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 3:35 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 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 3 (September 3, 2019).
       o A motion to approve the minutes passed unanimously.
       o After the voting, A. Smith requested to abstain because he was absent from Meeting # 3 (September 3, 2019)

III. Consent Agenda.
   ➢ There were no Consent Agenda.

IV. Chair's Report (Terrance Grieb).
   ➢ Sustainable Financial Working Group Membership
     • Sustainable Financial Working Group membership has been announced last week by the President’s Office. They are expecting to begin their work in October.
     • Chandra Zenner Ford will attend next week Senate meeting to give a preview of the working groups.
     • Other future working groups include Sustainable Athletics Model, Enrollment Management, Student Experience, ICCU Arena, CAFÉ, and Online Education.
   ➢ 2019 Michael Kyte Distinguished Lecture Features Purdue's Darcy Bullock
     • The event will be held on Friday, September 13 at 4:00 pm at the IRIC Atrium. The event is free, and a reception will precede the event at 3:00 pm.
     • Speaker: Darcy Bullock, a Lyles Family Professor of Civil Engineering and Director of the Joint Transportation Research Program at Purdue University.
     • The event is hosted by the University of Idaho College of Engineering Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering's 2019 Michael Kyte Distinguished Lecture.
     • The Kyte Lecture event honors University of Idaho Emeritus Professor of Civil Engineering Michael Kyte. His research focuses on traffic signal systems, highway capacity and...
transportation engineering education. He received his doctorate in civil engineering from the University of Iowa, Master’s in Civil Engineering from the University of California – Berkeley, and bachelor’s in systems engineering from the University of California – Los Angeles.


- **Take Back the Night** hosted by the Women Center
  - Take Back the Night is scheduled for September 19th beginning at 7:30pm at the Ag Sci Auditorium. Take Back the Night is a rally and march spread awareness of interpersonal violence on campus and to show support for those affected by it. Email Bekah MillerMacPhee at bekam@uidaho.edu for more information.
  - Link: [https://www.uidaho.edu/diversity/edu/womens-center/events/take-back-the-night](https://www.uidaho.edu/diversity/edu/womens-center/events/take-back-the-night)

- **Questions:**
  - Senator A. Smith: He expressed concern about the absence of representation from the Colleges of Arts and Architecture and the College of Natural Resources in the Working Groups.
    - Chair Grieb: Noted the comment. Chair Grieb said that as a member of a committee he will express this to the Co-Chairs of the Sustainable Financial Model Group. He has not yet communicated with Chandra Zenner Ford about this. His understanding is that they are trying to have broad representation of faculty on campus.

V. **Provost’s Report (John Wiencek).**

- The Provost expressed appreciation to those who supported the Science Diplomacy Lecture by Dr. Bill Colglazier (09/09/2019). Those include: The Martin Institute, the James A. and Louise McClure Center, and the College of Science.

VI. **Other Announcements and Communications.**

- Fall University Faculty Meeting will be held on September 18, 2019 from 2:30 pm to 4:00 pm in the International Ballroom at the Bruce Pitman Center.
- Chair Griebs called for a motion to suspend the rules and change the agenda. If such motion is made and passes, we will invite Vice President Brian Foisy to make a presentation related to the current changes in the Employee Health Insurance.
  - A motion to approve suspension of the rules and invite Vice President Brian Foisy to speak instead of Diana Whitney (as planned in the original agenda) passed unanimously.
- Pending Health Insurance Open Enrollment for the 2020 Calendar Year (Brian Foisy).
  - Chair Grieb:
    - The recommendation by the Benefit Advisory Group (BAG) to eliminate coverage for “Other Eligible Adult” (OEA) is in contradiction with FSH 3705. If we go with the current plan as recommended by BAG, we need to repeal FSH 3705. Otherwise, retaining coverage for OEA will result in significant additional costs for everyone. A tentative schedule is to hold a Senate vote 2 weeks from today and potentially (if the Senate vote is to repeal FSH 3705) and Emergency UFM on October 8, 2019. If the faculty vote to repeal, the President will sign it. The open enrollment period is between October 21 and November 1.
  - B. Foisy:
Introduced the Director and Executive Director of HR, Brandi Terwilliger and Wes Matthews. He mentions that the President Scott Green has made it very clear that he will not fight with the faculty’s decision. He began to explain the recommendations in the decision that needs to be vote. Both Finance and Management Division needs to balance the budget.

Question by a Senator: Who was on BAG?
- B. Foisy provided the names.

In response to an additional question, B. Foisy and Brandy Terwilliger (HR, Director) clarified that it was not within BAG’s scope to consider policy. BAG was charged with the task of designing a plan change to off-set 1.2M in reduced funding from the state. B. Foisy observed that the 2012 memo by Liz Brandt in support of the FSH 3705 policy focused on same-sex couples and possible issues of discrimination if a same-sex partner cannot be covered, since at that time same-sex couples could not marry in Idaho. However, since 2015 same-sex couples can marry in Idaho. Of the 28 couples impacted by the change in OEA coverage, all are heterosexual. Thus, B. Foisy noted, we are not serving the population for which the policy in FSH 3705 was intended. Of the 28 impacted couples, 5 are faculty and 23 are staff. B. Foisy reiterated that President Green intends to go along with what the faculty chooses.

B. Foisy proceeded to explain the impact of keeping OEA coverage: considering only medical (not dental or vision), it would amount to about 220k/year. When employees receive benefits that they are not in title to according to federal law, such benefits are considered income, and thus taxed accordingly. The employer must match the taxes paid by the employee. B. Foisy proceeded to give some estimates for the rate increase which will have to be absorbed by the employees in the two categories:
- 1) PPO (or Preferred Provider Option), and
- 2) the high-deductible option.

The university does not cross-subsidize the two groups, meaning that it contributes to both in the same way. If the OEA coverage remains in place, it is estimated that the PPO group will have to absorb an increase in insurance costs of about 20% (as opposed to 8%) whereas the high-deductible group will move to about 60% (as opposed to 37%). B. Foisy noted that about 65-70% of all employees are currently on the high-deductible plan, because it allows for less money withheld from their paycheck.

B. Foisy mention that they will send an unpleasant memo to 28 people indicating that the OEA coverage will be eliminated. These people will have a direct impact by January 1st. The other alternative will affect around 2,500 people. At the end is reducing the impact in the employees.

B. Foisy remarked that the Faculty Senate is being asked to decide between the needs of the few and the needs of the many. (Added as amendment approved on 9-17-19)

Chair Grieb: this was a part that the FSL was not aware of and was brought after the meeting. Now that FSH 3705 is impacted, the decision comes to the Senate. He mentions that B. Foisy will be back next week with more information about the topic.

Questions by several Senators:
- They requested clarifications on how the specific numbers come out.
- How can 28 employees (about 1% of all employees) have such a large impact on everyone else? Senators would like to see the data and have more information.
  - B. Foisy provided some additional examples, although, he noted, these are just estimating (and include only medical).
  - The senators will like to have the information before next week Senate Meeting.
Question by E. Chapman (Zoom): Can B. Foisy re-state the estimated percentage increases? Was it 20% for PPO and 60% for HDHP?

- Respond by B. Foisy: He proceeded to give the information again.
  - Assuming that we eliminate the OEA coverage, the increase on the PPO is 8% and in the HDHP is 37%. The estimates that will be increase eliminating the OEA on the PPO plan ion the neighborhood of 20 and in the HADHD plan on the neighborhood of 60%.

Secretary Sammarruca mentioned to B. Foisy that if he can provide a more detail information.

Senator M. Chopin: Mention that the is one of the people that use the OEA. He talks about how the numbers are calculated, the impact will affect the staff members that are not prepared to absorb that impact. He will plan to help his staff members and look for other ways to cover the plan. He mentions that he will vote on not to retain that program.

A Senator explained that she represents more than 50 people and would like to be able to explain the issue to her constituency in a simple way. Senators asked to have more data before next meeting.

Another Senator added that it was clarified that OEA concerns only unmarried partners, not relatives such as parents or other dependent adults.

As B. Foisy’s presentation approached the end (due to the late hour)

Chair Grieb reminded everybody that there will be more discussion and more information in the coming weeks. Potentially there will be an open forum, an idea welcomed by the Senators.

Guidelines for Choosing Peer Institutions for Idaho Public Four-Year Institutions (Cher Hendricks).

- Vice Provost Hendricks took the floor to present about benchmark institutions. She gave a summary of the SBOE guidelines attached to the agenda as Attach.#3. SBOE sent a list of institutions and their methodology and asked us for feedback to be provided sometimes in the Summer. The only parameters to be used are graduation and retention rates. The deadline was later extended to November 1. Our job is to identify 10 peer (benchmark) institutions and 3 “aspirational” peers.

- A Senator asked what does “aspirational” mean. Institutions can design their own methodology to select aspirational peers. Also, we should look at the College Score Card for any number of data.

- A Senator asks whether there will be a similar benchmarking also for graduate students. Hendricks replies in the negative.

- Comment from the Provost: it’s not clear how SBOE will used the data. They may apply a funding model based on performance.

- A Senator comments that indicators such as research expenditures are not considered all by the SBOE. Only retention and graduation rates may be too limited.

At this point, Chair Grieb asked how we want to proceed. A Qualtrics survey was sent out to Senators in the Summer. Should we resurrect the survey? If you sort out by graduation and retention rates, he noted, the choices seem clear and one can get 10 reasonable benchmarks.

- Perhaps SBOE does not fully appreciate us as a graduate research land grant institution.

- Senator: Perhaps we shouldn’t just focus on graduation rate but also on the quality of the education our students receive. What about employment? Do they get good jobs with decent salaries?

- There were no more questions or comments on this matter.
VII. Committee Reports.
  ➢ There were no Committee Reports.

VIII. Special Orders.
  ➢ There were no Special Orders.

IX. New Business.
  ➢ Memo: Off-campus participation in the UFM
    • Secretary Sammarruca briefly presented the content of the memo included in the agenda for this meeting as Attach. # 4
    • Vote to suspend the FSH 1540 A-1
      o A motion to approve the suspend the FSH 1540 A-1 passed unanimously.
      o It was moved, seconded, and approved unanimously to suspend FSH policy 1540 A-1 and allow every extension faculty to actively participate in UFMs effective immediately. In the meantime, Secretary Sammarruca will work with the University Multi-Campus Communication Committee on changing the FSH 1540 A-1 policy.

X. Adjournment.
  ➢ Motion to adjourn. Seconded. Motion carries.
  ➢ Meeting adjourned at 5:00PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francesca Sammarruca
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate
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

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

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 Halitinner, 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.:
  - 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 years or more 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 Wieneck: 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.
## 2019-2020 FSH Deadlines

<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 Classification1 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 effect2 on outcomes were:

- 25th percentile score of the standardized math test³
- 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 25th 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>47⁴</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 3: List of institutions that match University of Idaho on math and at least two other groups

<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 UFMs 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.