If either the Policy Coordinator or General Counsel have questions or spot problems, the policy will be returned for explanations or changes.

**This step can take four weeks or more. Plan ahead!**
The policy will be scheduled for a Faculty Senate meeting. If approved, then

The policy will be added to the agenda of the next University Faculty Meeting (UFM). If approved, then

It will be forwarded to the President for approval or veto

Some policies must then be sent to the State Board of Education for approval

After final approval, it will be sent back to Policy Coordinator for publication
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 22</td>
<td>October 22: Last date to submit an FSH policy for review if inclusion on Fall UFM agenda is desired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 19</td>
<td>November 19: Last Senate meeting to approve FSH policy for inclusion on Fall UFM agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 11</td>
<td>December 11: Fall UFM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 24</td>
<td>March 24: Last date to submit an FSH policy for review if inclusion on Spring UFM agenda is desired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21</td>
<td>April 21: Last Senate meeting to approve FSH policy for inclusion on Spring UFM agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 6</td>
<td>May 6: Spring UFM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APM vs. FSH

- APMs are mostly developed by administrative units across campus.
- APMs do not involve issues of shared governance.
- Broadly speaking, APMs are for procedures. They should not merely describe UI operations.
- Communication with Faculty Senate and Staff Council is required, but approval is not.
- APMs do have to be approved by
  - The Vice President in charge of the administrative unit,
  - General Counsel, and
  - The President.
The APM will be scheduled for informational discussion at Faculty Senate and Staff Council meetings. Comments will be forwarded to the proposers for consideration.

APMs sometimes go to the University Faculty Meeting for the purpose of widely communicating changes, but they do not need UFM approval.

Once approved by the General Counsel and VP, the APM goes to the President for approval or veto.

After final approval, the APM is returned to the Policy Coordinator for publication.
Questions?

Diane Whitney, J.D.
University Policy and Compliance Coordinator
Office of the Provost/Office of General Counsel
UofI-policy@uidaho.edu
208-885-6151
Guidelines for choosing peer institutions for Idaho public four-year institutions

May 14, 2019

Board staff are providing the following guidelines to the four-year institutions regarding the determination of peer institutions. The State Board uses peer institutions to give context to each institution’s performance metrics, specifically, graduation and retention measures. This analysis focused on identifying attributes (of either the institution or the students served by the institution) that have a significant impact on these outcomes.

The 2018 Basic Carnegie Classification\(^1\) is correlated with both institution and student level attributes. However, for Doctoral Universities, the classification still had an impact on outcomes even holding these other attributes constant. Therefore, staff recommends that Idaho institutions choose peers within their Basic Carnegie Classification.

Within an institution’s Basic Carnegie Classification, attributes identified as having a significant effect\(^2\) on outcomes were:

- 25\(^{\text{th}}\) percentile score of the standardized math test\(^3\)
- The number of full-time equivalent students (FTE)
- The share of undergraduate, degree-seeking students who attend fulltime
- Share of students who receive a Pell Grant

Standard deviations for each measure were calculated for those institutions within an institution’s Basic Carnegie Classification. Table 1 shows the number of institutions within a standard deviation for each attribute.

Table 1: Number of institutions within one-standard deviation of Idaho institutions on select variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Same Carnegie classification</th>
<th>One standard deviation of 25(^{\text{th}}) percentile math score</th>
<th>One standard deviation of FTE</th>
<th>One standard deviation of share of FTE</th>
<th>One standard deviation of share with Pell Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho State University</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis-Clark State College</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>47(^4)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^1\) See Appendix I for more details on the 2018 Basic Carnegie Classification.

\(^2\) I used a stepwise regression function to determine which variables had the most impact on the IPEDS 150\% graduation and the IPEDS fulltime retention rate. See Appendix II for more detail.

\(^3\) I considered different measures of ACT and SAT college readiness including scores at the 25th and the 75th percentiles. In most cases, scores at the 25th percentile were more meaningful in the outcomes (graduation rate and retention rates) regression analysis.

\(^4\) Only 53 institutions in LCSC’s Carnegie classification had SAT scores in the IPEDS database. Only 50 had ACT scores.
The attribute that most consistently had a large impact on outcomes was the math standardized test score. Table 2 shows how many institutions were within one standard deviation of the math score as well as:

- one standard deviation for math scores plus within one standard deviation of one other attribute,
- one standard deviation for math scores plus within one standard deviation of at least two other attributes, and
- one standard deviation for math scores plus within one standard deviation of all three attributes.

Table 2: Number of institutions that match Idaho institutions (are within one standard deviation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Math score</th>
<th>Math plus at least one other attribute:</th>
<th>Math plus at least two other attributes:</th>
<th>Math plus all three other attributes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho State University</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis-Clark State College</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board staff wanted to structure peer selection guidance in order to balance a uniform methodology with flexibility for the institutions to take into account their unique characteristics. Therefore, staff decided that matching on all four attributes was too restrictive. Staff recommends institutions match on math plus at least two other attributes.

The rest of the document shows the outcomes for your institution compared with all the other institutions in its Basic Carnegie Classification. It also shows the outcomes for your institution compared with the institutions in its Basic Carnegie Classification that match your institution on math plus at least two other attributes. Finally, it lists those other institutions and identifies which are current peers.

It is not staff intent that each institution is completely constrained to the institutions listed for their peers. For instance, there may be a peer which is just outside the one standard deviation benchmark but shares a unique characteristic important to the institution.

Staff requests that each institution choose ten peer institutions taking this guidance into account. Each institution should then submit that list to the Board staff along with an explanation of why they chose that institution as a peer. If staff guidance was not followed, then a detailed explanation for why it was not followed should be given. Each institution should also provide an explanation of how they achieved balance among all their peers. For instance, if an institution completely followed staff guidance, there should be some sort of balance between all the peers in terms of which two other attributes were chosen to match on.

Each institution can also submit up to three institutions to be designated as aspirational peers. Each institution can develop its own methodology for choosing aspirational peers.
Figure 1: 150% graduation rates for bachelor degree seeking cohort for all institutions classified as “R2: Doctoral Universities – High research activity”, sorted by value of graduation rate

Figure 2: Fulltime retention rates for all Institutions classified as “R2: Doctoral Universities – High research activity”, sorted by value of fulltime retention rate
Figure 3: Parttime retention rates for all Institutions classified as “R2: Doctoral Universities – High research activity”, sorted by value of parttime retention rate
Figure 4: 150% graduation rates for bachelor degree seeking cohort for all institutions classified as “R2: Doctoral Universities – High research activity” and for those that match University of Idaho on math and at least two other groups, sorted by value of graduation rate.

Figure 5: Fulltime retention rates for bachelor degree seeking cohort for all institutions classified as “R2: Doctoral Universities – High research activity” and for those that match University of Idaho on math and at least two other groups, sorted by value of retention rates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama in Huntsville</td>
<td>Huntsville</td>
<td>AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Alabama</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas at Little Rock</td>
<td>Little Rock</td>
<td>AR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas State University-Main Campus</td>
<td>Jonesboro</td>
<td>AR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego State University</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado Colorado Springs</td>
<td>Colorado Springs</td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University*</td>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southern University</td>
<td>Statesboro</td>
<td>GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho State University</td>
<td>Pocatello</td>
<td>ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois State University</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Illinois University</td>
<td>Dekalb</td>
<td>IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois University-Carbondale</td>
<td>Carbondale</td>
<td>IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball State University</td>
<td>Muncie</td>
<td>IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita State University</td>
<td>Wichita</td>
<td>KS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Tech University</td>
<td>Ruston</td>
<td>LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Orleans</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Louisiana at Lafayette</td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maine*</td>
<td>Orono</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan State University</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts-Boston</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts-Dartmouth</td>
<td>North Dartmouth</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
<td>Mount Pleasant</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan University</td>
<td>Ypsilanti</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland University</td>
<td>Rochester Hills</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan University</td>
<td>Kalamazoo</td>
<td>MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri-Kansas City</td>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri-St Louis</td>
<td>Saint Louis</td>
<td>MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Montana</td>
<td>Missoula</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska at Omaha</td>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowan University</td>
<td>Glassboro</td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montclair State University</td>
<td>Montclair</td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University-Camden</td>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University-Newark</td>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico State University-Main Campus*</td>
<td>Las Cruces</td>
<td>NM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Carolina University</td>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina A &amp; T State University*</td>
<td>Greensboro</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Charlotte</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina Wilmington</td>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota State University-Main Campus*</td>
<td>Fargo</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Akron Main Campus</td>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green State University-Main Campus</td>
<td>Bowling Green</td>
<td>OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland State University</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University at Kent</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toledo</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State University-Main Campus</td>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Rhode Island*</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>RI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota State University*</td>
<td>Brookings</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Dakota</td>
<td>Vermillion</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Tennessee State University</td>
<td>Johnson City</td>
<td>TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Technological University</td>
<td>Cookeville</td>
<td>TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University-Corpus Christi</td>
<td>Corpus Christi</td>
<td>TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University-Kingsville</td>
<td>Kingsville</td>
<td>TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall University</td>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>WV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wyoming*</td>
<td>Laramie</td>
<td>WY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Merced</td>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These institutions are land-grant institutions. Institutions in bold are current peers.
Appendix I: Further explanation of Basic Carnegie Classification

The Basic Carnegie Classification is a broad classification based on the types of degrees offered. Institutions are initially classified as Doctoral Universities, Master’s Colleges and Universities, Baccalaureate Colleges, Baccalaureate/Associate’s Colleges, Associate’s Colleges, Special Focus Institutions, and Tribal Colleges.

Three Idaho institutions (BSU, ISU, UI) are classified as Doctoral Universities. This means that these institutions awarded at least 20 research/scholarship doctoral degrees or at least 30 professional practice doctoral degrees in at least 2 programs. Institutions are further categorized as R1: Very high research activity, R2: High research activity and D/PU: Doctoral/Professional Universities. The three Idaho institutions are all classified as R2: High research activity.

LCSC is classified as a Baccalaureate College. That group is further classified by the major field of study for bachelor’s degrees awarded, either Arts & Sciences Focus or Diverse Fields. LCSC is specifically classified as a Baccalaureate Colleges: Diverse Fields.
Appendix II: Stepwise regression analysis

In order to determine which variables had the most impact on the outcomes, I used a stepwise regression model. I used IPEDS as a source for the outcomes. I concentrated on the six-year graduation rate and the fulltime retention rate as the parttime retention rate proved difficult to model and the results were not given as much weight.

There were a number of attributes considered in this analysis. The following institution-specific attributes were considered:

- Basic Carnegie Classification
- The share of all students who are graduate students
- The number of full-time equivalent students (FTE)
- Funding per undergraduate FTE

There were also student attributes considered. These are:

- College preparedness as measured by ACT/SAT scores
- The share of undergraduate, degree-seeking students who attend fulltime
- Socioeconomic status as measured by receipt of a Pell Grant

I used two models for each outcome – one utilizing SAT scores and the other utilizing ACT scores.

The variables that were consistently included in the final model and were statistically significant were the:

- 25th percentile score of the standardized math test
- The number of full-time equivalent students (FTE)
- The share of undergraduate, degree-seeking students who attend fulltime
- Share of students who receive a Pell Grant

5 I considered different measures of college readiness including scores at the 25th and the 75th percentiles. In most cases, scores at the 25th percentile were more meaningful in the outcomes (graduation rate and retention rates) regression analysis.
Off-Campus Participation in University Faculty Meeting

September 2019

Brief background:

Extension faculty have indicated that they feel left out of the UFM’s because they are just given a link to a live web cast but they cannot actively participate. A point which is perceived as an important one: when the names of the new faculty are read, they don’t get to stand up and be recognized.

Policy:

FSH 1540 A-1. Venue Determination. Remote sites that seek full participation at faculty meetings must submit to the Office of the Faculty Secretary by April 15th (when senate elections are due) a participation form for approval of their venue by Faculty Senate. The form is available on the Faculty Senate website under University Faculty Meetings (see also 1520, III-1-A). [add. 7-09, ed. 7-11, rev. 1-12]

Current Status:

Off-campus sites such as Boise, Idaho Falls, Twin Falls, and Coeur d’Alene, are “approved” for active participation into UFM’s because they have requested it “as a campus”. The situation may be different for some extension faculty.

Possible actions:

The normal course of action is to have a Senate Committee look at the matter and come up with recommendations. In this case, the appropriate committee is the University Multi-Campus Communication Committee (FSH 1640-94), chaired by the Faculty Secretary.

We could also explore the possibility of suspending the current rule (for the duration of the 2019-2020 academic year) and allow the Zoom link to be sent individually to all extension faculty. We should also check with ITS whether there are any technology limitations.