University of Idaho
2019 – 2020 Faculty Senate Agenda

Meeting #21

Tuesday, February 25, 2020 at 3:30 pm
Paul Joyce Faculty- Staff Lounge & Zoom

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 – Approved
Meeting # 21
Tuesday, February 25, 2020 at 3:30 pm
Paul Joyce Faculty- Staff Lounge & Zoom

Present: Bridges, Caplan, Carter, Chapman, Chopin, Cosens, DeAngelis, Dezzani, Fairley, Grieb (Chair), Hanigan, Hill, Jeffery, Keim, Kirchmeier (Vice-Chair), Lee-Painter, Meeuf, Paul, Raja, Sammarruca (w/o vote), Schab, Schwarzlaender, A. Smith, Wiencek (w/o vote)
Present via Zoom: Kern, McKellar, Tenuto
Absent: Tibbals, R. Smith
Guests and Observers: 9
Guest Speakers: Rachel Halverson

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

Approval of Minutes (vote):
There was a motion (Lee-Painter/Cosens) to approve the minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 20 (February 18, 2020). The following friendly amendments to the minutes were proposed:
- On p.5, within the paragraph starting with “Admissions Committee Chair…”, the sentence starting with “After the first year.” should be replaced with “For at-risk students admitted in one year there was a 65% retention rate. For at-risk students admitted the following year there was a 58% retention rate.”
- On p.5, CEDAR should be replaced with CDAR.

The motion to approve the minutes with the above friendly amendments carried unanimously.

Consent Agenda: None.

Chair’s Report:
- University Faculty Meeting is Wednesday, Feb. 26th at 2:30 p.m. (Pacific Time), in the Pitman Center, International Ballroom.
- The Resolution regarding the Vandal Gateway Program (VGP) admittance was forwarded to President Green. We anticipate that he will enact this policy in the next few days. Further follow up with SEM will go on as the implementation of VGP for the pilot cohort moves forward.

The Faculty Secretary shared a message from Scott Green where the President expressed gratitude for the Senate’s help in properly implementing the VGP.

A Senator asked whether programs in colleges other than CLASS and COS will also have the opportunity to be involved in VGP. Indeed, Chair Grieb replied, that will be the case.

A Senator asked whether there was a plan to form a committee or taskforce from the Senate with the charge of assisting with VGP implementation. Chair Grieb replied that there was no specific
action in that direction, although that had been his original idea. We may not have a formalized Senate VGP taskforce, but FSL is part of the conversation. The goal is for faculty, administrators, and SEM to work together and report to Senate towards the end of the semester.

- It is time for the Jazz Festival. Efforts to make classroom accommodations are appreciated. Please support this as a recruiting event.

There were no additional questions or comments following the Chair’s report.

Provost’s Report:

- The deans have submitted their budget-resetting plans on the 20th. We are in the process of collecting those together in a “master sheet”, and then we will meet with the President. It is likely that some adjustments will be made. There is nothing definitive yet, but we are approaching the end of that process.
- Provost Wienecek has been working with the Academic Program Prioritization Taskforce (APPT). We will hear more about that shortly from the APPT Chair.

There were no questions for the Provost.

Committee Reports: None

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

Chair Grieb recalled that the Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Committee (IPEC) convened a specific taskforce for program prioritization (PP). He noted that, besides guest speaker and APPT Chair Rachel Halverson, other people involved with APPT were present in the room (such as Senators Mark Chopin and Barb Cosens, and John Wieneck).

The full report from the APPT Chair is included below:

**Academic Program Prioritization Taskforce – Report to Faculty Senate**

1. Taskforce selection and meetings
   a. Committee Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Name (16 w/ JW &amp; MS)</th>
<th>Employee Type/Work Unit</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Halverson, Chair</td>
<td>Faculty (CLASS)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rhalverson@uidaho.edu">rhalverson@uidaho.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Allen</td>
<td>Faculty (COS)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pballen@uidaho.edu">pballen@uidaho.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Alves-Foss</td>
<td>Faculty (COE)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jimaf@uidaho.edu">jimaf@uidaho.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Chen</td>
<td>Faculty (CBE)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lindachen@uidaho.edu">lindachen@uidaho.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise-Marie Dandurand</td>
<td>Faculty (CALS)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lmd@uidaho.edu">lmd@uidaho.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Long</td>
<td>Faculty (CNR)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ralong@uidaho.edu">ralong@uidaho.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Scruggs</td>
<td>Faculty (CEHHS)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pwscruggs@uidaho.edu">pwscruggs@uidaho.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. **Staffing:** Terry Grieb and Chad Neilson selected committee members. They strove to ensure representation of all colleges, faculty ranks, and staff. Eight members of the committee had been assigned to serve on UBFC.

c. **Role of Consultants:** David Yopp and Rob Ely were invited to consult on valid assessment methods given their discipline expertise. They also were members of REAPP. Rob Ely attended the taskforce meeting on January 10, 2020. David Yopp and Rob Ely also met separately with the Provost to discuss possible evaluation methods for the committee to use to evaluate program presentations.

d. **Number of Meetings/Topics Addressed:**

There were five meetings: December 13, 2019; January 7, 2020; January 10, 2020; February 7, 2020; and February 24, 2020.

**December 13, 2019 (3 hours):**
- Review of Academic Prioritization Process done in 2017, including recommendations from REAPP (re-envisioning another program prioritization) that the first stage of the process use quantitative measures and the second stage of the process use qualitative measures.
- Discussion of formation of a small committee to review programs’ mission centrality. The taskforce agreed on the following composition: President, Provost, Dean, Department Chair/Head, Faculty member and Staff member.
- Discussion of RBA formula and populating quintiles, including not ranking individual programs within quintiles.

**January 7, 2020 (3 hours):**
- Review of 2017 program prioritization process: 20% mission essentiality, 50% contribution to strategic plan, 30% was how much money is allocated to a program.
- Review of president’s charge for 2020 and REAPP recommendations: 50% conferrals and 50% student credit hours.
- RBA Formula:
  \[
  RBA = \frac{(Tuition + F&A + G&A - GenEd Budget)}{GenEd Budget} \times 100%
  \]
- Discussion of weighting of conferrals and student credit hours.
- Overview of Current Process Steps Identified:
  1. Quantitative (RBA)
  2. Small Committee Determination of Mission Centrality
  3. AAP formulates recommendations and identifies programs for closure.
  4. Provost shares results with IPEC and the deans.
  5. Recommendation to the President
  6. Appeal Process with the President
January 10, 2020 (3 hours):

- Rob Ely attended this meeting as a guest consultant.
- There was extensive discussion of whether the 50/50 mix of tuition and SCH is appropriate. The committee came to an agreement that the exact weighting will be set after some testing. For the testing process, program names will be removed, consistently giving an alpha description. A sensitivity analysis will determine the most stable range. This will drive the discussion at the next meeting on February 7, 2020.
- The committee continued its discussion of the appeal process. It was decided that the programs identified for elimination give a presentation to the committee consisting of no more than five slides, one point per slide. The committee would work with David and Rob to develop a rubric to evaluate the presentations. Its recommendations to the president would be based on their evaluation of the presentations. These presentations also could be recorded for the president to review as he is making the final decision.
- Presentation protocols will be discussed at the next meeting.

February 7, 2020 (2 hours):

- Jodi Walker, Director of Communications, attended this meeting as a guest.
- The committee reviewed the results of the sensitivity analysis and agreed to use 54% for SCH and 46% for conferrals. This created the least damage, least distortion. It assumes a common production measure across the university. There will be a weighted scoring of 80% RBA and 20% Mission Essentiality.
- The presentation process was revisited and defined further:
  1. Maximum of 5 PPT.
  2. 10-minutes presentation; 20 minutes for Q&A.
  3. Considerations such as job placement, grad school placement, alumni giving, and philanthropy may be included in the presentation.
- The committee understands that it must identify 2.5 million dollars in cuts.
- It was reinforced that the information discussed by the committee is confidential.
- Next Steps:
  1. Data will be disseminated to the deans for their review. The Provost will work with them to clarify the number of programs in the fifth quintile slated for elimination.
  2. At the committee’s next meeting, members will review the data: RBA, rank by RBA, rank by mission essentiality, 80/20 mission score.

February 24, 2020 (1.5 hours):

1. Discussion of reports and recommendations from deans.
2. The committee identified the programs in the fifth quintile that would be invited to give a presentation to the committee.

Extensive discussion followed:

A Senator, also an APPT committee member, noted that the deans looked only briefly at the results of APPT. They do not have the “full overview”, unless a program is in the bottom quintiles. The question was raised about the degree of changes since the previous PP: namely, what percentage of the programs were assigned to a quintile differing by more than two quintiles as compared to 2017? It was replied that, generally, the majority of programs were not far off, although some level of differences is to be expected, because of the qualitative data (narratives) used last time.

The discussion moved to the support, if any, being provided to those faculty who will lose their jobs as a consequence of either APPT or the Deans’ recommendations. The committee has not dealt with
this aspect. Naturally, confidentiality, respect, and sensitivity have to be exercised very carefully when dealing with people going through such a traumatic experience. The Provost agreed that support is important and suggested that Senate make a recommendation on what kind of support to offer.

The discussion shifted to the RBA indicator (defined above). While a Senator pointed out that it is a good starting point for the analysis, another Senator expressed deep concerns about trying to capture with a single number a multi-dimensional process such as the one being discussed, with all its complexities. It does not take into account, for instance, that a program may support other programs, or the complexity of interdependence among different units. On the other hand, it was argued that this single number is actually not used to make decisions, but rather as an initial sort. The APPT Chair noted that the student credit hours (instead of degree conferral) do, to some degree, take this objection into account. Nevertheless, the same Senator argued, there is lack of justice. He stated his opposition to the entire process. The APPT Chair noted that the presentations are an opportunity to bring up aspects specific to a particular program (for instance, the low number or absence of conferrals in a new program).

It was noted that “secular trends” can make a particular discipline unpopular. These changing trends are of course time dependent and may have little to do with the actual quality of a program. A Senator argued that percentiles and quintiles are not an appropriate way to make these decisions, as it became clear already in 2017, although he understands that decisions must be made. This time, he continued, we are still applying the same percentile system. The Provost replied that the State Board (SB) requires that we make decisions based on priorities. However, just because a program is in a low quintile, it does not necessarily mean that it will be closed. Instead, it could be placed on a “Performance Improvement Plan”.

It was noted again that students’ choices to go into a particular field (and thus into a particular program) are driven by many factors, such as family and society, who tend to push students towards areas perceived as more lucrative. Other Senators and the speaker appreciated this point, and emphasized the value of a broad liberal education, independent of “money making” aspects. A Senator argued that low-RBA producing programs do not necessarily have to disappear; however, with less high-RBA producing programs there is less money for everyone.

A Senator wondered about the potential scenario where a program is not available anywhere in the state of Idaho, if the SB and other presidents in the state make similar decisions about a program. The Provost brought up the mission essentiality aspect. Should a program be the only one in the state, that would be taken into account. The deans do have that awareness while making their recommendations. They do not interface directly with APPT, but there is communication between the groups.

A Senator, also APPT committee member, shared that the committee was thoughtful and surprised when they saw the quintiles and noticed how this is going to impact the institution. She said that the Humanities actually do quite well as they are not expensive, whereas more costly programs are in the bottom quintiles. Qualitatively speaking, she continued, there was a lot of discomfort in assigning these numbers to programs. Only people close to those programs can really explain the value of what the programs bring to the institution. Again, the value of a liberal education as an important part of our mission was reiterated. The APPT Chair agreed that the committee will reach a much better understanding about the low-ranking programs after their presentations are delivered.
Some Senators felt there was not enough clarity about measures and metrics, which creates a lot of anxiety in people, as they do not know how programs are being saved or closed. The APPT Chair noted that information about programs to be potentially eliminated is currently being shared with the deans, who may or may not agree with the recommendations. Deans are then encouraged to work closely with those programs on their presentations.

Chair Grieb recalled that a subcommittee (of the APPT) was also involved. Indeed, the Provost followed up, the main task of this subcommittee was to revisit the aspect of mission essentiality, and what is the best way to describe it. They used objective criteria, with their main point being that students should be driving essentiality (see, for instance, English). The subcommittee forwarded their conclusions to APPT.

The next focal point was how this process can be best used for constructive purposes. Will programs in the bottom quintiles receive feedback on how to do better in the future? In fact, that is the purpose of having the deans working with the programs on their presentations. The plan is also to continue improving the PP process, and possibly keep the committee together.

Next, the question was raised whether the top-quintile programs will see increased resources coming their way. The Provost commented that some colleges like CLASS and CBE have been historically underfunded and this may be a way to address that. Although that has been part of the conversation, the committee has not yet made any recommendations in that direction. It is not clear at this point if and how the data will be disseminated. Probably there will be a report. Data will be shared with the deans, who may share it with the faculty in the appropriate units. Faculty Senate should weigh in on how to best balance the importance of transparency and the impact on morale.

Chair Grieb said that the incremental base budget model is not working, as we know. In the future, fair performance should be a measure. In addition, he noted that while some programs like those in the CBE had high RBA’s and ranked in the top quintile, they are not immune to cuts. Despite high quintile rankings the CBE is losing 12-14% of its faculty to budget cuts. All colleges across the university are feeling the impact of the budget cuts.

A Senator emphasized that, if this process is to have any positive outcome, it must be used to improve the quality of programs and their curriculum. We need a process which is logically consistent with the goal of delivering education. We should look at program improvement rather than program cutting.

A Senator and APPT committee member, who was also on the REAPP committee, noted that he does agree with the importance of a broad liberal education, especially in view of the fact that a large fraction of our students are first-generation. At the same time, we must generate revenue to be able to “keep the doors open”. This takes a balance of efforts. The committee decided to focus their attention on the bottom quintiles, requesting that deans work together in consultation with their Chairs to improve the outcomes. Many members of the APPT share the Senator’s view that this should not be a punitive process. We need to have a conversation which leads to the evolution of the institution, and one data point cannot accomplish that. Collectively, we make recommendations (not decisions). We look for programs with the highest degree stability and seek a balance between the institution’s need for resources and essentiality.
A Senator expressed concerns about the concept of one program subsidizing other programs. All of our programs rely on one another in complex ways. There are ways to be important other than making money. We should not “oversimplify” what a program actually brings in. We should not forget that we are here to educate.

Chair Grieb asked what defines a program. That is, at which level (e.g. department level) do we say that a program is a program? Provost Wiencek explained that the SB maintains an inventory of academic programs, and that the programs that were evaluated are those in the SB inventory. In most cases, Chair Grieb followed up, an option is embedded within a major. He inquired about the process to divide revenue and costs for majors vs. options. Provost Wiencek replied that the data are available for the revenue part. As for the costs, the deans are asked to assign dollars to the programs. Within a single department, one may potentially see programs spread out considerably over several quintiles. Useful information can be extracted, for instance, that a department does not need a particular emphasis with those extra courses which require money to staff. On the other hand, there can be “opposite” cases where eliminating a particular option wouldn’t save much money. Holistically, though, all emphases and options roll up into a major. So, the data gathered on programs are generally consistent with what goes on at the department level.

Provost Wiencek said that other aspects are in need of adjustments and will need additional discussion with the Registrar’s office. As of now, we have 30 or 40 Bachelor’s degrees, not only the BA and the BS. Often people confuse major and degree type. For instance, now we would print on a diploma that a student has been awarded a BS in Computer Science with major in Computer Science, obviously redundant information.

There was one last question from a Senator, who, in reference to the F&A appearing in the calculation of the RBA, became worried about protecting faculty involved in interdisciplinary research. Chair Grieb reiterated that this quantitative measure and the RBA does not prevent other qualitative considerations. Provost Wiencek followed up and noted that, when looking at the total amount of money for revenue generated, G&A is only 1% and F&A probably 4-5%. The vast majority is tied up in tuition revenue generation. The challenges concerning interdisciplinary activities do not reside in F&A and G&A, but rather in how we offer courses and programs and co-mentor graduate students.

**New Business:** None

**Adjournment:** A motion to adjourn (A. Smith) passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

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