Present: Barannyk, Blevins, Chapman, Gauthier (Chair), Haltinner (Vice Chair), Hobbs, Justwan, Kenyon, Kirchmeier, Torrey Lawrence (w/o vote), Miller, Mittelstaedt, Murphy, Raney, Ramirez, Rinker, Roberson, Rode, Schiele, Schwarzlaender, Shook, Tibbals.

Absent: Long (excused), Sammarruca (excused), Strickland, Walsh, Reynolds, McKenna, Mischel.

Guests: John Woods

Call to Order: Chair Gauthier called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.

Approval of Minutes (vote):
The minutes of the 2023-24 Meeting #4, September 12, 2023, were approved as distributed.

Chair’s Report:
• Today we welcome John Woods, Chief Academic officer and Provost at University of Phoenix. The Faculty Senate is interested in digital learning and innovation at University of Phoenix and academic pathways that can be developed between the two universities. There will be questions after the presentation, and we will schedule more presentations as we move to other topics related to the University of Phoenix.
• Today, we will also discuss boundaries between APM and FSH. This is a global conversation about current and future directions. I hope we will have constructive discussions based on examples of policies where APM and FSH overlap with regard to their impact on faculty — for example, the way APM items related to technology impact education and/or research activities.

Provost’s Report:
• A follow-up to a question that came up during a recent discussion with Dean Blaine Eckles about the university childcare center and its utilization – 18% by students, 62% by U of I employees, 10% by the community. Graduate students are considered students, not employees.
• U.S. News & World Report released yesterday a number of significant changes on how rankings are determined. It’s good news for us: for example, this is the 4th year in a row UI is ranked No.1 among public universities in the West for Best Value. All rankings for UI can be viewed at https://www.usnews.com/best-colleges/university-of-idaho-1626

Announcements from Vice Provost Diane Kelly-Riley:
• We will have a monthly gathering for faculty to meet informally across colleges, exchange ideas, build social relations and share intellectual interests. The first meeting will be Thursday, September 28, 4:30pm to 6:30pm in the ICCU Arena club room. Faculty can bring a guest (must be over 21). These events will continue through the academic year until April, hosted by different colleges. An invite will be sent soon.

Announcements and Communications:
• Provost Lawrence introduced John Woods, Chief Academic Officer and Provost, University of Phoenix (UOPX). Provost Woods will give a town hall style presentation followed by Q&A. Provost Woods started with some background about UOPX and its many years of educating adult learners. UOPX has been a pioneer in online education for adults. Since 1978, the university held continuous regional accreditation from the Higher Learning Commission (HLC). UOPX was the first university to offer fully online programs at the associate degree level. Eventually, it moved away from those programs and into a model of partnership with Community Colleges. Currently, UOPX has 80,000 students, following a drop in enrollment due to the refocusing of its mission. Provost Woods described the realignment of strategic directions since 2017. They dropped degrees that did not improve job outcomes and aligned 100% of their curriculums with career-relevant skills, through programs that have above-average career projections. The UOPX assessment system was revised accordingly. They created a career exploration tool through which students can look for jobs that match their skill level. The average student at UOPX is 38 years old, works full time, and supports dependents. The university created a plan to reach out to adults with life challenges, which resulted into a higher retention rate than the one for students who do not seek an accommodation. On the average, the UOPX student has three risk factors that can negatively impact progression, retention and graduation rates. The UOPX graduation rate is higher than the national average for students with one risk factor.

In summary, UOPX is a different kind of institution, focused on serving underserved student populations. They published papers in peer-reviewed journals on the improvements they made on required UG math courses. They completed several HLC accreditations.

Question from Provost Lawrence: Shared governance is a hallmark of higher education yet institutions all operate differently. Can you comment on how UOPX faculty work together in a shared governance situation?

Provost Woods: Colleges have College Councils, made of faculty who work on curriculum matters and policies about their programs. An Academic Council, comprising faculty and administrators, approves programs and recommendations for our Board, and institution-wide policies. All courses are built with faculty experts, who are current in their fields. There are many opportunities for faculty to be informed and participate, including internal journals and monthly messages. In response to a follow-up comment from Provost Lawrence about the role of governance in the accreditation process, Provost Woods noted that there was never a problem with governance at the accreditation level.

Question from faculty read by Provost Lawrence: How does UOPX use data to improve curriculums and learning outcomes?

Provost Woods: We have program-level learning goals and university-level learning goals, all of which are measured and tracked.

Question from faculty read by Provost Lawrence: Can you comment on the letter written by three U.S. Senators to President Green asking that he reconsiders the plans to acquire UOPX?

Provost Woods: These senators represent a philosophy that would never support for-profit education. The Department of Education has placed rules for the for-profit institutions that should apply to all institutions. The letter is politically motivated and contains allegations with no evidence to support them. With the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) 2019 case, we settled to avoid a long litigation, but made no admissions of wrongdoing. Senators’ letter:
President Green’s response: [https://www.uidaho.edu/-/media/UIdaho-Responsive/Files/president/Communications/phoenix-faq/uoph-senator-response.pdf](https://www.uidaho.edu/-/media/UIdaho-Responsive/Files/president/Communications/phoenix-faq/uoph-senator-response.pdf)

Questions from the floor:
A senator asked about possible competition between the two universities in the online space. Provost Woods replied that competition will not be an issue. U of I and UOPX are different institutions with different student populations, focus and mission, and they are not merging. Provost Woods expects more opportunities than challenges, and more options for the students. Provost Lawrence added that this concern can be addressed in more depth in a follow-up conversation where he can show a comparison of programs.

A senator commented that, although the two universities have different student populations, math proficiency may be a common problem. This area may be an opportunity to share ideas and collaborate.

A senator inquired about the ratio of faculty to administrators at UOPX. Provost Woods replied that they have 150 full-time faculty and 2500 non-faculty employees. Many are in student service offices such as financial aid, to address the needs of 80,000 students. The senator wondered whether this model is financially sustainable. Provost Woods reiterated that many of the non-faculty employees are in student-related roles (such as financial aid and academic counseling). For 13 years in a row, they have reduced the number of staff due to declining enrollment. UOPX is financially healthy and always had a surplus. This year, they had revenue in excess of $160M over expenses. (Comment from Provost Lawrence: there may be some confusion between definitions of staff and administrators.)

A senator inquired whether faculty are given constraints on their course content, and whether UOPX would have to follow the restrictions imposed by Idaho state law, if affiliated with the U of I. John Woods responded that, as a self-funded university, UOPX is not part of the Idaho system and, thus, will not have to follow the same rules. To reiterate: this transaction is an affiliation, not a merger. There will be opportunities to work together and share best practices as we choose to.

Chair Gauthier thanked John Woods for his visit and for sharing very useful information.

- Open Forum: Separation between APM and FSH – Rationale and process
  There was some discussion about the scope of what we are trying to do. Should we identify specific policies in APM which impact faculty but are nevertheless approved outside faculty jurisdiction? APM 70.02 and APM 50.53-A.1 were mentioned as examples, as well as the phone policy with respect to safety in laboratories. More broadly, it’s a global concern about the approval process, and faculty not being involved in making decisions about their work conditions. When Francesca and Diane W. are both back, we hope to have them come and discuss the process and potentials for different ways of doing APM/FSH. At present, knowing what concerns/problems exist is helpful.
Chair Gauthier recalled the request by some faculty at the recent UFM to survey the degree of faculty approval/disapproval of the UOPX affiliation. Some senators emphasized the need for additional clarity on several topics, such as the U of I legal liability on alleged UOPX wrongdoing, if any were proved. Also, we should put our data and those from UOPX side by side and compare them in a meaningful way. Provost Lawrence will respond to these questions next week.

New Business:
Vice Chair Haltinner gave a brief update on the status of FSH 1640 committees.

Adjournment:
The agenda being completed, Chair Gauthier adjourned the meeting at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francesca Sammarruca
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate
University of Idaho
2023 – 2024 Faculty Senate Agenda

Meeting # 5

Tuesday, September 19, 2023 at 3:30 pm
Zoom Only

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes
   • Minutes of the 2023-24 Faculty Senate Meeting #4 September 12, 2023 Attach. #1

III. Chair’s Report

IV. Provost’s Report

V. Announcements and Communications
   • University of Phoenix - John Woods, Chief Academic officer and Provost, University of Phoenix. Presentation and Q&A
   • Open Forum: Separation between APM and FSH – Rationale and process

VI. New Business
   • University Committee Review

VII. Adjournment

Attachments:
   • Attach. #1 Minutes of the 2023-24 Faculty Senate Meeting #4 (September 12, 2023)
2023 – 2024 Faculty Senate – Pending Approval
Meeting #4
Tuesday, September 12, 2023, 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm
Zoom only

Present: Barannyk, Blevins, Chapman, Gauthier (Chair), Haltinner (Vice Chair), Hobbs, Justwan, Kenyon, Kirchmeier, Torrey Lawrence (w/o vote), Long, Miller, McKenna, Mischel, Mittelstaedt, Murphy, Raney, Ramirez, Rinker, Roberson, Rode, Sammarruca (w/o vote), Schiele, Schwarzlaender, Shook, Tibbals, Strickland
Absent: Miller, Reynolds, Walsh

Guests/speakers: Ken Udas

Call to Order: Chair Gauthier called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.

Approval of Minutes (vote):
The minutes of the 2023-24 Meeting #3, September 5, 2023, were approved as distributed.

Consent Agenda:
- Approval of University Committee Appointments
  There were no requests to pull items out for discussion and vote. The consent agenda was approved by unanimous consent.

Chair’s Report:
- We have several presentations today. One of them is by Torrey Lawrence about the status of higher education. The other one is by Ken Udas about digital initiatives at U of I. The goal is to share more information and details about where we are and to help us think about next steps.
- We will break down the complex landscape of the University of Phoenix transaction into several categories starting with a focus on academic issues. We plan to focus on financial elements, public relations aspects, and other topics later in the fall. Other issues are equally important, but the best approach when facing a complex and novel situation is to break it into smaller issues.
- We have invited John Woods - Provost and Chief Academic Officer for University of Phoenix - to the Senate meeting next week, September 19.
- I think it is important that all opinions are represented, so please send your academics-focused questions by Friday. We want to give John Woods the opportunity to prepare his presentation and address your questions. We will schedule more presentations as we move to other topics.

Provost’s Report:
- This week, no new questions about the University of Phoenix were received.
- September is Katy Benoit Safety Awareness Month. Please make a note of the following events:
  - Wednesday, September 13, 7 – 9pm: “Take Back the Night” march.
    https://www.uidaho.edu/diversity/edu/womens-center/events/take-back-the-night
  - Tuesday, September 19, at 7pm, in the International Ballroom: Katy Benoit Campus Safety Forum Keynote Address.
Status of Higher Education – Torrey Lawrence, Provost and Executive Vice President

Many factors are contributing to changes in Higher Education, such as: decrease in state funding; increase in cost; widely available choices between education and job preparation/training; the typical age of a student entering college is no longer between 18 and 22 years. We need to be fully aware of these changes and trends because they are impacting us.

The slides are a sub-selection from a presentation given at the ACE conference. The Provost shared data covering 50 years of Carnegie classification, starting from 1973, and 150 years of US high school (HS) graduation data. Following the 2008-09 recession, the birth rate dropped sharply. We are looking at 15 years of no growth as the number of 2030 HS graduates returns to 2015 levels.

The Provost displayed 150 years of enrollment data by gender. At the U of I, 53% of the students are female, which is within the national trends. At the U. of Phoenix, 70% are female. Private for-profit institutions make up about 5% of enrollments.

Schools are changing the way they teach, offering online, hybrid or on-campus classes, and projections indicate that online education will continue to grow. Naturally, this is driving the massive growth of online universities.

Another factor contributing to changes in Higher Ed is the increase in alternative credentials, of which a large spectrum is now available in many schools. 100M learners spend more than $10B each year on micro and alternative credentials. U of I offers some, but they are not a major component.

Google Career Certificates: 6.3M learners have participated. Data covering 150 years of Higher Ed conferrals shows a rise in non-degree credentials. This area is a growth opportunity for us.

Discussion:

A Senator argued that, if we decided to make changes based on these data, we may miss the broader picture and take the wrong path. Provost Lawrence agreed that the facts presented above are not meant to be driving all decisions. But we need to be informed and aware of the landscape, so that we may join some of those efforts if we believe they are beneficial to us. Understanding this landscape will help us understand future opportunities better.

Vice Chair Haltinner commented on the importance to push back against anti-higher education political messages that may discourage college enrollment.

Sustainability Certificate

- Chair Gauthier gave a summary of the issue. The motion to be voted on was placed in the chat and read aloud by the Secretary: “Move to appoint the existing interdisciplinary faculty-led committee as an ad-hoc program committee to serve as the ‘relevant unit and college’ authorized to submit curricular proposals per FSH 4120-E. This committee shall be empowered to propose the UG Academic Certificate in Sustainability to the University Curriculum Committee as a University-Wide Program, and to set its initial curriculum.”

Moved to approve (Mittelstaedt, Long).

Vote: 21/23 yes; 2/23 no. Motion passes.

Task Force Proposal from Senate priorities as Emerged from the Senate Retreat

- Vice Chair Haltinner reviewed the process that was agreed upon at the retreat. At the retreat, senators brainstormed on potential priorities for the year, resulting in a list of about 80 items. Additional feedback and votes were collected by email. Based on that, the list was narrowed down to about 8 – 9 priorities, to be assigned to nine standing committees and four senate task forces. At this meeting, we’ll finalize senate task forces and their charges.

  o Employee Retention Task Force (Priorities: Campus Climate Survey; Retaining employees; Salary raises; Well-Being). Charge: to conduct a campus climate survey to
assess employees’ needs; Based on that survey, work with FSL, FAC, and FSPG to propose policy changes, with special attention to salary raises and employee welfare.

- Employee Benefits Task Force (Priority: Improvement of Dependent Tuition Waiver).
  Charge: Assess peer institutional practices; assess U of I specific contexts, needs, constraints; work with the Finance Office to meet needs in light of constraints. Currently, only one dependent at a time can receive the tuition waiver benefit. Staff Council is also very interested in working with Senate towards an extension of the benefit.

- Boundary of APM/FSH Task Force (Priority: Faculty involvement in policy and procedures involving employees). Charge: work to improve current practices; work with the Provost Office and other entities on ways to include employees in future decisions that concern them.

- University of Phoenix. Charges still to be determined.

Discussion:
Provost Lawrence noted that the results of the “Great Colleges to Work for” survey should come out very soon. It’s something to be aware of, to avoid potential overlap. Vice Chair Haltinner recalled that the idea was to ask questions that weren’t covered in the “Great Colleges to Work for” survey, and also to cover more university-specific aspects. With regard to the “salary raises” priority, the Provost noted that we have the Staff Compensation Committee (SCC). Some may remember that SCC came to Senate last year to present their proposal for CEC. A Senator thought that the “APM/FSH Boundary” task force should have a clearly defined and pointed charge. Several Senators agreed that the scope should be broader than looking into specific policies: people are interested in whether the decision-making process about APM items is working. The broader charge should be to come up with a mechanism through which one can identify proposed APM policies that impact teaching or research and, thus, faculty in the execution of their responsibilities, and whether parts of those policies may be best housed in FSH. How are APM items modified? Is the process consistent with the Constitution of the University Faculty?
There was a general consensus that specific technology policies, such as APM 30.16, should be left to the Information Technology Committee.

- Moved to vote yes or no to the creation of each individual task force (Haltinner, Mittelsteadt).
  - Employee Retention Task Force
    22/23 yes; 1/23 no. Motion passes.
  - Employee Benefits Task Force
    22/23 yes; 1/23 no. Motion passes.
  - Boundary of APM/FSH Task Force
    18/23 yes; 5/23 no. Motion passes.

Announcements and Communications:
- Digital Learning Initiatives at University of Idaho - Ken Udas, Vice Provost for Digital Learning
  Vice Provost Udas emphasized that he is always open to questions and comments. He introduced Nicole Remi, Program Manager.
Today, he will provide an overview of digital learning initiatives (DLI) his office has worked on or is working on. Digital Learning (DL) was established about two years ago, following the recommendations from a White Paper put together by a DL working group. Over the past couple of years, the office received several requests from various groups/units/deans interested in developing digital programs. They do market research and gather information on, for instance, other schools who may have or are developing similar programs.

They provide support with use of technology in teaching and learning, and work on online infrastructural capacities. For some programs, they can provide financial support in the form of seed funds. For instance, they helped fund a program in COS and one in CBE. It’s a four-year commitment to provide seed funds for more systemic needs, such as faculty lines.

They provide support for individual classes, typically under the Gen Ed portfolio. They help the university comply with current state and federal regulations and stay in touch with state initiatives, such as Online Idaho. They deliver market research forecasting. They work with bodies that provide support in teaching and learning, such as CETL. Lately, they worked closely with Virtual Technology and Design (VTD), where they had the opportunity to work with Jean-Marc Gauthier. Jean-Marc and his team developed an educational support system for virtual labs.

Currently, they are working with six colleges on various ideas. Overall, they work across the university to help move things forward.

One of the larger efforts is CAPE (Continuing Adult Professional Education). They help streamline and simplify traditional processes to facilitate the engagement of non-traditional learners. They plan to provide a robust set of programs for adult learners by Spring 2024.

Discussion:
A Senator had a question about certificates. As certificates are becoming increasingly popular, should we expand them and/or introduce more of them? Also, if companies are interested in those certificates for prospective employees, what’s the best way to bring together the industry and the university? Reply by Provost Lawrence: There are several different types of certificates that are allowed by the SBOE, many of which are 12-credit certificates (roughly 50% of a minor). Some institutions have introduced “stackable certificates,” that can add up to a degree. This fall, CBE is offering an online BBA degree which is a combination of certificates. In this way, students have more customizable options to focus on particular areas and have the flexibility not to pursue a degree. This lets us build more flexible options using what we already have. As for the second part of the question: Some employers require traditional classes and credits (INL is an example of those). On the other side, programs like CAPE, just mentioned by Vice Provost Udas, offer training that doesn’t result in academic credits or credentials, but fulfills the training requested by the company. We have a lot of options and opportunities.

• APM 30.16 update
Chair Gauthier pointed to the memo from President Green attached to the agenda.

Discussion:
Going back to the previous conversation about APM/FSH, a Senator reiterated that we should focus on a way to track processes and how well they are working. Now that some time has gone by since implementation of current APM 30.16, we should invite Dan Ewart to talk about how the policy is functioning across campus.
New Business:
Phones/Teams – Tim Murphy, College of Law
Senator Murphy reported concerns from his constituents about the phone/Teams changes. From a practical standpoint, a phone has a function. Giving out the department phone number is not a solution, because we don’t have receptionists. But there are also concerns of a different nature. Being required to provide a business reason for keeping a phone is found to be inappropriate. It is a shared governance issue as well. Per FSH 1520, we should be able to have a discussion and a vote about our working conditions, including access to standard office equipment and a phone.

Adjournment:
The agenda being completed, Chair Gauthier adjourned the meeting at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Francesca Sammarruca
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate