2020 – 2021 Faculty Senate – Pending Approval
Meeting # 10
Tuesday, October 20, 2020, 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm
Zoom only

Present: Ahmadzadeh, Brantz, Bridges, Carney, Chapman, Dezzani, Fairley, Goebel, Hickman, Keim, Kirchmeier (Chair), Lee-Painter, McIntosh, McKellar, Meeuf (Vice-Chair), Paul, Quinnett, Raja, Rashed, Rinker, Rose, Sammarruca (w/o vote), Schwarzlaender, Smith, Stroebel, Tibbals, Wargo, Torrey Lawrence (w/o vote)
Absent:
Guest Speakers: Dean Panttaja, Brian Foisy, Trina Mahoney
Call to Order: Chair Kirchmeier called the meeting to order at 3:30pm.

Approval of Minutes (vote):
• Minutes of the 2020-21 Meeting #9 – Attach. #1
There were no corrections to the minutes of the 2020-21 Meeting #9. The minutes were approved as distributed.

Chair’s Report:
• Faculty Senate Leadership, along with the Provost’s Office and CETL are creating a questionnaire to gather information from everyone who is teaching this semester. The survey is a collaborative tool designed to help us all better understand what teaching was like for faculty across campuses, in different disciplines, and in different formats. Please keep an eye out for the survey and encourage your constituents to complete the survey. A special thank you to Diane Kelly-Riley for getting this project started, and to the Covid-19 Advisory Committee for helping to draft and revise the survey.
• We received updates from Dan Ewart relevant to the recent discussions on preferred names and Blackboard. I will share that communication with the Senators.
• I will be sending out a communication later this week asking Senators from each college to nominate faculty to sit on the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. Please look for an email from me soon; we have to submit our nominations by October 30.
• Three upcoming deadlines to keep in mind:
  o Sabbatical applications are due on October 30, 2020.
  o Honorary degree nominations are due on November 16, 2020.
  o Deadline to request delay for promotion and/or tenure is March 14, 2021. Please help us spread the word about these upcoming deadlines by sharing with your colleagues.

Discussion:
Will the survey also involve staff who are teaching a class? It was clarified that the survey is directed to anyone (faculty, staff, graduate teaching assistants, etc.) who is teaching this semester.

There were no more questions or comments for the Chair.

Provost’s Report:

1
• COVID-19 update: See President Green’s memo from Monday. We have seen significant improvement over the last two weeks. Currently only one Greek Chapter House is in quarantine, down from 14 just a few weeks ago. The active positive cases are 59, and we currently have 7 students in our isolation facility, down from 60 a few weeks ago. We returned to original class formats today. Increased positivity rates in Southern Idaho and nationwide are a concern. We all need to be careful and continue to follow safety protocols.

• Everyone should carefully read the President’s memo from this morning about enrollment and budget.

• A reminder of the 2020 Common Read Talk delivered tonight at 5:30 by author Cristina Henriquez. It’s open to the public, but one must register in advance. Everyone is encouraged to attend.

Discussion:
Chair Kirchmeier asked what facilities are being used to host students in isolation. Provost Lawrence said the Targhee Hall is the primary location. Students receive support, such as meal delivery, and reported having a positive experience. A few have been placed at the Idaho Inn. If needed, the Stevenson wing – part of the Wallace complex – can also be used, but we have not needed it thus far.

Some faculty have reported a drop in attendance. Chair Kirchmeier asked whether students receive separate communications about going back to class, or whether they receive the general memo that goes out to students, staff, and faculty. The Provost said that students do not receive a separate communication, which could be confusing as different classes have different attendance policies, and he does not want to interfere with faculty’s attendance expectations. Faculty should reach out to their students and communicate their expectations.

When students are isolated because they tested positive, are they put in contact with a doctor or a nurse? Yes – the Provost answered – they are contacted by a physician who conveys the positive test information, answers questions, and provide resources. The Dean of Students Office follows up with these students and puts them in contact with the Vandal Health Clinic, if needed. As for notifying a student of a positive test result, they should receive a call from a Gritman physician. However, the student could miss the call, in which case they may be notified by university officials first – we have been advised by Public Health that, in such situations, it is best not to wait. In summary, Gritman handles the medical notification while the Dean of Students addresses the students’ immediate needs. There is a staff member living in Targhee Hall to help make sure students’ needs are met.

A Senator sought clarification about the “non-eligible to attend class” list. If a student is off the list, they are eligible to attend classes. But – the Senator noted – if they went home to isolate, potentially in a region with high infection rate, won’t that create a safety issue when their return to class? The Provost confirmed that students who are off the list are eligible to attend classes. If they remain on the list, possibly because they have not yet been tested, the university continues to reach out to them. If they are in isolation, it is because they tested positive. If they need to quarantine, they can do so in the dorms, where they get assistance such as food delivery. As adults, they cannot be prevented anyone from going home to quarantine, but they are discouraged from doing so. If they go home to a “hot spot,” they may be request a test upon return. If anyone is uncomfortable about a student situation, they should file a Vandal Care report. Faculty can remind their students to get tested, but they should do so with sensitivity.
A Senator inquired about the email invitations to join the Gritman Medical Center Patient Portal. The Provost replied that it can be disregarded if you are not being tested nor is it necessary to receive test results.

There were no more questions or comments for the Provost.

Committee Reports

- Committee on Committees – Committee Assignment Updates (Russ Meeuf).
  Vice Chair Meeuf reported that the Committee on Committees is in the process of filling a few remaining vacancies in the Senate committees. Appointing students has been somewhat challenging, but the committee is working on it. UCC still needs two undergraduate representatives. We also need a few more faculty and staff (for instance, a faculty Senator for the Faculty&Staff Policy Group). Also, the committee is almost ready to release the survey for the 2021-22 committee appointments.
  Discussion:
  In response to a question, Vice Chair Meeuf said that both graduate and undergraduate students are needed, depending on the committee membership as prescribed by FSH 1640.

A Senator noted that participation in UCC is a great opportunity for students to be involved with the curriculum.

Other Announcements and Communications

- Online Idaho (Dean Panttaja) Attach. #2
  Dean Panttaja gave a brief overview on the State Board of Education “Online Idaho” initiative. He started with a brief history of the project, which started in June 2020. At that time, SBOE approved and forwarded a $4M request of Corona Virus Financial Advisory Committee (CFAC) legislative funds to create a digital learning platform in collaboration with Idaho Workforce Development Council (IWDC). On June 29, two models were conceived, and on July 9, SBOE approved the implementation of Online Idaho utilizing a “storefront” model of existing online programs as delivered by the eight Idaho institutions. On August 24, a Statewide Steering Committee was formed. The main components of the model are: a course-sharing platform, with a digital catalog of available online programs and certificates with appropriate institutional links, and tools/resources to make the platform and learning successful. A prospective learner can just go to the link and sign up for courses from a particular institution. For instance, students at Boise State could take an open seat at U of I. Dean Panttaja noted that course sharing is only a small part compared to what already exists.
  Moving on to actions and timelines: “Quottly” is currently the preferred digital platform provider; “Pressbooks” may be the chosen OEN (Open Education Network, essentially a collection of free textbooks); “Canvas” will probably be the statewide LMS, potentially for all K-20 students in the state. Implementation of the model requires institutional staffing of three positions. Fall 2021 is a more realistic timeline than the originally proposed date of January 2021.
  Dean Panttaja acknowledged consultation with Dean Kahler, Lindsey Brown (for admissions and transcripts), Randy Croyle (for financial aid), the CETL Team (for online learning), Dan Ewart and Team (for technology and infrastructure), and of course with President Green and Provost Lawrence. As a final note: we chose the courses that we want to share and the program we want to offer; we accept from other institutions the courses that we want to accept. We have one year (may be more) of free access to Canvas to check out how it works for us. (See Attach.#2 in the Meeting #10 binder for more details.)
Discussion:
The Chair asked whether current courses can remain in Blackboard when the Canvas learning platform becomes accessible. The Provost addressed this question: it may be required to move all course to Canvas at a later date, for consistency. Most of the Idaho institutions are already using Canvas. We can try for free for a year.

A Senator asked for the meaning of OEN, which stands for – as Dean Panttaja explained – Open Education Network, a collection of free textbooks.

A Senator inquired about the opportunities that Online Idaho could present to our institution. On the other side, are there any dangers if we decide to (or not to) participate? Dean Panttaja replied that there is no penalty for not participating, although President Green will appreciate any level of participation. It is a state-wide model, a single place to go to check out what is available for anyone who wants to further their education. We already have Independent Study Idaho. We can participate at any level we want. It is an opportunity to further market our online footprint.

A Senator raised a question about course sharing: if people from other institutions can sign up for open seats with us, do they pay tuition to us or do they sit in our classes for free? This Senator had a second question: if CANVAS is chosen, should we develop online courses directly on Canvas? With regard to the second question, Dean Panttaja said that we will try it (free of charge) and see if faculty like it. Boise State went through a pilot program and then switched to Canvas. As for the first question, tuition for the people who sit in our classes will be paid to us by their institutions.

Another Senator wished to make a comment: reading the attachment, he noticed mention of staff reallocation in relation to the financial commitment expectation by the institution. He expressed concerns about possible staff reallocation, particularly during these challenging times. Dean Panttaja acknowledged that three new positions are needed. If it were up to him, he would hire additional staff with the state implementation funds. But it is not his decision to make.

The Chair noted that we need to move on to the next agenda item. This conversation will continue next week.

• Budget and Enrollment Overview (Brian Foisy & Trina Mahoney)
  Brian Foisy said he will focus on the connection between revenue sources and the drivers of that revenue. The primary institutional budget is referred to as the General Education (Gen Ed) budget. The major sources of revenue for the Gen Ed budget are state appropriations and tuition revenue. Enrollment drives tuition and thus the Gen Ed budget relies on enrollment. Virtually every unit on campus is a direct or indirect beneficiary of the Gen Ed budget. The current year Gen Ed budget is $166M, most of which comes from state appropriations. The benefit of state appropriations is that the final year-end revenue figure is known in advance and is essentially guaranteed (unless the Legislature or Executive Branch acts to hold funds back). On the other hand, tuition revenue is subject to increases and decreases in enrollment. Brian Foisy displayed a preliminary spreadsheet, prepared by Trina Mahoney, with updated numbers for the current fiscal year. The spreadsheet included estimated actual revenue for Fall and projections for Spring. Brian Foisy clarified the meaning of some terms. Gross tuition is what we charge the student. A waiver is a policy-granted authority to not collect some or all of the charged tuition. It is different than a scholarship, where the tuition is payed by someone other than the student. Gross tuition minus waivers equals net tuition, which is essentially the tuition revenue we actually collect. The gross tuition budget is
approximately $100M. Subtracting the waivers – $38M – results in $62M of net tuition. Trina Mahoney noted that the waivers are predominantly non-resident or WUE, whereas the few resident waivers are mostly related to employees and/or their spouses. From the draft spreadsheet, one can see that we are $2.6M under budget on the gross revenue side, which is due to the fact that the overall enrollment is down. However, we are underspending our waiver in the amount of $6.3M. From the financial standpoint, this is good, as we have $6.3M in potential savings, which leaves us at $3.7M to the good. The “Contingency” entry shows $2.9M. A large impact came from the FY 2021 transition from full non-resident tuition to 150% of resident tuition for WUE students. Moving on to FY 2022, we will have to use the $2.9M to balance the budget. Just as in a household where the income is anticipated to be reduced by some amount for the next two years, we anticipate two revenue drops, one in 2021 and one in 2022, as a result of the transition to WUE. President Green’s preference was to do the necessary budget reduction all at once rather than in multiple cuts. So, we have a “buffer” of $2.9M in the current year, because we know a revenue reduction is coming in the next year and we accounted for it now. So, the $2.9M is available to balance the budget next year. Finally, we end up with $6.6M to the good. There are a few other aspects to consider: the “Idaho Falls Adjustment” and the “Estimated Melt” (which we must refund under certain circumstances, even if the deadline for refund has passed). When all is accounted for, we estimate a total surplus of $4.7M. Trina emphasized that these estimates are very conservative, under the assumption that all goes as expected in the Spring. In his most recent memo, President Green made it clear that these estimates are contingent on the university staying open in the Spring and no more drop in enrollment. Barring some event that would force us to close in the Spring, we are optimistic about the surplus.

A Senator wondered how a surplus is seen by the state legislators. Is it possible that this “safety cushion” may be interpreted as an indication that we are free from financial problems? Brian Foisy noted that we have made a financial turnaround and worked to stop cash losses. He is confident that anything we can do to show that we are building resources will be seen positively. Also, the proposed use of the surplus funds, which he will discuss next, is an important consideration.

The question was raised: why was about 16% of the waiver budget left unused, while it could have been used to recruit additional students? Brian Foisy noted that President Green had raised the same question, namely, what enrollment increase would have been generated had we used the full waiver budget. The other side is that there is no financial gain if we recruit a student who does not have to pay tuition. We discussed this issue extensively with the Financial Aid Team and the Enrollment Management Team. In the $38M waiver which they provided us, some categories of waiver were counted more than once, such that the $38M was a larger budget than it needed to be. As SEM moved through their awarding process, they were using a smaller number – and still left money on the table – because they had inadvertently double-counted certain waivers. The error will be corrected in the FY 2022 budget. On the positive side, while we built the budget around $38M, the budget could have been set at $35M. Moreover, most of the waivers go to non-resident students, and COVID-19 has had a large impact on non-resident enrollment in the current semester. A similar scenario is seen with international students, especially new students who were unable to travel.

Brian Foisy moved to the next spreadsheet titled “Gen Ed Funding Actions,” to talk about disposition of the funds discussed on the previous page. Shortly before the beginning of the fiscal year, we were notified that the Governor was imposing a one-time 5% holdback, which amounts to $4.7M. Also, no CEC awards were allowed for employees for FY 2021. However, the legislators had built CEC funds
into our Gen Ed budget for the current fiscal year, which could not be used to give raises to employees. The decision was made to net the 5% holdback with the unallocated CEC, yielding an unfunded amount of $3.3M. This $3.3M budget problem was handled with the mandatory furlough, which will generate about $3.3M in savings.

Moving to items which impact the current FY budget and are yet to be addressed: during the last legislative session, the Joint Finance and Appropriations Committee (JFAC) decided to impose a base 2% state holdback of $2.4M. Furthermore, a legislative action resulted in a small reduction in employee benefits funding – about $194K. Two more issues, related to the operation of the university and not legislature, also need to be addressed. They are related to the Idaho Water Center and funding for TAs. Brian Foisy recalled that, while COGS did participate into the $22M budget reduction, the administration did not want to reduce the overall number of TAs. All of the above adds up to $4.6M of known budget issues which we need to address. As discussed earlier, this was expected, so we now have a $4.7M solution to a $4.6M budget problem – reason why we will not need a mid-year budget reduction.

Moving on to on-going issues (for FY 2022): we found a solution in the current FY to deal with a permanent budget cut, namely the 2% holdback, but this is a one-time solution to an on-going problem. Thus we need to develop an on-going solution to an on-going problem, such as a base cut to the university expenditures. Also, the other issues mentioned earlier (IWC, benefit funding, and TA funding level) need a permanent solution. All of the above considered, we end up with a $4.8M budget challenge for the coming fiscal year.

A Senator inquired about the amount of reserves that we need to reach per State Board requirement. Brian Foisy explained that our net worth position was negative by $10M and needs to be around $25M, meaning that we must increase our net position by $35M. However, this does not mean that we must accumulate $35M in cash.

How can the surplus help our situation? Brian Foisy thinks that the legislators will see this fiscally conservative result and recognize that reserves allows us to take advantage of opportunities for the institution when they arise. Universities survive based on their ability to borrow money and repay it. Similar to credit ratings, agencies evaluate the university and our credit worthiness. They have told us that rebuilding resources will go a long way towards our credit worthiness, which hinges on our balance sheet and on our ability to maintain reserves.

The Chair thanked the guests and encouraged the Senators to send additional questions for Brian Foisy to her email address.

The Chair called for a motion to adjourn.

Adjournment: There was a motion to adjourn (Fairley/Tibbles). The meeting was adjourned at 5:02pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francesca Sammarruca
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate
I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes (Vote)
   - Minutes of the 2020-2021 Faculty Senate Meeting #9 (October 13, 2020) Attach. #1

III. Chair’s Report
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   Committee on Committees
   - Committee Assignment Updates (Russ Meeuf)

VI. Other Announcements and Communications
   - On-line Idaho (Dean Panttaja) Attach. #1
   - Budget and Enrollment Overview (Brian Foisy & Torrey Lawrence) Attach. #2

VII. New Business

VIII. Adjournment

Attachments:

- Attach. #1 Minutes of the 2020-2021 Faculty Senate Meeting #9
- Attach. #2 On-line Idaho
2020 – 2021 Faculty Senate – Pending Approval
Meeting # 9
Tuesday, October 13, 2020, 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm
Zoom only

Present: Ahmadzadeh, Brantz, Bridges, Carney, Chapman, Dezzani, Fairley, Goebel, Hickman, Keim, Kirchmeier (Chair), Lee-Painter, McIntosh, McKellar, Meuef (Vice-Chair), Paul, Quinnett, Raja, Rashed, Rinker, Rose, Sammarruca (w/o vote), Schwarzlaender, Smith, Stroebel, Tibbals, Wargo, Torrey Lawrence (w/o vote)

Absent: 

Guest Speakers: Lindsey Brown, Dan Ewart, Richard Seamon, Kristin Haltinner, Jan Johnson

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

Approval of Minutes (vote):

- Minutes of the 2020-21 Meeting #8 – Attach. #1
  The Secretary reported that she included the following clarification on p.4 as requested by President Green: “Achieving R1 status should be doable, not likely in the next cycle since we are approaching that review, perhaps at the next cycle which would be 3 years after that.” She also corrected the misspelled name of a Senator. There were no other corrections to the minutes of the 2020-21 Meeting #8. The minutes were approved as amended.

Chair’s Report:
- Please distribute the Talking Points to your colleges. We are getting reports that faculty are not getting the Talking Points. Make sure to update your contact lists from last year and regularly distribute the Talking Points.
- Please join me at the Palouse Literary Festival on Zoom this week. This festival is organized by MA and MFA graduate students in the English department. This year’s events include readings by MFA alum and award-winning author Joe Wilkins. Zoom link for all events: https://uidaho.zoom.us/j/7242893322
  - Thursday, 10/15, 7pm Reading by Joe Wilkins
  - Friday, 10/16, 7pm reading by Ching-In Chen
  - Saturday, 10/17, 2pm Pop-up prose
  - Saturday, 10/17, 7pm DJ Lee with Mike Bishop
- Three upcoming deadlines to keep in mind:
  - Sabbatical applications are due on October 30, 2020.
  - Honorary degree nominations are due on November 16, 2020.
  - Deadline to request delay for promotion and/or tenure is March 14, 2021.
  Please help us spread the word about these upcoming deadlines by sharing with your colleagues.

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

Provost’s Report:
- Another event to highlight: a week from today, Tuesday, October 20, the 2020 Community Talk will be delivered by Common Reader author Cristina Henriquez. She will talk about her book. It’s open to the public, but one must register in advance. Everyone is encouraged to attend.
COVID-19 update: communications were sent on Friday and Monday by the President and the Provost. The news is generally good. Campus-wide testing showed a clear downward trend. Two weeks ago we had something like a “spike” which caused some concerns. We ramped up testing and saw the rate go down quite a bit last week and even further this week. Wastewater testing continues to be expanded and the results are lining up with the findings from the last few weeks. Plan to return to original class formats on Monday, Oct. 19. Further information will be sent when all the comprehensive testing is completed.

There have been questions concerning the recent recommendation from the White House to move U of I, Boise State, and BYU-Idaho fully online. We are not going to follow the recommendation because we believe it is based on inaccurate data, such as that 80% of college-age individuals in Latah County are positive. This does not match any of our findings, and we have by far the most comprehensive testing system of any university in the state. We will continue to work with Public Health and our Modeling Team. Sampling wastewater is going well. We are not far from Thanksgiving and, if everyone is diligent, we will be able to remain open until then. It is in the living groups where we have seen the positivity rate increase.

The State requires public release of enrollment data on October 15. With that, there will also be an update on the financial implications of enrollment.

The Provost acknowledged Lindsey Brown and her Staff for their amazing amount of work related to testing, such as coordinating exchange of information with Gritman. They deserve great appreciation. Thanks also to everyone on campus for the extra work they are doing this semester.

Discussion:
A Senator asked whether staff is required to telework after the Fall break or whether buildings on campus will remain accessible. Provost Lawrence responded that the change after the break impacts only instruction. Campus will remain open, unless circumstances require reconsideration.

The focus shifted to the budget. A Senator asked: we heard that the State of Idaho has a $300M budget surplus. With regard to the 5% temporary holdback from our budget, are the SBOE and the President trying to get those dollars back? The Provost answered that this is definitely on the President’s radar. There are no clear news yet, but conversations are taking place.

The Provost moved on to address questions on the Spring semester schedule. A decision should be communicated in about a week. It is very likely that we will start remote while we test all students. With the experience we are gaining this semester, we will be able to make accurate predictions of how long testing will take in January. The plan for Spring Break will also be communicated at the same time.

The Chair inquired whether faculty might be able to opt out of course evaluations beyond Spring and Summer 2020 in consideration of the latest, and sudden, changes in delivery modes required by recent circumstances. The Provost said this matter is being discussed with the Teaching Committee. On the one hand, we don’t want to lose the feedback entirely; on the other hand, we must keep in mind the possible negative impact of these unintended teaching irregularities on a faculty’s record. Other options for evaluation of teaching may be considered. In fact, finding better ways to evaluate teaching (such as peer reevaluation) is part of a broader conversation often brought up on campus.

Other Announcements and Communications
- Preferred Names (Lindsey Brown & Dan Ewart) – Attach. #2
The Chair introduced the topic and pointed out that two faculty members, Kristin Haltinner and Jan Johnson, Co-Chairs of the Ubuntu committee, were also present to answer questions as needed.

Lindsey Brown gave a brief history of the project, which started October 2019, when a Working Group (WG) was assembled to explore the scope of the project. The WG met in February and made a recommendation to move forward, but soon after the pandemic hit. Similar to ID changes (which now carry the Vandal number), there are about 100 systems that connect to Banner, so there are multiple implications. Dan Ewart spoke with the President about the size of the project in terms of hours, people, and resources. It will be brought up and ranked at the IT Governance and Prioritization discussion at the next meeting of the President’s Cabinet. Although some strides were made with the assistance of HR, this must be a concerted effort requiring resources on a large scale.

Responding to a Senator who inquired about the justification for this change, Kristin Haltinner explained the significance and importance of allowing students to use preferred names. At this time, students who wish to use preferred names must email all their instructors to let them know how they prefer to be addressed in a classroom discussion – a request that may be rejected by the instructor. This can escalate to circumstances where the student no longer participates in classroom discussions, or their privacy and safety can be compromised. On the other hand, faculty who care go to great lengths to assist students who are in this situation. But it is not only about transgender students – it may impact international students or anyone else, for that matter. Kristin noted that nearly 200 universities use preferred names, many (but not all) of which use BbLearn and Banner. Not allowing students to be who they are can be fatal, in addition to violating our mission.

The Secretary inquired about the timeline for the project to be fully completed. Lindsey Brown and Dan Ewart replied that there are other projects, and sharing resources is an issue. As a rough order of magnitude, it would probably take 1,700 work hours – most likely an underestimated figure.

Can the system be implemented in small parts? Lindsey Brown was of the opinion that it is best to do it all and well, due to the many “parts” which need to come together.

The Vice Chair reported frustration from some of his constituents because BbLearn does not interface with any other platform, even though it is the primary mode for faculty to engage with students. Could we start from BbLearn, since it seems to be “isolated” from other platforms? Lindsey Brown noted that from BbLearn one can input grades in Vandalweb. We need to be consistent to eliminate the risk of assigning a grade to the wrong student. Dan Ewart added that we can scale the project moving forward, keeping in mind that BbLearn, Vandalstar, and Vandalweb are the most important platforms that need to be changed.

Responding to a follow-up question from the Vice Chair, Lindsey Brown pointed out that it is impossible to change names just in one place. Changing names impacts many other areas, from HR to finances. For instance, issuing refund checks requires legal names. Even though we already have preferred names on the Vandal card – as the Chair observed – Vandal Cards are not official IDs.
A Senator commented that it is important to make sure the name change does not create problems for the students after they graduate – when they apply for a job, or a prospective employer needs to contact the university.

Apparently, a “Best Practices” document to help faculty work with the students in the meantime does not exist. But Kristin Haltinner, Jan Johnson, and Chair Kirchmeier expressed interest to work on such a “manual.” Perhaps a project for the Ubuntu committee? A broader conversation with CETL? Dan Ewart said that research has been done in this area. Guidelines and recommendations do exist, but they are specific to a particular school. We need to look at the whole project.

How long would it take to have the preferred-name feature be functional on BbLearn? Dan and Lindsey reiterated that it is hard to predict a timeline. The change has to flow from Banner to BbLearn.

There were some additional comments from the Chair and the Vice Chair about the possibility of implementing the change in Blackboard, even if not in Banner. It would be helpful to have a quick change just on a discussion board, like we do with Zoom, where the participants can have their preferred names displayed. Lindsey Brown mentioned some experiment done earlier along those lines. There were problems. If they change their last name, for instance by marriage, that information can only come from Banner.

The Chair thanked everyone for participating in the discussion. She will work with Ubuntu to explore further the possibility of a simple temporary solution for BbLearn only, while the larger project moves forward.

- Class Delivery Methods Roundtable (Rich Seamon)
  Chair Kirchmeier provided a brief background for this roundtable: The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is considering possible FSH changes to address course delivery issues that have come up during the pandemic. The starting points was: what rights, if any, do faculty have to choose their course delivery methods during a health emergency or pandemic? The committee realized that the issue is broad and complicated and would like to gather input from Senate to help them clearly define their goals and potentially proceed to policy changes or creation. Rich Seamon, Chair of FAC, and the Secretary, ex-officio FAC member, will lead the discussion.

Rich Seamon confirmed that FAC is in information-gathering mode. Part of the committee’s charge is to consider working conditions and related problems which may arise for faculty. Presently, the main issue is, of course, the COVID-19 situation. An example of the concerns expressed by FAC members is the impact that sudden changes in class delivery methods can have on junior faculty, who may have to spend the weekend reworking their lecture plan on very short notice rather than meeting other obligations, such as scholarship or writing. The impact is strongest for people with significant outside obligations, such as family obligations or caregiving for aging parents. We realize that there is an HR aspect to this, but we are also trying to find ways to ensure that the needs of faculty are met. The administration has been extremely understanding and flexible – we appreciate the work of David Lee-Painter and the COVID-19 Advisory Committee – but all of this is an ad hoc response. There is no reason to assume that similar situations will not happen again – recently, a serious wildfire problem shut down operations and required adaptation. This is what we are trying to address.
Secretary Sammarruca said she echoed Rich Seamon’s presentation. She added that there is nothing in FSH to address these issues. Therefore, she opened the discussion proposing the general question: What would you like to see in FSH that might have made things easier and more comfortable for you as instructors as we moved through the pandemic?

Chair Kirchmeier heard from a number of constituents that the ability to choose their class delivery methods, based on best practices, pedagogy, and teaching philosophy, would have made planning easier. But they were not able to do so. Another question was: Why is there nothing in FSH that gives the instructor or, at least the department chair, the ability to make those decisions?

One of the things that would have been helpful to another Senator: there are five different delivery methods – face-to-face, hybrid, Hy-Flex, online, and virtual. We need better definitions of what they mean and what the expectations are for the students. She teaches in person but has no live stream capability. Several students asked to Zoom in and she accommodated them by recording the sessions. Whether we do or do not need all five options, a set of standard expectations would be helpful.

In response to the previous comment, Provost Lawrence clarified that there are actually eight different teaching formats – some of them used not nearly as much as the others mentioned in the question. A chart was distributed in late July to students and faculty – another will be distributed for the Spring – explaining those formats and what is expected of the students. This is one of the issues to be finalized for the Spring. Hopefully, the document will be helpful. With regard to standard expectations, a generalization that works for everyone is not possible.

A Senator commented in the chat on the abrupt shifts mentioned by Rich Seamon. We could have such situations on snow days. These sudden changes are very hard on faculty.

With regard to impact on faculty, Rich Seamon noted that expectations for faculty must be clear both at the hiring stage and on an on-going base. Teaching effectiveness is often an important criterion for P&T. Thus, there should be some way to reflect input from the faculty in what is best for teaching effectiveness in their case.

While recognizing and appreciating the hard work the university invested to assist faculty with various methods of class delivery, a Senator said that the lack of adequate technology in some classrooms poses limitations.

A Senator seconded the idea to consolidate the options. Prior to the COVID pandemic, on his campus they offered classes on Zoom but discouraged students from making use of them. When the need arose, they were fortunate to have the experience which helped them through a smooth transition. Engineering Outreach has existed for a long time and developed a significant infrastructure. But in recent times, the question came up: why would students take a class through Engineering Outreach and pay more when they can just Zoom into a class? So, on his campus, they developed a system which worked well, although it did not have many of the features offered by Engineering Outreach – such as ways to prevent cheating on tests. This Senator suggested to consider all of this carefully when we return to “normal.” We do have the experience now, but do we want to go forward with this even when there is no need?
A Senator reiterated the importance of setting clear expectations for the students. They may not understand to which degree they can be accommodated in a particular teaching format. This can create confusion and problems, as well as put excessive burden on the faculty. Provost Lawrence agreed on the importance of communicating clear expectations. We have more experience now, and we will go into the Spring with better understanding and preparation.

Secretary Sammarruca suggested that the main goal should not be the development of a large infrastructure to sustain multiple delivery methods, but rather to design a process to guide us through future pandemics or natural disasters on matters of class delivery and the role of faculty in making those choices. Rich Seamon emphasized the need of a mechanism to modify the position description if, for instance, the faculty spent more time than anticipated on teaching. The faculty must be alerted of the opportunity and of the process for requesting such modification. Documentation must be maintained and properly considered going into the P&T process. Secretary Sammarruca added that, while junior faculty are impacted the most, all faculty are. For instance, this year professional evaluations need to be done looking through the proper “lens,” that is, accounting for the work that faculty actually did since March 2020.

A Senator said that, while he understands the need for flexibility in the position description, he worries about budget constraints. In his college, the GenEd budget is very small.

The Vice Chair stressed the importance of keeping faculty labor visible. We will not go back to normal with the students having the same expectations as prior to COVID. Whether future changes and shifts are due to new circumstances to which we need to adapt or they are routine changes, we must ensure that faculty work is visible, recognized, and rewarded. The concern is: now that we all have adjusted and are capable of delivering classes in multiple formats, we should not build on the assumption that what we have learned and done during the pandemic will remain an expected part of our teaching efforts and position descriptions.

Provost Lawrence summarized: there are two different directions this conversation can follow, 1) defining the steps to take in an emergency situation, or 2) defining a “new normal.” Which one are we addressing? A lot can be done towards the second point, but not much can be done in policy regarding the first point.

Secretary Sammarruca said she hopes we can fill the void in FSH (rather than resorting to many emergency policies when needed) to assist faculty deliver classes the best way they can under difficult circumstances.

The Chair thanked FAC and everyone for the useful discussion. She hopes more committees will come to Senate to discuss their work in progress.

The Chair called for a motion to adjourn.  
**Adjournment:** There was a motion to adjourn (Fairley/Lee-Painter). The meeting was adjourned at 4:58pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francesca Sammarruca
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate
SUBJECT
Digital Campus Update

REFERENCE

June 10, 2020 The Board approved and forwarded a request to the Coronavirus Financial Advisory Committee for $4M to support development of a system-wide digital campus for postsecondary education.

June 29, 2020 The Board received an update on CFAC funding and two different potential models for a digital campus in Idaho.

July 9, 2020 The Board voted to approve the Idaho Online Initial Implementation Plan and directed staff to access funds from the Governor’s Coronavirus Financial Advisory Committee to pursue this plan.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

In May 2020, a working group was formed to explore the concept of a digital campus that would deliver low-cost, high-quality, online postsecondary educational experiences to Idahoans regardless of their location. A digital campus would also provide means for Idaho students to secure work that is both financially and personally fulfilling long-term, enabling them to play an enhanced role in their communities across the state. In an effort to design a digital campus that is sufficiently viable, feasible, and desirable as a postsecondary innovation in Idaho, the working group consulted prominent online and continuing education leaders and models from aspirational institutions/systems, as well as the accumulated knowledge of Idaho’s academic community.

At a Special Board Meeting on July 9, 2020, the Board approved an initial implementation plan to pursue development of a model that seeks to address the online education needs of Idaho citizens by consolidating necessary courses, degrees, services, and resources of the current institutions into a digital campus that adapts to the needs of faculty and students. This digital campus model is currently referred to as the “Idaho Online” model.

The Idaho Online model emerged with the recognition that new efficiencies for delivering high-quality online courses may result from consolidating and fortifying the current efforts of Idaho’s postsecondary institutions. Culminating in a state-level portal for online course sharing (a “marketplace”), the services and resources of Idaho Online would be federated to meet the unique needs of every institution in four focus areas: (1) the statewide scaling of technology-enhanced instruction and learning analytics via a robust portfolio of common digital technologies, (2) the advancement of Board priorities for promoting student success (e.g., open educational resources, Complete College Idaho, prior learning assessment, dual credit, etc.), (3) the development of faculty-owned standards for ensuring the continuous improvement of online courses/instruction, and (4) the expansion of
student/faculty opportunities to pursue high-need skills and credentials beyond the traditional classroom. The Idaho Online model will also build on a statewide inventory of online degrees, programs, and services currently offered by Idaho institutions.

IMPACT
The Idaho Online model is being designed to deliver low-cost, high-quality, online postsecondary educational experiences to Idahoans regardless of their location. The model attempts to promote and augment the efficacy of Idaho’s current postsecondary institutions regarding online education to ensure more reliable access and improved outcomes for all students, current or prospective.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment 1 – Idaho Online Update Slide Deck
Attachment 2 – Idaho Online Frequently Asked Questions
Attachment 3 – Idaho Online Implementation Roadmap

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Since the July 9, 2020 Special Board Meeting, staff at OSBE have begun implementing the approve plan by taking the following actions: 1) extensive engagement with institutional leadership, faculty, staff and students; 2) establishment of a Steering Committee for Idaho Online; 3) development of a set of Frequently Asked Questions; 4) establishment a set of key outcomes for the initial phase of project development; 5) building of a project roadmap based on these outcomes; and 6) securing of sole-source procurement authority from the Division of Purchasing to allow for expedited expenditure of all CFAC funds by the end of the calendar year. Staff are prepared to provide an update on these activities to the Board and to seek further direction.

BOARD ACTION
This item is for informational purposes only.
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Steering Committee

State Board: Dave Hill

Presidents: Cynthia Pemberton (LCSC) & Rick Aman (CEI)

Provosts: Tony Roark (BSU) & Denise Aberle-Cannata (CWI)

General Education: Dean Panttaja (UI, GEM)

Workforce Development: Wendi Secrist (WDC)

Office of the State Board: TJ Bliss & Jonathan Lashley
Stakeholder Engagement

• Holding regular conversations with institutional leadership/faculty/staff/students

• Identifying quality online courses, student support needs, technology wants, etc.

• Facilitating vendor demonstrations and soliciting feedback on possible solutions

• Soliciting and openly answering stakeholder questions about Idaho Online:
  ○ General information
  ○ Courses and Programs
  ○ Software and Technology Services
  ○ Governance and Operations
  ○ Fiscal Considerations
  ○ Research and Evaluation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What Idaho Online is</th>
<th>What Idaho Online is not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔ Idaho’s Digital Learning Consortium</td>
<td>✗ A New, Ninth, Degree-Granting Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ An Online Course Sharing Marketplace</td>
<td>✗ An Affront on Traditional Instructional Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Faculty-Owned Quality Assurance of Online Courses and Pedagogy</td>
<td>✔ A Challenge to Existing Institutional Authorities and Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ A Pilot Next Generation Digital Learning Environment (NGDLE)</td>
<td>✔ Cannibalization of Institutional Tools and Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Idaho’s Collective Contribution to Educational Excellence and Leadership</td>
<td>✔ Top-Down Mandates for Online Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation Outcomes  (Due December 31, 2020)

1. Establish long-term governance structure
   a. Multi-year strategic plan, business model
2. Establish a federated staffing model with our institutions
3. Develop a Next Generation Digital Learning Environment (NGDLE)
   a. Common LMS, other shared academic technology and support services
4. Launch online course sharing platform and catalog
5. Establish organizational infrastructure
   a. Domain, website, branding, communication plan, project management pipeline
6. Establish research and development plan
   a. Online course quality assurance process, market research, data partnerships
7. Launch professional development programs
   a. Research fellowships, pedagogy fellowships, professional internships for students
# Implementation Roadmap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epic</th>
<th>JUL - SEP</th>
<th>OCT - DEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business and Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federated Staffing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGDLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Course Sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Purchasing and Procurement

- Received exemption from State Division of Purchasing to procure NGDLE elements via sole-source process
- Completed state process for accessing CFAC funds
- Engaging with institutions to inventory, demo, and determine specific vendor tools and services to procure for statewide implementation
- Collecting quotes from vendors for further negotiation and prioritization by the Idaho Online Steering Committee
# About Idaho Online

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What Idaho Online is</th>
<th>What Idaho Online is not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✅ Idaho’s Digital Learning Consortium</td>
<td>A New, Ninth, Degree-Granting Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Online will support sharing of common resources, services, and practices to benefit all forms of educational delivery at public postsecondary institutions in Idaho</td>
<td>The current eight institutions already offer a comprehensive foundation for online postsecondary education in Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ An Online Course Sharing Marketplace</td>
<td>An Affront on Traditional Instructional Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Online will include a platform for expanding the joint delivery of online teaching and learning across institutions by making registration, cost, and credit transfer as simple as possible for all learners</td>
<td>The capacity of faculty to effectively teach online is a mission-critical concern, but Idaho Online is designed to support all faculty regardless of how they teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Faculty-Owned Quality Assurance of Online Courses and Pedagogy</td>
<td>A Challenge to Existing Institutional Authorities and Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Online will support centralized resources and workflows for acknowledging and promoting the successful online education efforts of Idaho’s academic community in a systematic way</td>
<td>Idaho Online is intended to complement and fortify the current infrastructure for online education at Idaho’s public postsecondary institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ A Pilot Next Generation Digital Learning Environment (NGDLE)</td>
<td>Cannibalization of Institutional Tools and Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Online will provide access to robust digital tools, services, and professional development opportunities to augment and fortify those already provided by the institutions</td>
<td>Idaho Online’s portfolio of tools and services will offer some strategically redundant or alternative resources to simulate what increased state or institutional investments might yield for online teaching and learning in Idaho in the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Idaho’s Collective Contribution to Educational Excellence and Leadership</td>
<td>Top-Down Mandates for Online Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Online is intended to be a catalyst for piloting novel educational tools and practices as the needs of Idaho’s academic community evolves</td>
<td>Effective educational practices span delivery methods, and Idaho Online seeks to demonstrate and amplify how State Board priorities are being implemented by Idaho’s institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
About Idaho Online

Curated Questions

General

1. What is the primary benefit Idaho Online will achieve for Idaho?
   a. The primary benefit of Idaho Online will be to increase access and affordability to postsecondary education in Idaho, for current students and for potential new students. In particular, Idaho Online is intended to benefit place-based learners in remote and rural areas of the state. The project is also a rare opportunity to explore how strategic state-level investments in digital teaching and learning infrastructure could lead to more resilient educational delivery in the future.

2. What is the general timeline for development and implementation of Idaho Online?
   a. Implementation of Idaho Online’s infrastructure, services, and resources begins in August 2020. A detailed project roadmap can be viewed at https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1mLlLVHZnjpYa55GLy6P_INGmAcUdckEeggHezJn6nng/edit?usp=sharing

3. Who is the primary audience for Idaho Online course and program offerings?
   a. All current students, potential new first-time students, potential returning students, and other place-bound students in Idaho. Special emphasis will be given to marketing Idaho Online to adult learners.

4. How will Idaho Online be marketed to current and potential students?
   a. Marketing to current and potential students will be done by Idaho’s institutions, the State Board Office, and potentially by other state agencies and entities with a vested interest (Workforce Development Council, public libraries, etc.)

5. Who was consulted during the development of the Idaho Online proposal?
   a. Board staff consulted many stakeholders from the eight public colleges and universities during the development of the Idaho Online proposal. Consultations occurred with institution presidents, academic leaders, relevant professional staff,
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faculty from a variety of disciplines and employment levels, and students from a variety of grade levels. Board staff also consulted other state agencies who have vested interest in the success of higher education in Idaho. The design prompt—a digital campus strategy that could consolidate resources, promote broader educational access, and increase affordability for students via CARES Act funding—and urgency of the moment (funding availability and a public health crisis) led staff to research models from institutions/systems/consortia beyond Idaho, consult their stakeholders, and make educated decisions about how their lessons learned may best apply to Idaho. As such, Idaho Online is rooted in relevant experience, current research, and effective practice in the delivery of educational experiences. Idaho Online is an educated, short-term strategy that can and should be iterated for longer-term gains.

Courses and Programs

6. What courses and programs will initially be supported by Idaho Online and what will the process be for determining these courses and programs?
   a. Institutions will identify high-need common courses (e.g., GEM), interinstitutional degree pathways, and specific online courses for inclusion in Idaho Online’s course sharing marketplace. Courses and their faculty will then undergo Idaho’s common quality assurance process for assessing online readiness. This process is currently under development. It is unlikely that institutions will choose to list all online courses with Idaho Online via the course sharing marketplace, but all faculty will be welcome to leverage the digital resources, professional development opportunities, and quality assurance processes that will be provided.

7. Will schools use their own current quality controls for courses and programs, or will other quality controls be imposed externally?
   a. While many Idaho institutions have sophisticated processes for building and assessing high-quality online courses, methods vary significantly. Idaho Online will facilitate a new opportunity for institutions to work together in developing common standards for course design, quality assurance, and continuous improvement. This collaboration will be an opportunity to develop common resources to ensure the online readiness of faculty and students.
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8. Will Idaho Online require additional accreditation approval?
   a. No. Idaho Online facilitates greater access to the courses and programs of the
      eight colleges and universities, but course enrollment, delivery, and management
      resides with the institutions.

9. Will the state be broken down for service areas that relate to the
    current institutions or will the boundaries go away for delivery?
   a. Courses shared through Idaho Online are not intended to have service area
      boundaries. There may be limits, however, to how many courses any one student
      at a particular institution may take via course sharing from other institutions. Such
      limits, if imposed, would be determined through collaborative agreement between
      the institutions and the Board.

10. Will faculty be required to qualify to teach courses offered through
    Idaho Online?
    a. Faculty will need to complete a common “online readiness review” in order for a
       course to pass the quality assurance process for inclusion on the Idaho Online
       marketplace.

11. Will instructional design resources be provided to the institutions
    through Idaho Online?
    a. Instructional design resources in the form of templates, tools, media, and
       professional development opportunities will be available in partnership with
       relevant faculty and staff from the institutions. This is one of the areas in which
       Idaho’s colleges and universities already do excellent work and Idaho Online
       intends to further fortify, showcase, and scale current practices.

12. How will Idaho Online align with Career Technical Education,
    Workforce Development, and other similar state-level initiatives?
    a. Board office staff will work closely with the Division for Career Technical
       Education, the Workforce Development Council, and other relevant agencies and
       projects to seek points of critical synergy on statewide initiatives. One example of
       an Idaho Online investment that may prove beneficial for state agencies as well
       as institutions is the investment in a statewide partner for conducting education
       market research and aggregating labor market data to inform course sharing
       marketplace priorities and emphases.
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Software and Technology Services

13. What shared software and technology services will Idaho Online provide institutions, faculty and students?
   
a. Board staff have developed a running list of digital tools that may complement or even improve the current academic technology portfolios of Idaho’s institutions. Because the strategic plan for Idaho Online spans three years, the implementation of software and technology services should be regarded as opportunities for faculty and staff to pilot, compare, and realign infrastructure toward technology interoperability between institutions.

14. How will shared software and technology services be selected and managed?
   
a. In the coming weeks, Board staff will complete an inventory of the tools and services most desired by the academic community. Because Idaho’s institutions already offer much of what faculty and students need, the expressed wants of the academic community will weigh heavily on what is selected for purchase. Where possible, investments will be made in vendor support for tools that are untenable for current institution staff to support. Federated staffing models are also in development to ensure that Idaho Online technology is implemented and administered well at each institution.

15. Will Idaho Online require all institutions to utilize the same Learning Management System (LMS) or Student Information System (SIS)?
   
a. No. Idaho Online will select vendors that can ensure interoperability with the current technology and data infrastructure of Idaho’s institutions. Idaho Online will not require use of its technology resources. Board staff will conduct efficacy research, organize communities of practice, and author support materials related to the technology portfolio as needed.

16. What is the process for procuring a statewide LMS?
   
a. While effective online courses may be designed and taught without a comprehensive learning management system, a good LMS can set a clear
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baseline for what is possible across disciplines when it comes to online teaching and learning. Because of available funding, Idaho Online currently plans to provide enterprise access to a market-leading LMS for three years. In the event that a campus currently utilizes another vendor, this allows for a second enterprise LMS to be available at no extra cost to each institution and allows for direct comparisons to be drawn by faculty, staff, and students across concurrent environments. Institutions that already have a contract with the chosen vendor will be able to enhance their preexisting environment with additional integrations and support offered by Idaho Online’s LMS. In either case, the LMS secured by Idaho Online will be implemented separately at each institution and any college or university is welcome to migrate completely to the Idaho Online LMS if and when the institution-specific LMS contract runs up in the next three years. Doing so would allow institutions to redirect the budget for an LMS elsewhere for the remainder of the initial Idaho Online LMS contract term.

17. In an effort to spend federal dollars on an expedited timeline, is there a concern that we would not fully utilize the services we are committing to?

   a. While it is unlikely that we can secure every digital resource that faculty and students may want to utilize, this is an opportunity to explore specific tools and practices that would not otherwise be funded by a given institution. Since Idaho Online is designed to be time-limited, the most productive path forward is to invest smartly and as completely as possible in tools that Idaho’s academic community agrees will provide more resilient teaching and learning practices long-term. These common investments provide novel opportunities to reconsider expectations, resources, and investments around technology-enhanced education statewide.

18. Are discussions underway to support federated identity management?

   a. Yes. Referencing the interoperability standards mentioned above, as well as the institution-specific implementation of Idaho Online’s technology portfolio, the board staff will consult with institutions about where best to utilize pre-existing single sign on (SSO) or reconcile user credentials under a systemwide conception of federated identity management. Additionally, the strategic consolidation of student data across institutions is an ongoing priority in matters related to transcripting, transfer, and financial aid and is an investment that our state is should make independent of Idaho Online.
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19. Who will "own" system integrations for class rosters, identity management, timing of upgrades, plug-ins, accessibility of content, etc?
   a. A federated staffing strategy is in development for Idaho Online where specific on-campus “staff” will manage local operations and support for course sharing, learning technology, pedagogical excellence, digital scholarship, and other infrastructure related to this initiative.

20. How will support for technology and pedagogy be handled?
   a. Where possible, vendor support is preferred, but federated staff will also coordinate local support and escalate needs directly to the leadership of Idaho Online. Professional opportunities for faculty and students are envisioned to also provide peer support at their respective institutions. While the intent is to minimize disruption to current campus operations as much as possible, Idaho Online looks forward to partnering with relevant campus support staff when it is mutually beneficial.

21. How does Idaho Online ensure that high-end and advanced needs are being met instead of just reinforcing the status quo of the institutions?
   a. The technology infrastructure of the institutions already represents a baseline for the features and functionality that faculty and students have come to expect for online learning in Idaho. These tools and services vary significantly by institution, however. By taking inventory of current resources and consulting emerging trends in digital teaching and learning, Idaho Online will provide an opportunity to fortify current institutions’ infrastructure as well as invest in more innovative resources and practices than institutions would/could otherwise.

22. Who owns policy and data management related to educational content?
   a. Idaho Online is responsible for ensuring that relevant educational content is available for consistent access and version control. Faculty and institutions own their intellectual property (IP), and Board policy related to IP is currently being revisited to overtly define a clear, reliable strategy for ensuring long-term access to educational content statewide.
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23. Will there be a common, single admission and registration platform? If so, how will it communicate and transfer data with our respective systems and processes?
   a. Students will need to enroll at a specific public institution in Idaho before they will be able to register for online courses at other institutions via the course sharing marketplace. Registration for courses that are available in the marketplace will be available to students through a central portal that may be accessed either through the Idaho Online website or the corresponding webpages of students’ home institutions. Due to the demand for this service to be available in time for Spring 2021 registration, backend processes around student data, registration, and payment will likely be managed by a third-party vendor with support from federated Idaho Online staff.

Governance and Operations

24. Who will operate Idaho Online and are there specific ways institutions can help?
   a. Governance of Idaho Online, at least during the initial implementation, will be a collaborative effort between the Board, its staff, and stakeholders from Idaho’s eight public institutions. A steering committee will be established, as well as a faculty and student advisory group. Presidents, provosts, faculty, and staff across Idaho’s institutions were consulted as much as possible during development of the Idaho Online proposal. The Board Office and federated staff at the institutions will oversee Idaho Online operations in collaboration with willing partners at each institution. There are great pre-existing expertise and strategies at the institutions that Idaho Online initiatives will seek to augment through sharing and collaboration.

25. Will staff be hired at the Office of the State Board of Education to run Idaho Online?
   a. There is no plan to hire additional Board Staff at this time. If strategic investment of federal funds in vendor support, federated staff, faculty fellowships, and student internships do not entirely offset the burden of managing Idaho Online, additional funding sources will need to be identified.

Fiscal Considerations
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26. What is the funding model of Idaho Online?
   a. Idaho Online’s $4 million in startup funds are meant to secure three years of infrastructure. Any additional funding needs during that time would need to be negotiated between the Board and institutions. Based on the example set by successful models in other states, two strategies seem probable: (1) a cooperative funding model where institutions pay annual dues for specific goods and services or (2) a Board budget reallocation. A percentage of revenue from course sharing will only fund the administration of the course sharing marketplace, but not the other aspects of Idaho Online.

27. How will revenue be allocated from tuition for courses taken through Idaho Online?
   a. Most tuition revenue will go to the institutions. A small portion of the revenue will be used to cover the costs associated with course sharing administration, which will likely be done by a third-party vendor.

28. Will consistent tuition rates be established for programs through Idaho Online?
   a. Any decisions about tuition rates for courses listed with Idaho Online will be made through consultation by the Board and institutional leadership.

29. Is there a financial commitment expected from each institution to Idaho Online?
   a. Initial institutional investment will most likely come in the form of staff reallocation around the implementation and management of Idaho Online. If additional staff or resources are needed, a cooperative funding model could be explored.

Research and Evaluation

30. How will the success of Idaho Online be evaluated?
   a. The efficacy of the new resources and services provided by in-kind Idaho Online will be evaluated by observing changes in student/institution cost, student outcomes, faculty/student use, and stakeholder perception under the Cost, Outcome, Use, Perception (COUP) Framework. Evaluation will start early and be supported by federated staff, research fellows, and any relevant stakeholders who are interested in contributing to Idaho Online’s research community.
# Idaho Online Implementation Roadmap

**PROJECT TITLE** | Idaho Online  
**ORGANIZATION** | Idaho State Board of Education  
**PROJECT MANAGER** | Jonathan Lashley  
**DATE** | 8/3/2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #</th>
<th>TASK TITLE</th>
<th>START DATE</th>
<th>DUE DATE</th>
<th>DURATION (DAYS)</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.a.</td>
<td>Draft Idaho Online Steering Committee</td>
<td>8/3/20</td>
<td>8/6/20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.b.</td>
<td>Draft initial roadmap</td>
<td>8/3/20</td>
<td>8/6/20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.c.</td>
<td>Launch Idaho Online Steering Committee</td>
<td>8/6/20</td>
<td>8/14/20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>DONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.d.</td>
<td>Circulate draft roadmap for feedback</td>
<td>8/6/20</td>
<td>8/14/20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>DONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.e.</td>
<td>Draft initial vision, mission, and goals</td>
<td>8/6/20</td>
<td>8/21/20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>IN PROGRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.f.</td>
<td>Propose formation of Digital Learning Council</td>
<td>8/7/20</td>
<td>8/21/20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>IN PROGRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.g.</td>
<td>Schedule Steering Committee meeting(s)</td>
<td>8/10/20</td>
<td>8/21/20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>IN PROGRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.h.</td>
<td>Solicit Digital Learning Council nominations</td>
<td>8/12/20</td>
<td>9/14/20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>IN PROGRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.i.</td>
<td>Launch Digital Learning Council</td>
<td>8/24/20</td>
<td>9/4/20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.j.</td>
<td>Launch Online Course Sharing community</td>
<td>9/5/20</td>
<td>9/15/20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.k.</td>
<td>Launch Digital Pedagogy community</td>
<td>9/5/20</td>
<td>9/15/20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.l.</td>
<td>Launch NGDLE community</td>
<td>9/5/20</td>
<td>9/15/20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.m.</td>
<td>Merge OPAL and ID Open Communities</td>
<td>9/18/20</td>
<td>9/25/20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.n.</td>
<td>Develop Business Plan</td>
<td>10/8/20</td>
<td>11/27/20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.a.</td>
<td>Draft federated staffing strategy</td>
<td>8/3/20</td>
<td>8/21/20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>DONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.b.</td>
<td>Solicit feedback on federated staffing strategy</td>
<td>8/7/20</td>
<td>8/24/20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>IN PROGRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.c.</td>
<td>Finalize federated staffing strategy</td>
<td>8/10/20</td>
<td>8/28/20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>IN PROGRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.d.</td>
<td>Develop NGDLE Manager role and responsibilities</td>
<td>8/10/20</td>
<td>8/28/20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>IN PROGRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.e.</td>
<td>Develop Course Sharing Manager role and responsibilities</td>
<td>8/10/20</td>
<td>8/28/20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>IN PROGRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.f.</td>
<td>Develop Digital Pedagogy Manager role and responsibilities</td>
<td>8/10/20</td>
<td>8/28/20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>IN PROGRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.g.</td>
<td>Inventory additional federated staffing needs</td>
<td>8/10/20</td>
<td>8/28/20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>IN PROGRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.h.</td>
<td>Develop MOUs related to federated staffing</td>
<td>8/17/20</td>
<td>8/28/20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.i.</td>
<td>Recruit nominations/applicants</td>
<td>8/27/20</td>
<td>9/14/20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.j.</td>
<td>Appoint federated staff</td>
<td>9/4/20</td>
<td>9/11/20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.a.</td>
<td>Inventory student and faculty needs</td>
<td>8/3/20</td>
<td>8/17/20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>DONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.b.</td>
<td>Prioritize and finalize portfolio of tools and services</td>
<td>8/14/20</td>
<td>8/21/20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>IN PROGRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.c.</td>
<td>Procure common LMS</td>
<td>8/14/20</td>
<td>9/12/20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.d</td>
<td>Implement/integrate LMS at every institution</td>
<td>9/11/20</td>
<td>11/27/20</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.e</td>
<td>Procure the rest of the NGDLE portfolio</td>
<td>9/11/20</td>
<td>12/4/20</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.f</td>
<td>Implement/integrate the rest of the NGDLE portfolio</td>
<td>9/18/20</td>
<td>12/3/20</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.g</td>
<td>Launch knowledge base platform for NGDLE</td>
<td>10/8/20</td>
<td>12/18/20</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.a</td>
<td>Inventory priority classes for institutions</td>
<td>8/3/20</td>
<td>8/17/20</td>
<td>DONE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.b</td>
<td>Run priority classes/faculty through QA audit</td>
<td>9/3/20</td>
<td>10/3/20</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.c</td>
<td>Develop and launch public storefront</td>
<td>9/3/20</td>
<td>10/3/20</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.d</td>
<td>Implement course-sharing processes</td>
<td>9/3/20</td>
<td>10/3/20</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.e</td>
<td>(Re)Develop priority courses using NGDLE (if needed)</td>
<td>9/25/20</td>
<td>10/30/20</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.f</td>
<td>List approved SP21 courses for registration via Idaho Online</td>
<td>10/16/20</td>
<td>12/18/20</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.a</td>
<td>Acquire .edu domain</td>
<td>8/3/20</td>
<td>10/5/20</td>
<td>IN PROGRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.b</td>
<td>Launch Idaho Online Website</td>
<td>8/31/20</td>
<td>10/2/20</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.c</td>
<td>Solicit Idaho Online branding from students</td>
<td>8/31/20</td>
<td>9/21/20</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.d</td>
<td>Finalize brand</td>
<td>9/18/20</td>
<td>10/5/20</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.e</td>
<td>Develop brand/style guides</td>
<td>9/18/20</td>
<td>10/5/20</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.f</td>
<td>Launch project management and ticketing platform</td>
<td>8/31/20</td>
<td>9/4/20</td>
<td>IN PROGRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.g</td>
<td>Develop training/communication plan with the institutions</td>
<td>9/25/20</td>
<td>10/16/20</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.h</td>
<td>Publish Idaho Online information to appropriate institution pages</td>
<td>10/19/20</td>
<td>11/2/20</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.a</td>
<td>Relevant OSBE staff participate in IELOL Global</td>
<td>9/21/20</td>
<td>12/18/20</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.b</td>
<td>Develop strategic plan through year three (and beyond)</td>
<td>9/21/20</td>
<td>12/18/20</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.c</td>
<td>Develop research questions with Idaho Online Research Fellows</td>
<td>12/2/20</td>
<td>12/21/20</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.d</td>
<td>Inventory current QA processes of institutions</td>
<td>8/3/20</td>
<td>8/18/20</td>
<td>IN PROGRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.e</td>
<td>Develop consolidated QA processes for course/faculty audits</td>
<td>8/14/20</td>
<td>9/3/20</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.f</td>
<td>Inventory market research and job data needs of institutions</td>
<td>8/3/20</td>
<td>9/10/20</td>
<td>IN PROGRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.g</td>
<td>Secure statewide education/workforce data partner</td>
<td>9/1/20</td>
<td>9/12/20</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.a</td>
<td>Develop Idaho Online Research Fellowship scope</td>
<td>8/31/20</td>
<td>9/21/20</td>
<td>IN PROGRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.b</td>
<td>Develop Idaho Online Pedagogy Fellowship scope</td>
<td>8/31/20</td>
<td>9/21/20</td>
<td>IN PROGRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.c</td>
<td>Determine budget for Idaho Online fellowships</td>
<td>9/1/20</td>
<td>9/25/20</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.d</td>
<td>Recruit Idaho Online fellows (graduate students and faculty)</td>
<td>9/28/20</td>
<td>11/2/20</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.e</td>
<td>Develop Idaho Online professional internships</td>
<td>12/31/20</td>
<td>9/21/20</td>
<td>IN PROGRESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.f</td>
<td>Determine budget for Idaho Online professional internships</td>
<td>9/21/20</td>
<td>9/25/20</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.g</td>
<td>Recruit Idaho Online interns (undergraduate students)</td>
<td>9/28/20</td>
<td>11/2/20</td>
<td>TO DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>