

**University of Idaho
2008-2009
FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA**

Meeting #8

**3:30 p.m.
Tuesday, October 21, 2008
BRINK HALL FACULTY LOUNGE**

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.

- Minutes of the 2008-09 Faculty Council Meeting #7, October 14, 2008

III. Chair's Report.

IV. Provost's Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.

- Criteria for Program Prioritization Process
- Budget and Background on PPP (Mues)

VI. Committee Reports.

University Curriculum Committee:

- **FC-09-008:** FSH 4260: Academic Calendar

Information Technology Committee:

- **FC-08-051:** Information Technology Committee Resolution (Robberecht)

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Karen Guilfoyle, Chair 2008-2009, Faculty Council

Attachments: Minutes of 2008-2009 FC Meeting #7, October 14, 2008
FC-09-008: FSH 4260 (distributed previously)
FC-08-051: ITC Resolution

University of Idaho
Faculty Council Meeting Minutes
2008-09 Meeting #7 Tuesday October 14, 2008

Present: Baird, Baker (w/o vote), Battaglia, Chandler, Crowley, Eveleth, Fairley, Frey, Fritz, Guilfoyle (chair), Holbrook, Hill (w/o vote), Huber, Limbaugh, Machlis, Miller, Murphy, Oman, Schmeckpeper, Schmiede, Sullivan, Williams, Wilson. Liaisons: Budwig (Boise), (Coeur d'Alene), Crepeau (Idaho Falls), **Absent:** Holthaus, Ripplinger, Newcombe. **Visitors:** 1.

A quorum being present, the chair, called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m. in the Brink Hall Faculty Lounge.

Minutes: It was moved and seconded (Wilson, Williams) to accept the minutes of the October 7 meeting (Meeting #6) of the 2008-2009 Faculty Council as distributed. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair's Report: The main focus of this meeting will be on the program prioritization process (PPP). VPR Jack McIver will also present the process re-engineering being conducted in the research office. If there is time, FC will move on to other business on the agenda.

Last week the faculty leadership met with the provost. There was agreement that communications and building trust through the PPP were priorities.

The chair asked FC members if faculty constituents were being made aware of the issues around the PPP. The chair added that higher education is going through changes and reading on the potential new directions for higher education prompted her thinking of what this means to the University of Idaho.

The chair then asked for suggestions from FC members to improve communications with faculty constituents and whether anyone had any opinion on the mind-set of the faculty as a whole with regard to the current deliberations on the PPP.

Discussions noted that many faculty are disengaged and demoralized and even mentally and emotionally tired after many years of budget cuts and similar past program review processes. It was suggested that disengagement may arise in cases such as recent decisions to eliminate extension positions. These decisions happened ahead of the PPP which does not seem to fit with the intention of the PPP. It was further noted that in the past, providing information to faculty (through various means) about issues from FC in some instances did not appear to elicit interest or feedback.

The chair suggested that sending out the draft minutes soon after FC meetings might be a way to connect in a timely manner with faculty.

Further discussion expressed the notion that disengagement may happen in some colleges that were directly referenced in the Morrill Act and thus faculty in those units believed they were unlikely to face program cuts. Likewise, disengagement may be from faculty in programs with few faculty and students who believe they face being cut.

Discussion of the current point of development of the PPP suggested that faculty likely become more interested in engagement when the process approaches the stage of cutting specific programs.

The chair was asked to clarify what feedback is expected from the faculty and how might FC members judge faculty engagement.

2008-09 Faculty Council Meeting #7 Minutes – October 14, 2008 – Page 2

The chair reiterated the need to engage faculty in the process and requested that the PPP criteria be circulated to faculty and comments relayed to the next FC meeting.

The discussion then turned to the issues of which data will be used to evaluate program performance. The issue of whether the process was more related to budgeting diminishing resources or to bring UI to a greater program focus and what proportion each of these contribute to driving the process was reiterated.

Provost's Report: The provost noted that the process was an extension of the Strategic Action Plan and prior processes and it was very important to consider the long-term view of the future shape of UI. He noted that UI had faced 30 years of declining resources from the state and nationally these trends would remain. The provost referenced President Daley-Laursen's vision announced in his fall address and noted that this laid out how UI would meet its teaching, research and outreach mission. He also noted that in the current economic climate it was even more important to focus upon how UI will best address its mission in a budget-limited environment.

The provost strongly encouraged FC members to be engaged and to engage their faculty constituencies. He noted that the Provost's Council had worked very hard to get the PPP to the present point. The provost circulated two documents, the overview of the nine program prioritization criteria and the criteria for a first pass Coarse Review to be done at department level not program level. He noted that there were about 180 programs over 50 departments and the initial review would identify tri-tiles (high, medium, low). The data would be national norms from sources such as the Delaware database.

Questions:

How will criteria be identified for performance-based disciplines (e.g. music)? The provost replied that for those departments, rather than number of publications, national norms of performance measures would be used.

Will each of the criteria cells in the Coarse Review be equally weighted? The provost noted that the criteria would be weighted relative to the goals of the particular department.

Departments that have a mix of programs doing well and poorly will perhaps rank lowly. How does this get factored into the analysis? The provost acknowledged that this point was discussed by Provost's Council. The deans recognize that there will be a need to go back and use judgment in looking for false positive and false negative evaluations.

The chair asked once the deans have worked through this process, would recommendations be ready to come to FC in two weeks? The provost noted that lower ranking departments would have the opportunity to respond to Provost's Council before recommendations are made and forwarded to FC.

The provost then moved on to discuss that the vision articulated by President Daley-Laursen was at a level that needs to be worked down through administrative strata. An objective of the Provost's Council was to work with the president's vision statement and add further detail and refinement.

A discussion ensued of the merits of using number of students in each major versus other student parameters such as number of graduates, and other measures of teaching impact. The consensus was that the number of majors is difficult to estimate accurately and other measures of teaching impact would be effective in capturing the data from each department.

How would data from teaching interdisciplinary programs and from teaching the core be credited towards departments? The provost replied that interdisciplinary programs, and their value, had received a lot of

2008-09 Faculty Council Meeting #7 Minutes – October 14, 2008 – Page 3

discussion in Provost's Council. Dean Baird added that both areas would be evaluated using both qualitative and quantitative data and their value would be captured.

Faculty need to be engaged to be proactive in deciding to stop doing things that are less relevant. Where in the process is the opportunity for faculty to engage with the deans to bring their creative perspective to the plan? The provost noted that this was an important component and faculty will have the opportunity to talk to their deans. This is a time for deans to have discussions with faculty about what is the shared vision.

The chair suggested that it would be useful for FC members to take the criteria to their constituent faculties and get feedback. The chair suggested that next week FC could take a vote to decide if FC agreed that the criteria were reasonable and suitable for use in the evaluative processes.

An additional, off topic question for the provost asked if Digital Measures was to be used for data input/management towards Position Descriptions? The provost replied that he had instructed the deans to use Digital Measures for this purpose for the previous two years. He was aware of efforts to make the system more user friendly.

Discussion followed around whether the use of Digital Measures for this purpose had been previously approved or disapproved by FC. The chair asked for previous FC meeting minutes on the topic to inform a discussion at a near future FC meeting.

The chair then moved the meeting forward noting that due to time constraints, some business would be delayed to a later meeting and VPR Jack McIver was invited to address FC.

Re-engineering of the Research Office: McIver thanked the chair for her invitation. He noted that the research office was in the midst of process re-engineering. The office was now organized into three sections research administration, the compliance office and the office of technology transfer. In addition there was another entity through which the institutes reported to the VPR.

The overall goal of the office was to increase the time that PIs spent devoting to their research and reducing the time required for administrative functions. But it had to be recognized that the role of the office was also to protect the UI and to ensure that compliance issues were observed. He noted that checks on post-award expenditures under \$5,000 were now only done for "hot-button" items. For example computer purchase was closely monitored by research funding bodies and is an ineligible expense. Random checks on smaller transactions will continue. The VPR noted that one difficulty for the office was retaining trained staff. He warned that a factor driving office staff dissatisfaction was occasions of verbal abuse by frustrated faculty. A new policy was instituted. Non-professional behavior will not be tolerated. Staff are vulnerable and working hard to get their jobs done. They have a right to protection from frustrated faculty. McIver noted that faculty may get frustrated with compliance criteria and delays in work being processed due to the office being understaffed, but it is very important for faculty to maintain a professional attitude.

The office will be implementing evaluation of service in grant proposal processing to identify bottlenecks. An evaluation process will also be asking deans to identify if there are bottlenecks in the college part of grant proposal processing. The current policy of requiring proposals to be lodged in the research office at least four days prior to the external funding body deadline will be enforced and he asked for faculty assistance in meeting this deadline. This is needed because of the problem of ensuring grant proposal compliance to issues such as animal care and use, thus to protect UI from potential penalties for non-compliance.

2008-09 Faculty Council Meeting #7 Minutes – October 14, 2008 – Page 4

Plans were in place to migrate the External Support Form (ESF) to full electronic handling. This will allow greater efficiency, as well as an added data collection function for use by the research office. Thus, ESF approval will also not need to be sequential as it is presently. A package that facilitated full electronic tracking of all project expenditure was under evaluation. PIs will be able to look up every document related to the award and all transactions that occurred in award budgets. A range of products with these functions are being evaluated. One package has the advantage that it will calculate all personnel-related benefits and overheads, and compile the budget. This will save a lot of work for PIs and for the research office staff. It also interfaces with grants.gov and efficiently does error analysis. It can also load into banner. The cost is substantial at \$20k to \$30k per year. It will also allow collection of data and for statistical analysis. Packages under review are being beta tested by faculty and he is always looking for faculty willing to be beta testers if anyone is interested.

VPR McIver also noted that improvement of compliance issues was a high priority for the research office. The penalties for non-compliance are substantial. He noted that it was important to initiate the formation of a faculty-based compliance committee. He also noted that he is considering mandatory PI training on research project management for all awardees. This is not onerous and takes about 2 hours, once every three years.

He also noted the possibilities for using external agencies to assist with accreditation issues: ALAC for animal care, NASULGC for evaluation of policies and procedures.

He added that he will be seeking input from faculty who are bigger users of research administration. He saw the need to have a faculty group work on identifying problem issues and work with research administration to help resolve issues early. He noted that the Research Council was working on the compliance audit and a separate group was needed to fill this role. He further noted that there was a need for an independent survey to report on research office performance in meeting compliance guidelines that should occur before the end of 2008.

The VPR then moved on to other issues: What should UI be doing in terms of a sustainable research focus? This question needs both bottom-up and top-down input. He sees opportunities for UI being in a unique environment, relatively pristine and interfacing with agriculture. What are the challenges and opportunities for development of a (small number of) large project(s)? What strategies can be used to incorporate the social sciences and fine arts into such projects? Arts reflect the way a society looks at itself. How do we harness these aspects to feed into a large, focused project of high relevance and unique to the region? UI needs to lead such a project in the region, possibly partnering with other Idaho and northwest institutions. He then turned to comments about the need for a centralized core facility for UI research that needs to be enhanced with selective equipment to serve a large, focused project and the needs of the other research programs. McIver also noted that any large project will also need to span from basic through applied levels of research and creative activity.

The chair thanked VPR McIver and noted that FC was encouraged to think about the issues raised and keep questions for the VPR's visit in the near future.

Adjournment: It was moved and seconded (Miller, Murphy) to adjourn at 5:00 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Rodney A. Hill,
Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Council

FC-08-051

TO: University of Idaho Faculty Council
FROM: Information Technology Committee
RE: student laptop requirement
DATE: February 29, 2008

The members of the Information Technology Committee request that the Faculty Council debate an academic policy requiring full time students to obtain laptop computers. In the attached document, Ron Robberecht reviews various aspects of a laptop requirement. Most important among his observations is that the availability of laptops will enhance classroom teaching and learning.

Issue: University-wide requirement for laptop computers in the classroom

Synopsis: Computers are an indispensable tool in education. Key uses of computers at the University of Idaho include: online courses, distribution of learning materials via course web site, course homework assignments and projects, computer-based testing (especially via course systems such as Blackboard), email, and library and archival research of online databases, and Internet searches. Despite the ubiquitous use and essential nature of computers at the university, computers are generally absent from the classroom. Notable exceptions include the College of Law and the College of Business and Economics.

Advantages:

Computer-based testing Currently, because computers are not required in the classroom, it is not possible to have advanced computer-based testing during class to assess student performance. The Blackboard courseware system, e.g., is one of several excellent assessment tools that can quickly be administered and evaluate student performance on mid-term and final examinations in a secure classroom environment. Instead, computer-based testing is limited to wireless devices (e.g., InterWrite PRS and Turning Technologies). These devices are being used successfully in many courses at the university, but these devices must be purchased by students and offer instructors limited options for examinations. Computers in the classroom would eliminate the need for such wireless devices and allow the instructors more sophisticated levels of testing. Multiple choice/short answer tests could be automatically graded, and grading of essay-style examinations would be significantly facilitated because word processor features (e.g., spell and grammar checking, formatting, electronic submission).

In-class computer-based exercises Courses in a variety of disciplines use computer-based modeling (e.g., projects in art, architecture, science, natural resources, engineering, and chemistry), *what-if* scenarios, and discussions based on Internet searches. All of these course enhancements could be used on a regular basis only if computers were required in the classroom.

Innovative and transformative teaching/learning approaches Laptop computers in the classroom would allow instructors to develop innovative approaches in teaching/learning that would be difficult to achieve without classroom computers. In classrooms at other universities where tablet-style computers have been used, new and transformative classroom arrangements and teaching/learning approaches have emerged. Since learning materials are available simultaneously on everyone's computer screen, students and instructor work together as a group rather than the traditional student-professor classroom arrangement where students all face forward toward the instructor and learning materials are presented only on the front screen.

Electronic note-taking and the potential for substantial reduction in paper use and waste An increasing number of courses at the university have online learning materials (e.g., class notes, slide presentations, illustrations, and readings), which students can view electronically outside of class sessions. Because these are not accessible in class unless students have computers in the classroom, students tend to print out such electronic learning materials for use in class. This is not only inefficient, but tends to use a substantial amount of paper – paper that may become waste after the class is completed¹. Computers in the classroom would allow students to access online learning materials during class sessions as well as take notes electronically. (The capability to annotate electronic materials is integrated into Windows XP and Vista.) Furthermore, electronic learning materials that are interactive and non-sequential, and include multimedia elements lose these aspects when printed. The potential for a substantial reduction in paper use and waste would be consistent with the university's initiative on sustainability.

¹For the course, Ecology (RNGE 221), all learning materials are online and available anytime and anywhere. Yet, students tend to print out the lecture notes for use in class – a use of more than 5000 pages of paper per semester course.

Disadvantages:

Cost of computers The cost of laptop computers has substantially decreased at the same time that the capabilities of such computers have increased¹. A highly capable laptop computer for most learning applications costs between \$500 - \$800. Also, the V-Mobile program currently provides excellent cost/service computer purchase opportunities for students at the university.

Multi-tasking and distractions Computers in the classroom have the potential to create new distractions. Students who engage in non-class activities on their computers are distracted from learning. Moreover, such students distract other students from learning. Thus, computers in the classroom will require instructors to establish strict guidelines for appropriate use of computers in the classroom. Instructors will have to adopt new teaching techniques to engage and challenge students in the classroom so that students maintain their attention on classroom activities.

Weight A typical laptop and charger may weigh four to six pounds. While students may resist the requirement to transport a laptop around campus, the added weight of the laptop may be offset by a reduction in need to carry other course supplies, e.g., notebooks, paper, lab and textbooks.

Infrastructure: Wireless limit Currently, wireless access points at the university are limited to about 25 students per wireless point. This limitation would be problematic for large enrollment classrooms. However, this technical limitation is relatively easy to increase and can be accomplished at relatively low cost.

Security (possible hacking) This should not be a problem as long as students and instructors use secure web sites ("SSL") such as Blackboard and secured course web sites.

Electricity: Battery life This is a potential problem for students who would use their computers in successive class sessions where opportunities for plug-in power and recharging are not available. Students would also have to be more judicious in making sure their computer batteries are sufficiently charged to last through each class session. Thus, class rooms would have to have sufficient power outlets available.

Compatibility Currently, both Windows and Apple Macintosh laptops are used by students at the university. Even though the overwhelming majority of computers use the Windows operating system, a mix of Windows and Apple operating systems in the classroom could pose compatibility problems (these problems can be resolved on late model Apple laptops that can run the Windows operating system).

¹Class surveys in Ecology (RNGE 221) for 2007 show that 100% of the students own computers; most of whom own laptops.