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

Approval of Minutes (vote):

- Minutes of the 2020-21 Meeting #25 – Attach. #1
  The minutes of the 2020-21 Meeting #25 were approved as distributed.

Chair’s Report:

- Next week we will discuss the emergency change to admissions standards for fall 2022. A report from SEM has been emailed to all Senators today. Feedback from the Admissions Committee will follow tomorrow.

- We are working on another emergency action due to COVID. This emergency action increases the number of allowed withdrawal credits by 12, from 21 to 33. We will be asking you for your feedback on this potential emergency action next week as well. We may begin this discussion today if there is time during the new business section of the meeting.

- Work continues with the Faculty Statement of Values, which we hope to conclude by the end of the semester. Additionally, we continue our work on the Affinity Group Policy.

- Reminders:
  - Nominations for Honorary degrees for the December 2021 commencement are due April 15, 2021.
  - The names of new faculty senators should be submitted to the Faculty Secretary by Tuesday, April 20. New senators will have their first meeting on Tuesday, April 27. The 2021-2022 Senate will meet for the first time at 4:30pm on Tuesday, April 27 to take nominations for chair and vice-chair.

Please help us spread the word about upcoming deadlines by sharing with your colleagues.

There were no questions for the Chair.

Provost’s Report:

- COVID update: We are back to surveillance testing. Of 667 tests done last week, 3.15% were positive. Currently we have three students in UI supported isolation and nine in UI supported quarantine. The situation in Pullman is concerning. Three counties in Washington state have been downgraded from level 3 to level 2 – that is, more restrictions are in place. There will be no changes to our COVID-19 protocol during Spring semester. We are focused on getting through
commencement and we’ll continue to wear masks and maintain distance. It is not yet time to let our guards down.

• Update on legislature: The House defeated the Higher Education Bill. It will return to the Joint Finance-Appropriations Committee (JFAC). They hope to conclude by Friday. We are concerned about our budget and higher education in general. As private individuals, we can reach out to our representatives, keeping in mind that there is a difference between being a UI employee or a private citizen.

• P3 funds for proposals, as suggested by Vice Chair Meeuf last week: At the end of the week, RFP should go out. The process will be modeled after “VIP” from last year, but on a quicker timeline so that decisions are made before the summer. People will have two or three weeks to submit short proposals, which will be evaluated and ranked by an appropriate committee – the Provost will suggest UBFC for this task. Thanks to Vice Chair Meeuf for this idea, which President Green is very excited about.

• Registration is open for summer. At this time, the numbers seem to have gone up. Fall registration opened yesterday for seniors. Retention is an important part of our enrollment, so please encourage students in your unit to meet with their advisor, register, and make plans to return.

• Vandal Giving Day (actually two days, last week) was a success. We raised a record $669K in donations. Also, the number of people who participated went up this year. It is great news that people are excited about all that we are doing.

• The Women Cross Country Team has the highest GPA – 3.87 as a team – of any cross country team in the nation!

Discussion:
A Senator commented on the importance of including staff in the group that can submit P3-funded proposals. Provost Lawrence said that proposals can be submitted by staff, faculty, and students, and by groups including all three categories.

Committee Reports:
• UAAC 1640.90 University Assessment and Accreditation Committee – Russ Meeuf, Attach. #2. Vice Chair Meeuf gave a brief history of the project, driven by Dean Panttaja. Instead of various ad hoc committees dealing with assessment and accreditation, they recommend a single committee to advise on assessment and accreditation issues. The proposed policy can be found in attachment #2.

Discussion:
A Senator had positive words for the creation of the new committee, which is in line with the U of I Constitution, Article IV Section 2. He suggests that the committee chair be a tenured faculty member rather than “preferably a tenured faculty member,” as stated in the policy draft. Vice Chair Meeuf responded that the language is consistent with what is generally done across FSH 1640. The current terminology gives the Committee on Committees more flexibility. However, they prioritize seniority and experience when deciding on committee leadership. The Senator was satisfied with the response, and did not wish to make a motion to amend.

A Senator asked whether clinical faculty, who cannot be tenured, are excluded from the new committee. Vice Chair Meeuf noted that the preference for tenured status only applies to the chair – any faculty can be on the committee.
Vote: The motion was approved with 95% of the votes.

Other Announcements and Communications:

- Updates from ASUI – Lauren Carlsen, Dylanie Frazier.
  Lauren Carlsen said that the main ASUI concern during the past year has been to aid students during the pandemic and keep people engaged in a safe way. They plan to provide support for students during finals week in a variety of ways. Students are interested in and concerned about the current events with the legislature – ASUI is considering ways to come together with students from other institutions across the state in support of higher education. ASUI has also been active in civic engagement (e.g., helping at voting polls locations). They are working to make the Student Union a more vibrant space. They have talked to Senate about the importance of timely grading. ASUI now looks forward to the future and to helping students transition to a more normal status. She would like to see more civic engagement next year.

Discussion:
A Senator thanked Lauren Carlsen for the nice overview and posed a question: President Green has pointed out that out-of-state applications went up whereas in-state ones went down. Any suggestions from ASUI on how to recruit in-state? Lauren Carlsen responded that ASUI is talking about this. They plan to get more involved with reaching out to prospective students and let them know about our programs. They also would like to start visiting high-school classrooms to talk about programs, extracurriculars, and what life is like for a current student. Lauren Carlsen emphasized the importance of legislative support for higher education, as more students are likely to apply from regions where higher education is valued.

The conversation moved to VandalStar. On March 3, 2021, ASUI passed a resolution in support of VandalStar. They find VandalStar to be a great resource on campus that benefits the students. Students are sometime frustrated by the presence of too many platforms (Vandalweb, BbLearn, etc.), and therefore they appreciate that VandalStar consolidates many features in a more modern way. It helps students get in touch with different people, in addition to academic advisors, such as career advisors.

Dylanie Frazier gave a short presentation on VandalStar. She emphasized: connection (it is easier to connect with professors, tutors, and others); retention (VandalStar helps students excel in their classes and graduate); and the ability to provide feedback and communicate concerns. ASUI finds this tool especially important for first-generation students and new students. It is becoming more popular – there has been an increase by 136% in appointments scheduled through VandalStar. It has been an essential tool during the pandemic – streamlining the early-warning grades process, COVID holds, and tutoring services.

- Vice Chair Meeuf said that more detailed information on absolute numbers rather than percentages would be useful. His experience has been rather different, as only 10-15% of his students were active with VandalStar. How many students actually use it? What do they use it for? It seems like a lot of money every year for a scheduling tool. Dylanie Frazier responded that they will be happy to share more information. Details shared to Faculty Senate about the # of
students using VandalStar were shared by Lisa Ormond. Every student has a VandalStar account. The software does not have a way to "track" student usage directly. We can gauge engagement/interactions through meetings. Also, the 'Raise Your Hand' feature is a proactive way a student can ask for help from the U of I community virtually. In addition, students use the Directory Listing to find services on campus that highlights over 50 services and programs. Unfortunately, there isn't Google analytics for these searches but they are happening. Students also receive alert flags when an academic concern is raised about a student in addition to receiving an email. VandalStar does an impactful job in also informing students when there is something they need to do --like resolve bills, advisor holds, get documentation to financial aid so they can get a package, etc. For all alert flags, students receive email notifications. These are ways indirectly that students are "using" and interacting with the system that help them.

Lisa Ormond, VandalStar coordinator, joined the conversation. She said that VandalStar is used extensively in a variety of ways, for instance to connect with resources such as tutoring services, which specifically use VandalStar, or to sign up for service workshops. It is not used just for scheduling one-on-one meetings. For instance, when an adviser wishes to raise a concern with a student or send a praise, or the institution needs to reach a student, the notification appears on their dashboard and also automatically on the student’s email.

Chair Kirchmeier reiterated that a fact sheet would be helpful to address concerns from faculty. She asked for a brief summary of the ASUI Resolution. Dylanie Frazier summarized the spirit of the Resolution: ASUI is committed to supporting and continuing to use VandalStar; to encourage other students to use it; to educate themselves and others about the tool and its benefits; to talk about VandalStar in a positive way; and to bring any concerns forward to committees.

A Senator inquired whether VandalStar would absorb some of the costs we have now with other platforms, should we adopt it permanently. Lisa Ormond responded that they are part of the SEM division, which falls within the Provost area. The contract was renewed last July and is in place for another three plus four years. Provost Lawrence said that multiyear contracts for software are typical because they offer better pricing. Going back to the Senator’s question: VandalStar is funded through the Provost office and the SEM budget. It does not duplicate other platforms, such as Banner or Blackboard. The interest in VandalStar was to address a specific need. Lisa added that VandalStar is the only platform capable of holistically integrating the university as a community. It makes us aware of students’ needs so we can provide timely services. It builds a sense of community that students feel and appreciate. A unique feature of VandalStar is that we can see if a student is struggling, and how other instructors are supporting them. The Senator thanked the ASUI representatives. Information in terms of numbers, not percentages, will be insightful.

If we move to Canvas, which seems to be more efficient, would these features be available? The answer to the question is not clear at this time. A question was also asked from the floor that if we ‘pulled the plug’ on VandalStar, what would be the loss or impact? The answer to this question is not clear at this time and could not be directly answered in this setting. Depending on what is wanted or needed by the Faculty Senate, more information could be shared.
Vice Chair Meeuf said that colleagues often ask about the effectiveness of VandalStar. Has it actually increased the retention rate during the four years we had it? If so, in what areas? More data will be provided for Faculty Senate Leadership to share with Senate.

Before closing the conversation with ASUI, Provost Lawrence acknowledged outgoing president Lauren Carlsen for her amazing job. In his 23 years at the U of I, he never met a more active and proactive ASUI president. On behalf of Senate, Chair Kirchmeier thanked Lauren Carlsen for her great leadership.

- Updates from Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives – Dean Panttaja
  Dean Panttaja will present updates related to his roles as Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives and as Director of General Education. The actions and initiatives he will present are regrouped in four areas, which will be addressed and discussed one by one:
  o Assessment and Accreditation (First Area)
    - NWCCU Standard 2 Report Annual Program Review (known as Anthology).
    - Annual Program Review.
    - Faculty Led Assessment.
    - University Assessment & Accreditation Committee.
  Presentation and Discussion on the first area:
  Standard 2 is about procedures, regulations, and financial issues. The report was submitted March 1 and has been accepted. It is a large report, to which the different areas contributed their part. The Standard 1 report will be prepared during the summer and through February, when it is due. It is all about student accomplishments. We will do a large-scale, campus-wide pilot for the Annual Program Review (APR), formerly the External Program Review. The former system did not work well with Banner and did not address the 2020 standards under which we will be evaluated. A university-wide communication went out about three weeks ago, more details will come soon. APR is tied to the new module proposed three years ago, now known as Anthology. Faculty Led Assessment (FLA) is part of it – it uses a module in Anthology and can be tied to BbLearn. Our accreditors want to see FLA and the State Board is supportive of faculty engagement in course assessment. The ideal process is to have each instructor select one course per semester and one assignment from that course, and report on whether students met, partially met, or did not meet expectations. We will generate that data working with the CETL Team, which will then become part of the evaluation process. The UAAC just approved by Senate engages faculty in the accreditation process, and thus it will be seen positively.

  There was a comment about FLA. A Senator reported that many of his constituents are not aware that FLA, and not just program-level assessment, is required. He suggests to send a communication to all deans about NWCCU requirements, particularly FLA. His constituents are opposed to FLA, unless it is required (because it creates more work). Dean Panttaja will extract that information and send it to FSL to share with the Senators and, in turn, with their constituents.
Vice Chair Meeuf asked for clarification about course-level assessment for instructors who use BbLearn: when we export data out to Anthology, can we establish our parameters for how a percentage grade translates into the learning outcome language of “meet, does not meet, etc....”? Can we grade our assignments as usual and have the data automatically exported, rather than telling each student which assessment corresponds to their grade? The latter would be very cumbersome for instructors teaching large sections. Dean Panttaja replied that instructors can set the parameters. When a grade is entered in BbLearn, a box opens up with the assessment choices, which uploads automatically to Anthology. If one doesn’t use Blackboard or Canvas, it would be a manual entry. Help will be available to make the transition as seamless as possible, whether we use Blackboard or move to Canvas. The Department of Education is trying to capture and store data on what faculty are doing. They would like to see granular data to identify equity gaps (such as for first-generation students or underrepresented groups).

- General Education (Second Area)
  - American Diversity and International Courses
  - GEM Award Nominees
  - GEM Summit (October 2020 and 2021)

Presentation and discussion on the second area:
Recently UCGE revised American Diversity and International Courses competency. They are currently reviewing syllabi to help faculty meet the new expectations for American Diversity and International Courses, which are more robust than the previous ones. In General Education, we nominated six faculty members to represent our institution for the GEM Education Award. There are six representatives for each institution. Although they are all winners, we will select one for each of the GEM areas to be recognized. Barb Kirchmeier was recognized last year. We had a successful summit in October, all face-to-face but with a different format due to COVID. We have six representatives at the statewide general education committee, mostly UCGE members. We first had individual discussions within each GEM area, addressing in depth topics of concern for that area, before meeting as a full body. It was more efficient this way, as each area could dig down into their specific concerns before meeting as a group. For next October, we are considering the virtual option, which may facilitate attendance. There were no questions on this part.

- Board Policy and Initiatives (Third Area)
  - Online Idaho
  - III.Q. – Admission Standards.
  - Program Approval Process & 3 Year Plan.

Presentation and discussion on the third area:
Online Idaho is in a testing phase. We are next after LCSC, which is tested and ready to go. We should be ready in June. We will put all of our courses that have online sections on this platform. Course-sharing program launches June 1. III.U. is a policy (target date: June 2022) that will require an affordability plan, including course marking to indicate
the costs. III.Q. will come on very fast. To allow students better access after the pandemic, there will be a minimum required GPA of 2.0, together with a passed ISAT. This is just a minimum for the state – institutions can set higher standards. There was a question about the ISAT passing score. Dean Panttaja will find out and convey the information.

- Further Paths (Fourth Area)
  - Re-establish a first-year experience.
  - NWCCU Standard 1 Report and Accreditation Visit (April 4-6, 2022).

Presentation and Discussion on the fourth area:
When we moved away from ISEM, we attempted to look at different possibilities for first-year experience. We are working with UCGE and faculty to find a first-year experience that can help with student success. Interested faculty are encouraged to get engaged. The Standard 1 report will be the first task of the newly approved UAAC, to identify who needs to be involved. Accreditors will meet with deans and administrators, but they really want to meet with faculty. Dean Panttaja plans a “walking tour” to give a presentation on what assessment and accreditation is about, so that we can be ready for the April 2022 visit. They want us to sponsor our own General Education Symposium and develop training modules. Finally, Dean Panttaja suggested to consider simplifying our curriculum approval process. It is difficult to meet the deadlines of a few UFM per year. If curriculum changes amount to changing a title or description, does this request need to go all the way to UFM? Perhaps the process can be streamlined.

There were no more questions for Dean Panttaja. Chair Kirchmeier thanked Dean Panttaja for his visit and transparent presentation. She also encouraged the Senators to send any items they may wish to see addressed at future meetings.

Adjournment:
The agenda being completed, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:57pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

• Attach. #1 Minutes of the 2020-2021 Faculty Senate Meeting #25 April 6, 2021
• Attach. #2 UAAC 1640.90 University Assessment and Accreditation Committee
2020 – 2021 Faculty Senate – Pending Approval
Meeting # 25
Tuesday, April 6, 2021, 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm
Zoom only

Present: Attinger, Brantz, Bridges, Carter, Carney, Chapman, Dezzani, Fairley, Hickman, Keim, Kirchmeier (Chair), Torrey Lawrence (w/o vote), Lee-Painter, McIntosh, McKellar, Meeuf (Vice-Chair), Paul, Quinnett, Raja, Rinker, Rose, Sammarruca (w/o vote), Schwarzlaender, A. Smith, R. Smith, Tibbals, Tenuto
Absent: Wargo (excused), Ahmadzadeh (excused), Rashed (excused)

Guest Presenters: Scott Green, Chris Nomura

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

Approval of Minutes (vote):
• Minutes of the 2020-21 Meeting #24 – Attach. #1
  The minutes of the 2020-21 Meeting #24 were approved as distributed.

Chair’s Report:
• Work on the Faculty Statement of Values and the emergency change in admission standards for fall 2022 continues. When we have additional information about these projects, we will share it with you.
• Updates on visits to Faculty Senate: Next week we will talk with ASUI President Lauren Carlsen to get updates on ASUI projects. If anyone has questions about ASUI, please email them to me.
• Today is Vandal Giving Day. Consider participating in this fundraising event by visiting this webpage: https://vandalsgive.uidaho.edu/giving-day/31531
• Reminders:
  o Nominations for Honorary degrees for the December 2021 commencement are due April 15, 2021.
  o The names of new faculty senators should be submitted to the Faculty Secretary by Tuesday, April 20. New senators will have their first meeting on Tuesday, April 27. Please help us spread the word about upcoming deadlines by sharing with your colleagues.

Provost’s Report:
• COVID testing: Of 1,031 tests completed last week, 1.16% were positive. A total of 5,001 midsemester tests were completed, 0.52% with positive results. In Latah county, the vaccine is available for anyone older than 16. Note that this is different from state to state. We are of course concerned about our neighbors in Whitman County.
• COVID vaccine: We encourage everyone to get vaccinated. The process is working very well at the Student Health Center. Please visit https://gritman.org/coronavirus/#anchor-c19v
  The link for the recent Town Hall about the vaccine is https://www.uidaho.edu/vandal-health-clinic/coronavirus/vaccine

There were no questions or comments for the Provost.
Committee Reports:

- University Curriculum Committee
  - UCC-21-037 M.S. in Groundwater Hydrology – Jerry Fairley, Attach. #2
    
    Jerry Fairley provided some background on this proposal, on which the department has been working for some time. Idaho depends on groundwater, which is a limited resource. It is therefore important to have professionals trained to deal with groundwater, and the department wishes to offer this program, through which students can become professional groundwater hydrologists. Being a groundwater hydrologist entails being a registered geologist or a registered professional engineer. The program is highly focused and disciplinary, and does not conflict with any existing programs in water resources or environmental science.

    There were no questions or comments.
    
    **Vote:** The motion was approved unanimously.

Other Announcements and Communications:

- P3 Funds – Scott Green, Attach. #3
  
  President Green said that he will give a short introduction and then welcomed feedback. The original intent was to invest P3 funds with the Foundation, but too many conflicts were identified that could put either the new entity or the Foundation at risk. Instead, the funds will be invested through a third party – Kent Nelson and the Office of General Counsel are finalizing the details. We received over $185M to invest in our university. After obtaining the necessary approvals, the intent is to take $6M per year for strategic initiatives. Based on our understanding of return on investment – this is actually a very conservative amount, given the principal. Our priorities are to invest in UG student success through distant education and scholarships; in graduate student success, through scholarships and research – in line with the recommendations of the R1 Working Group; and recruiting through “telling our story.” It is important to keep in mind that investments need to generate revenue for the model to work. President Green made a $3M commitment to research and a $1M commitment to the Provost Office for online excellence. Scott Green proceeded to itemize the priorities for the remaining funds. (More details can be found in Attach. #3.)
    
    - Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM): $925,000 including $5K scholarships to help students who may go to a 2-year community college or a university closer to home because they cannot afford to come to U of I. $5K can make up the difference in most cases. Also, President Green is working with Yolanda Bisbee and Dean Kahler to increase the amount of scholarships for Native American students, hoping to recruit more by closing the $5K gap that may prevent them from attending U of I – it’s called “Vandal Generations.”
    
    - The $1M for online excellence are the funds requested by the Online Working Group to implement their recommendations.
    
    - The Lionel Hampton School of Music has never captured data for the high-school students who come to the Jazz Festival every year. We will invest $200K annually to bring thousands of high-school students to the Jazz Festival. We will gather their data to keep in touch and engage with them as potential future students. The success of this
investment will be measured by the number of students who have actually enrolled at U of I through this outreach.

- The Office of Diversity and Inclusion: $50K will go to partially fund a recruiter for underrepresented groups, primarily within the Black student population. We are working on resolving an issue with funding the other half of the position with student fees, as originally planned – if that is not possible, it will be funded through the President’s Office.
- $75K will go to Student Affairs for the Raven Scholars Program, which is funded by donations and is currently in need of help.
- Research: $3 million for priorities that are aligned with the recommendations of the R1 Working Group.
- University Communication and Marketing (UMC), enrollment, branding. For the last couple of years, President Green has been raising money for a one-time funding for UMC. It used to be that most of the money went to pay people, but that has changed dramatically due to these fund-raising efforts and the presence of Teresa Koeppel in UMC. Since last year, we have been extremely successful at targeting particular areas, such as California – we are a great value for Californians, and their system is not able to handle all the students they have. The WUE program has been very successful as well – WUE applications went up by 37%. $600K will go mainly to digital marketing.
- SEM in rural Idaho: $50,000 for Enroll Idaho. The program to visit high schools in the rural regions was put on hold this year, while the previous year the team visited about 15 high schools. The purpose is to raise our profile and tell students that higher education makes one “healthier, wealthier, and wiser.”
- Strategic initiatives: $100k About a year ago, together with John Wiencek, President Green decided to invest in some research on our underrepresented population history. Some interesting facts have come out, which can help in a variety of ways.
- Lack of signage is a problem. Some of our Extension Offices do not have any signs that indicates they are part of U of I.

Discussion:
Vice Chair Meeuf expressed appreciation for the list of priorities presented by President Green. He asked whether a relatively small sum could be set aside for innovative ideas that faculty may come up with in the future, such as recruiting events. Perhaps there could be a pool of about $50K that people can apply for to get something off the ground. President Green loved the idea and will act on it.

A Senator addressed the 2% budget cuts that all colleges will face, which will be very painful. Why can’t we use some of the P3 funds to cover those cuts? President Green responded that he fully understands the frustration about the new cuts and hopes this is the last one. But using P3 money towards helping colleges absorb the cuts does not generate revenue. The Senator had another questions: is there a downside of implementing the current P3 plans? The deal almost sounds “too good to be true.” President Green responded that there could be problems, of course, if we mismanage large amounts of money, but the plans are very solid and conservative. Vice President Foisy joined the conversation and confirmed that the projections that have been made are extremely conservative. They are in a 50-year partnership with a world-class vendor
that operates on a global scale. Our analysis assumes that we will not realize a single dollar of savings by bringing in this world-class utility operator, or from the improved efficiency due to nearly $200M in improvements over 50 years. Both these assumptions are “ridiculously conservative.” We have created incentives within the concession agreement that allow us to share the savings; and of course we know that $200M in improvements of an aging facility will result in improved efficiency. With regard to the upfront proceeds of $190M, we work with investment advisers to balance risk-and-return objectives. We developed an investment policy to make sure we can be more aggressive in the earlier years and more conservatives in later years, as the concession agreement comes to an end. As we select specific asset classes for investment, our advisers are providing us with projected return over the life of the investment. We can earn less than the average and still meet the $6M per year target. The model has been built such that, if we realize our assumptions, the university stands to earn $300M excess cash over 50 years. If we exceeded our projections, that figure could be as much as $1.1 billion. So, we are in good shape. Of course – President Green added – we could end up with a bad concessionaire, but there are safeguards for such an event as well. We can always buy ourselves out of the lease with the principal that is invested. We are getting a lot of attention from other universities for having succeeded in taking a non-strategic asset, monetizing it, and using the proceeds for the central mission of the university. Brian Foisy provided an example of the safeguards that are in place. We can request to replace the operator, if they fail to meet expectations. The university retains significant control over the entire project – we have a P3 contract liaison whose only job is to monitor how the project is going on a daily basis.

A Senator asked whether recruiting out of state (such as in California) or through the WUE program can actually be harmful to a college/department, based on his understanding of the metrics – messages are confusing for the faculty. President Green acknowledged that our main mission as a land-grant institution is to educate Idaho students, and we are not moving away from that. At this time, we are doing well with WUE (which charges in-state tuition + 50%). It is a fertile market for us, with 37% more out-of-state applications with little money and effort, whereas the same effort and money spent last year for just in-state recruiting made nearly no difference. But it is important that the fraction of in-state students, 72%, does not decline materially. The Senator recalled a previous analysis, from about ten years ago, the outcome of which suggested that joining WUE was a disadvantage for us. Scott Green and Brian Foisy responded that, at the time of that analysis, enrollment was much higher, and the preference was to have fewer students who pay higher tuition. Thus, the analysis focused on revenue per student, whereas our goal today is to maximize gross revenue, which favors more students paying lower tuition.

The discussion moved to the funds for the recruiter in the Office of Diversity and Inclusion – a Senator said it seems like a very small amount. Scott Green noted that those funds will cover one-half of the salary. The entire budget for the operation is $160K, to target primarily Black and Native American students and increase enrollment in those cohorts. The more students we can recruit, the more revenue we can invest in Diversity and Inclusion programs. President Green also noted that our CAMP grant was renewed.
A Senator expressed concerns, on behalf of many COS faculty, about the absence of Elsevier publications in the library, which is a serious problem and is impacting proposal writing and submission. Funding the library is essential to engage in healthy research. The inter-library loan system is slow or insufficient. President Green responded that the inter-library loan system has been impacted by COVID. On the other hand, the UI approach is to provide faculty with any publication they need, whether through loans or by purchasing the item, which is cheaper than keeping an expensive subscription. He is only aware of a few complaints which we could trace to the inter-library loan program not working well during the pandemic. Provost Lawrence suggested to have a conversation with Dean Ben Hunter. A Senator added that inviting Ben Hunter back to Senate would be a great idea – Dean Hunter would be happy to come again.

There were no more questions for President Green. Senators were encouraged to send unanswered or additional questions to President Green.

- Office of Research and Economic Development – Chris Nomura

Chair Kirchmeier introduced and welcomed Chris Nomura, new Vice President for Research and Economic Development. Chris Nomura will give a brief review of ORED updates and then take questions. He started with mentioning a series of discussions with Research Council about the value of community service within research, and how we look at it in the various colleges, as research culture can be very discipline dependent. The goal of these discussions is to start speaking a more unified language about the research we do so we can better understand all the contributions people make across the university. Community service and engagement is crucial for a land-grant institution. Research Council members will contact their respective colleges to continue and extend these important discussions.

Chris Nomura started a brief slide presentation with information about the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP). He emphasized the importance of timely submission of proposals for OSP review, which is four business days prior to the deadline for submission to the sponsoring agency. Faculty and staff compliance reduces the probability of technical errors thus enhancing the likelihood that the proposal is successful. Please contact preaward@uidaho.edu or Sarah Martonik at smartonick@uidaho.edu for questions and assistance with proposal submissions. The second slide contained information about Technology Transfer Service Portal, which is a tool to track technology transfer services and agreements, as well as to disclose an invention or copyright, and follow agreements with industry partners.

The presentation moved to the P3R1 program – an annual investment of $3M. The goal is to increase research productivity and the number of doctoral degrees awarded. Approximately $1M will be invested in doctoral research assistantships and $2M in postdoctoral fellowships, through: matching competitive externally funded grants; matching new, externally funded endowed fellowships raised through advancement; and strategic initiatives. The grant matching program and other investments are advised by the P3R1 committee, consisting of: the Vice President for Research and Economic Development, the Assistant Vice Provost for Research, and the Deans of COGS, CALS, CNR, COE, CLASS, CEHHS, and COS. Following a request from the PI,
matches are made for new awards that meet key criteria. To jumpstart the program, ORED asked deans for a list of faculty who got awards in 2020 that would otherwise qualify for the program. Together with the first new awards, these grants will form the initial cohort of awards to date. (The list of PIs was displayed.)

Chris Nomura then presented the “Resubmission Success” initiative, where $200K of institutional funds will be invested annually to assist faculty who received mostly favorable reviews but were not funded. These are cases where no fatal flows were found in the proposal, but the proposal is lacking in some smaller, specific areas. These funds can help the faculty address those flaws, perhaps by collecting preliminary data or visiting another lab or institution. Preference will be given to proposals requesting Ph.D. student and/or postdoctoral scholar support and charging the full F&A rate.

Discussion:
A Senator commended the ORED initiatives, and noted that the “four business-day rule” is very generous and should be strictly enforced. Chris Nomura appreciated the comment and confirmed that a “14-day rule” is more common in other institutions.

Vice Chair Meeuf asked how the path to R1 status reconciles with recent cuts and other problems faculty are experiencing, such as enhanced teaching load. How can we create a sustainable research culture? Chris Nomura responded that the march to R1 status is worthy in itself. We are the flagship university in the state and heavily engaged in research, with $100M expenditures per year. Despite the shortfalls, we are making pointed investments in research. Of course, we need to address the financial issues of the institution, but without losing site of our research role. We may not acquire R1 status in the very near future, but working towards that goal is almost an obligation for us. Scott Green commented on the unbelievable progress we have been able to make. Provost Lawrence added that what happened in the past couple of years has been painful but at the same time miraculous. We turned around our financial position, thanks to Scott Green’s leadership, and during a pandemic! We need to be patient, stay on track, and stay focused on the investments.

The Secretary asked about a realistic timeline for reaching R1. Chris Nomura replied that it depends on us as a community. From the standpoint of research expenditures and the quality of our current research, we are already there, but we need to work on increasing the number of doctoral students and doctoral degrees.

The Secretary had another question: if a three-year federal grant expiring in 2021 is renewed for another three-year cycle, will it be considered a new award and thus be eligible for the grant-matching program? Chris Nomura replied that the renewal is indeed a new grant.

President Green made some concluding remarks: only 18 months ago, we were in a bad situation. The incredible progress since then was possible because for two years everybody worked hard and did more than we asked them to do. He is optimistic about our future.

Senators were encouraged to send unanswered or additional questions to Chris Nomura.
Adjournment:
The agenda being completed, the Chair meeting was adjourned the meeting at 5:00pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francesca Sammarruca
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate
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1. Policy/Procedure Statement: Briefly explain the reason for the proposed addition, revision, and/or deletion.

   The addition of this new FSH committee formalizes the work of two existing ad hoc committees into a single standing committee to advise on issues of assessment and accreditation.

2. Fiscal Impact: What fiscal impact, if any, will this addition, revision, or deletion have?

   None.

3. Related Policies/Procedures: Describe other UI policies or procedures related or similar to this proposed change, or that will be impacted by it.

   Per FSH 1520.IV.11, this new committee will be maintained by Faculty Senate and its members appointed by Faculty Senate via the Committee on Committees (FSH 1640.28).

4. Effective Date: This policy shall be effective on July 1, or January 1, whichever arrives first after final approval (see FSH 1460 D) unless otherwise specified in the policy.

   Effective July 1, 2021.
A. FUNCTION

A-1. Facilitate communication on the development and implementation of the program review process, student learning outcomes assessment, and university-wide student achievement and satisfaction surveys in respective departments and colleges. The UAAC will support the development of assessment activities that assess university-wide student learning outcomes to ensure a quality education and co-curricular experience, continuous program improvement, and compliance with accreditation standards.

A-2. Facilitate communication between Institutional Assessment and Accreditation (IAA) and faculty.

A-3. Develop and implement program and learning outcomes assessment guidelines based on SBOE and NWCCU expectations.

A-4. Recognize those who are actively engaged in assessment work.

A-5. Review and comment on results from university-wide assessment plans and individual program assessment plans and processes and recommend ways for improvement.

A-6. Provide input and feedback on the online UI student learning outcomes reporting system as requested.

A-7. Serve as subject matter experts from colleges and units on student learning outcomes assessment and continuous program improvement.

A-8. Review Annual Program Reviews (APR) and specialized accreditation reports and assist with feedback to programs and the Provost’s Office.

A-9. Review NWCCU reports and recommendations and provide input or feedback.

A-10. Assist with special projects pertaining to accreditation or APRs, as appropriate.

A-11. Advise on matters related to ongoing collection of data and evidence for accreditation standards.

A-12. Maintain a timeline for accreditation reporting.

A-13. Advise IAA on accreditation issues, as requested.
B. STRUCTURE AND MEMBERSHIP. Eleven faculty representatives, comprising one from Library and one from each of the following colleges: Agricultural and Life Sciences; Art and Architecture; Business and Economics; Education, Health and Human Sciences; Engineering; Graduate Studies; Law; Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences; Natural Resources; and Science. The representative from the College of Graduate Studies shall be named by their Dean. Preference shall be given to faculty members with expertise and experience in assessment and accreditation, and a chair shall be chosen by the Committee on Committees from among the faculty representatives, preferably a tenured faculty member. The following positions shall serve on the committee as ex officio members (without vote): the Vice Provost of Academic Initiatives or designee, Associate Director of Assessment & Accreditation, a recorder from the office of Assessment & Accreditation, a representative from the office of Equity, Diversity & Inclusion, a representative from the Division of Student Affairs, and a representative from Strategic Enrollment management.