I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes (Vote)
   • Minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting #20 (February 18, 2020) Attach. #1

III. Chair’s Report

IV. Provost’s Report

V. Other Announcements and Communications
   • Academic Program Prioritization Taskforce (Rachel Halverson, APPT Chair)

VI. Special Orders

VII. New Business

VIII. Adjournment

Attachments:

• Attach. #1 Minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting #20 (February 28, 2020)
University of Idaho

2019 – 2020 Faculty Senate – Pending Approval

Meeting # 20

Tuesday, February 18, 2020 at 3:30 pm

Paul Joyce Faculty- Staff Lounge & Zoom

Present: Bridges, Caplan, Carter, Chapman, Chopin, Cosens, DeAngelis, Dezzani, Fairley, Grieb (Chair), Jeffery, Keim, Kirchmeier (Vice-Chair), Meeuf, Paul, Raja, Sammarruca (w/o vote), Schab, Schwarzlaender, Tibbals, Lawrence (proxy for Wiencek, w/o vote)

Present via Zoom: Wargo (proxy for Kern), McKellar, Tenuto

Absent: A. Smith, Hill, Lee-Painter

Guests and Observers: 8

Guest Speakers: Sean Quinlan, Ralph Neuhaus

Call to Order: Chair Grieb called the meeting to order at 3:31 pm.

Approval of Minutes (vote): There was a motion (Dezzani/Fairley) to approve the minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 19 (February 11, 2020). The following corrections to the minutes were proposed:

- Senator A. Smith’s name should be on the list of Senators who were present on 02/11/20.
- The correct language in section B of the proposed 1640.88 should be:
  - “Executive Director of Student Success Initiatives” instead of “Director of Student Success Initiatives”
  - “professional academic advisor” instead of “college level academic advisor”
  - “a University Advising Services Associate Director” instead of “a lead advisor”

The proposed language should be considered friendly amendments as the intent has not changed. The language is simply placing current job titles in the text.

A motion (Tibbals/Chapman) to approve the amendment passed unanimously.

Consent Agenda: None.

Chair’s Report:

- The first University Faculty Meeting of the Spring semester will be on Wednesday, February 26, 2:30pm PT in the Pitman Center, International Ballroom.
- A Faculty Open House and Networking Event for all faculty members who are interested in the University Honors Program will take place on February 25th, 2-3:30 at Scholars LLC. The event is sponsored by Honors Program and CETL. Faculty are encouraged to participate into the program.
- The Sustainable Financial Model Working Group met last Friday. We focused on how to build a model which supports our four guiding principles: Strategic Alignment, Transparency, Agility, and Incentive Based. The next step is to develop a white paper with recommendations. Those will be presented to Faculty Senate and other stakeholders for discussion and input.
- If you have suggestions for topics to be addressed by Faculty Senate, please let us know as soon as possible. There are perhaps 8 or 9 Senate meetings left and agendas are filling quickly.
- There were no questions or comments following the Chair’s report.
Provost's Report, delivered by Vice Provost Lawrence:

- VSIP/ORIP final results:
  - University: 112 agreements totaling $8,446,431 in base salary (36 VSIP agreements + 76 ORIP agreements).
  - Academic Affairs/EVP: 61 agreements (20 VSIP + 41 ORIP) totaling approximately $4,559,796.
  - All of the addendums changing the incentive payment schedule from five years to three years for the ORIP were completed on time.

- Feedback for Administrator Evaluations:
  - 2017: about a dozen submitted (paper form process)
  - 2018: around 130 evaluations received
  - 2019 summary (new system, all online)
    i. 215 people submitted 355 separate evaluations
    ii. Every college received feedback, in fact every dean and chair received at least one evaluation
    iii. Feedback was sent directly to the supervisor of each administrator

- University-Level Promotion Committee (3560 committee):
  - They met a week ago to review 61 cases
  - The files will go to the Provost then to the President for decision with notifications coming soon. (We are still following the old policy.)
  - There are many amazing and inspiring colleagues at UI.

- Faculty and Staff Awards
  - There are budget challenges, but also a desire to celebrate our colleagues appropriately
  - Faculty and Staff awards will be united into a University Excellence Awards. This will provide a more unified experience between faculty and staff.
  - The event is being elevated to a Presidential Level event (his team of event planners will assist)
  - Event details to follow.

- There were no questions for the Vice Provost.

Committee Reports: None

Other Announcements and Communications: Discussion of Temporary Emergency Policy for admittance to Vandal Gateway Program (VGP), Attachment #2.

Senators will consider and vote on the Draft Resolution found in Attachment #2. Chair Grieb emphasized that it is important to look forward on this issue rather than reviewing the process for VGP to date. An acceptance letter (Chair Grieb showed the letter) has been sent out to 112 students. Although not the only one, this is certainly a concrete reason for having a pilot cohort. The question is how to best implement it. Scott Green is very sensitive to the principles of shared governance and that is why he is asking for a resolution that shows support from the Senate. VGP was an active topic of discussion last week, addressed in many meetings (involving Torrey Lawrence, FSL, Deans Quinlan and Carney, Chris Cook, Ralph Neuhaus, and others). Chair Grieb said that Deans Quinlan and Carney are taking a very professional approach to the issue.

Dean Quinlan noted that CLASS and COS are the colleges that will be most involved with and impacted by VGP. He thanked Barb Kirchmeier for her work with the curriculum. He was particularly intrigued by
the potential of the program to reach out to underserved student populations. How to fund the program is certainly a concern, particularly with regard to student support services and professional advising. However, Sean Quinlan continued, his main purview is the academic side. We will need an appropriate number of sections which must be properly staffed by faculty who work well with students in need of additional attention. To be pragmatic, one may expect about 50% positive responses from the currently admitted students. Dean Quinlan suggested that a “dual” model be constructed: one for a cohort of 100 (expected to cost about 270k per year), and one for a cohort of 50 (estimated to require about 150k per year).

Chair Grieb said he would like to have a resolution on the table before hearing from Admission Committee Chair Ralph Neuhaus. He read the resolution to be voted on. The Senate will be the “Author” of such resolution, if approved.

Title: Resolution on Temporary Emergency Policy for Admission to the Vandal Gateway Program
Author: University of Idaho Faculty Senate

WHEREAS The University of Idaho intends to enroll a pilot cohort for the Vandal Gateway Program (VGP) beginning in the Fall 2020 semester;
WHEREAS Students being accepted to the VGP do not meet the current standards for acceptance to the University of Idaho;
WHEREAS The University of Idaho wishes to admit students to this pilot VGP cohort without requiring a petition to the Admissions Committee as stated in the Faculty Staff Handbook and the Catalog;
WHEREAS It is deemed that the VGP has potential to improve access to higher education and to increase diversity in the student body.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO FACULTY SENATE SUPPORTS the implementation of a Temporary Emergency Policy by President Scott Green as allowed by FSH 1460 C-3 to allow qualifying students to be directly admitted to the Vandal Gateway Program until 100 students matriculate or June 30th, 2020, whichever comes first.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT THE FACULTY SENATE RECOMMENDS that, in conjunction with the implementation of the pilot cohort of the VGP, the administration work with the faculty to define the areas of accountability, the tools to assess the program, and the reporting mechanism for the assessments.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT THE FACULTY SENATE RECOMMENDS that SEM work in conjunction with faculty and administrators from the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Science and the College of Science to develop an academic curriculum and a program of support for students admitted to the pilot cohort of the VGP.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT THE FACULTY SENATE SUPPORTS efforts to provide VGP qualified students with a program that provides reasonable support to help them succeed at the University of Idaho in a way that also recognizes the serious budget challenges facing the university.

A discussion followed.
A Senator said that he is supportive of the general idea, but he would like to see something more specific about the source of funds. Chair Grieb replied that words such as “BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT THE FACULTY SENATE REQUESTS a report later in the Spring 2020 semester, and in each subsequent semester thereafter for this cohort, regarding matriculation rates, program budgets, curriculum, and other performance metrics for the VGP” can be included in the resolution as an amendment. The Senator was content about this course of action, but expressed some concern about the involvement of SEM. Chair Grieb noted that, while SEM is in charge of recruiting and matriculation, the resolution can contain wording about assessment and reporting to faculty. Another Senator observed that the purpose of the resolution is to support the Emergency Policy, which already contains some of that wording.

In response to questions about the length of the program, Dean Quinlan noted that the program will need to be assessed carefully moving forward. For instance, if the retention rate after the first year were as low as 20%, a serious look would have to be taken at the program. For now, the goal is to build a one-year program.

There was general agreement with the notion that we have the moral obligation to provide students with a support system that gives them a reasonable chance to succeed. In relation to the previously stated amendment, a Senator argued that we should request more than one report, perhaps semester reports. He also asked whether the students in the cohort will be considered separately from the “general population”, to avoid adverse impact on the retention averages of the college (for instance, CLASS). In a time where a performance-based model is gaining traction, perhaps reporting on performance metrics should be handled separately for the students in the program. Although one does not wish to “single out” the students in the VGP cohort, there could be unintended consequences for some colleges.

There was additional discussion on the importance of reporting twice, such as once in January-February and the second time in August-September. A Senator asked about the duration of the Emergency Policy, which is an important information before one can decide about frequency and dates of reporting. Chair Grieb recalled that an emergency policy is valid for 180 days, and that it will only cover the pilot cohort. Beyond that, serious conversations will need to take place about, potentially, amending FSH and the Catalog. Some students may have a low GPA but good SAT scores, and they would qualify for VGP. On the other hand, SBOE policy does not allow admission with a GPA less than 2.0, unless students specifically petition to be admitted. Bobbi Gerry, the Institutional Admission Director, has the authority to decide on those cases. But, an application is not a petition. How should one handle any subsequent letter which may go out to students with GPA less than 2.0? Torrey Lawrence observed that GPAs lower than 2.0 are not an issue for the pilot program (see Emergency Policy).

The discussion moved to student tracking. The importance of gathering good statistical data on students who are struggling (and in which areas) was brought up. Tracking should be embedded within the VGP. A Senator argued again that performance measures may impact the outcomes for the colleges. It was noted, though, that SBOE may not allow for the separation of these (admitted) students from the “general population”. Chair Grieb recalled that SBOE is concerned with retention rates and graduation rates, and wondered whether they are looking at those percentages at the college level or at the university level. As far as internal tracking is concerned, we will need to talk about how those considerations are built into the models.

The discussion moved back to funding sources for the program. Is the plan to fund it with the extra tuition revenue independently of college budgets? Sean Quinlan said that the tuition revenue would probably be transferred to the colleges involved (CLASS or COS), for instance to staff classes with appropriate faculty. He reiterated his “idealistic” enthusiasm about the opportunity to help all citizens of the state,
which is our mission as a land grant university. From the Deans’ perspective, Sean Quinlan continued, the most important aspect is to have the right faculty deliver the right level of support.

A Senator raised the issue of how other student support services outside of academics may be impacted, such as CTC or CEDAR. It is important to track data on the additional burden on those services. Dean Quinlan reiterated that he can speak mostly for the academic aspects, and that he does not have all the specific information about other kinds of support which will become necessary, especially if the program is successful. Vice Provost Lawrence noted that, currently, we have about 2,000 students less than we had in the past. Therefore, it is possible that student support services may not require very large changes to accommodate a new cohort of 50-100 students. We will need to look at each area individually.

A Senator wondered whether the idealistic arguments in support of VGP can be continued as we move through the academic program prioritization (APP). Could those arguments (that is, the benefits of serving disadvantaged student populations) be built into the APP metrics? Vice Provost Lawrence thought it was a great question, certainly something to consider moving forward. A Senator was skeptical about the administration weighing idealistic reasons more than growth arguments. Chair Grieb said that recent conversations with Scott Green had given him the clear impression that the President does not see VGP as a budget solution.

It was highlighted again that colleges, not SEM, should take the lead. Dean Quinlan agreed with that assessment. The Deans’ hope is to have control and focus on the academic side. Chair Grieb concurred that assessment and reporting should come from the colleges, working in collaboration with SEM.

On an intellectual level, the data on retention rates which will become available from VGP may show us a better and broader way to education, Dean Quinlan observed. He found this to be another intriguing aspect of the program.

Admission Committee Chair Ralph Neuhaus explained the role of the committee and how they handle petitions from non-admitted students. They identify and track students at risk. They wish to avoid admitting students who they believe have no chance to succeed. After the first year, they see about 75% retention rate, and approximately 58% after the second year. The committee membership includes representatives from various support services, such as the Counseling and Testing Center, and professional advisors. The admitted students are assigned to a professional advisor, who receives the student’s complete packet.

Chair Grieb acknowledged that the Admission Committee works hard and is composed of very qualified people. He suggested that VGP students might be regrouped into two categories: those who are disadvantaged, for instance, due to socioeconomic reasons, but have a great chance to succeed with the proper support; and those who are not likely to succeed. We must be able to identify issues that involve diversity and inclusion.

A Senator pointed out that the conversation should be broader. We must consider that what is best for an individual student may not work for another. Not going to college does not necessarily mean that a person is not successful.

The conversation moved to the number of available professional advisors. That number was not clear. However, a Senator noted, a professional advisor is embedded within the VGP. Their number may increase as the program proceeds. It would be a very bad scenario, a Senator noted, to have students “take a gamble”, fail, and leave with nothing. Dean Quinlan replied that this is a serious concern and that professionals have been brought into the discussions.
It was time to vote. Chair Grieb read the amendment to the resolution:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT THE FACULTY SENATE REQUESTS a report later in the Spring 2020 semester, and in each subsequent semester thereafter for this cohort, regarding matriculation rates, program budgets, curriculum, and other performance metrics for the VGP.

First, Senators considered adding to the attached resolution the language of the amendment (last paragraph of the resolution transcribed above). A motion to add this language was made and seconded (DeAngelis/Chopin). There was no discussion. Vote: motion carried unanimously.

Next, the Senators considered the motion as amended. There was no discussion. Vote: the motion carried with two negative votes.

**New Business:** None

**Adjournment:** A motion to adjourn (Dezzani/Fairley) passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

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