

**2024 – 2025 Faculty Senate – Approved 10/8/2024 (Mtg# 7)**

**Meeting # 8**

Tuesday, October 1, 2024, 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm

Zoom only

**Present:** Barannyk, Borrelli, Chapman, Corry, Hagen, Haltinner, Hu, Kenyon, Kirchmeier Torrey Lawrence (w/o vote), McKenna, Murphy (vice chair), Pimentel, Ramirez, Rinker, Roberson, Roe, Sammarruca (w/o vote), Shook, Strickland, Tohaneanu, Thorne

**Absent:** Buchen, Maas, Miller, Raney, Remy

**Guests:** Jaap Vos, Samantha Futhey, Mary Oswald, Jackie Wernz

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

**Approval of Minutes (vote):**

Minutes of the 2024-25 Meeting #7 September 24, 2024

The minutes were approved as distributed.

**Chair's Report:**

- Senate Chair and Vice Chair met with the senate leadership at the other four-year (or more) institutions in the state. They will continue to meet every month. They talked broadly about priorities, which largely align with ours. They learnt that the other institutions have a different leadership situation in which vice chairs automatically become chairs every year, to ensure continuity. One university requires a vote of confidence before that happens.
- Quick updates about the work of committees or ad hoc committees:
  - The Teaching Committee is working on how to support faculty when they're dealing with many requests for different accommodation from CDAR students.
  - FAC has been working on several projects, including picking up the pieces of last year's non-tenure track ad hoc committee. We have been working with Erin to try and figure out where things were left and where they needed to go.
  - Other current issues involve parking, dependent tuition benefit, employee recognition and morale, FSH vs. APM, best way to approve interdisciplinary certificate curricula, classroom scheduling issues.
- Common Read: <https://www.uidaho.edu/academics/general-education/common-read>
- Who we are – Barb Kirchmeier, Director of General Education, and Independent Study in Idaho. Barb gave a summary of her career at the U of I. After graduating from the U of I, she stayed on as an English department faculty. A couple of years ago she started in a new position as the director of Independent Study in Idaho (ISI). Independent Study in Idaho is a State Board of Education program that offers classes sponsored by our four-year institutions in the state. There is open enrollment into the program, and so students can work at their own pace and set their own deadlines. So, ISI classes offer students flexibility so they can finish the coursework they need to complete a degree on a timeline that works better for them as working parent or as somebody who is returning to school and has a full-time job, or a more traditional student who needs to take the class. ISI classes are affordable, at \$160 per credit. ISI pays instructors to teach these courses, and then we pay the sponsoring departments \$10 per credit per enrollment. All

classes ISI offers must be in a catalog at one of the sponsoring institutions, so we're not offering anything that hasn't gone through the regular curriculum process.

### Provost's Report

- Nominations for the university-level P&T committee are due today. We would love to receive any last-minute nominations you may want to submit.
- The strategic planning process officially kicks off tomorrow, at 2pm PT, with an in-person event in the Vandal ballroom. If you're in Moscow, you are strongly encouraged to attend in person. For those not in Moscow, of course we will have zoom available. We hope to have a great attendance. <https://uidaho.cventevents.com/event/f772d0e4-9b29-4f49-b423-f4bddf342f74/regProcessStep1?rp=6f70d915-5129-4d2c-9f6a-bb85d15360da>
- The next faculty gathering is Thursday, October 17, from 4:30 to 6:30pm, at the IRIC Atrium, hosted by CNR.
- The US News & World Report has several rankings that come out around this time of year. We did well this year. In the US News and World Report rankings, we moved up six places in national universities, to number 179 for top public schools. For best value schools, for five consecutive years we remained at number 23 in the nation – number two public school in the nation and number one in the West. We also went up in other rankings, such as social mobility and best colleges for veterans. We had a few undergraduate programs, business and economics, computer science, engineering, and psychology, recognized. There is an annual ranking of agricultural schools, and we jumped up to number 13 in the nation, which is fantastic. We have the top agricultural school in the Northwest, surpassing Oregon State and WSU. Follow the link below if you are interested in reading about that news. <https://uidaho.cventevents.com/event/f772d0e4-9b29-4f49-b423-f4bddf342f74/regProcessStep1?rp=6f70d915-5129-4d2c-9f6a-bb85d15360da>
- Next week, we will talk more about salaries. Diane Kelly-Riley will talk about the market-based compensation system that we use for faculty while Torrey will focus more on the CEC process. If you have questions about salary and our salary process you want addressed, send them to Provost Lawrence in the next few days.

### Committee Reports (vote)

- University Curriculum Committee
  - UCC 402 Environmental Sciences (MS) – Jaap Voss, Natural Resources and Society  
This is a clerical entry to correctly align the offering with inventories at SBOE and NWCCU. The curriculum can be delivered fully online, and we are marketing the program as such. There is a thesis option and non-thesis one. Only the non-thesis track is available online.  
Discussion:  
There was a brief discussion about the thesis track being unavailable online. Can one still say that the program is fully online? Gwen Gorzelsky noted that the State Board has typically accepted programs as fully online, even if only the non-thesis option is. It's common at U of I for thesis option to be campus only and non-thesis option online.  
Vote: 19/19 yes. Motion passes.

### Announcements and Communications:

- SI-PASS – Samantha Futhey, Senior Academic Coordinator, Academic Support Programs, and Mary Oswald, SI-PASS Faculty Liaison

SI-PASS are peer-led group study sessions for all students enrolled in selected historically difficult courses. Historically challenging courses are identified as those where 25% of the students receive D, F, W, and/or introductory or required courses for many majors. SI-PASS supports courses in biology, math, chemistry, and select courses in computer science and humanities. The purpose is to foster a collaborative and active learning environment to review challenging course content (combines “what to learn” and “how to learn”).

SI-PASS at University of Idaho was first accredited in 2018 through the International Center for Supplemental Instruction at UMKC; reaccredited in 2021 and 2024.

The goals are: Improve student performance in historically difficult courses; Improve student learning with application of learning strategies and study skills; Improve graduation and retention rates. The components of SI-PASS are focused on challenging content. SI-PASS leaders are academically strong, embedded in the supported course, and participate in ICSI certified training. They are not Teaching Assistants. The program is faculty supported, offers voluntary, pre-scheduled, consistent support. It is not a recitation/lecture or a replacement for classes. Data show that regular participants in SI receive lower DFW rates and tend to earn ½ to a full letter grade higher average end of course grade. Students consistently find SI-PASS and SI-PASS Leaders helpful across semesters. SI-PASS benefits for Students include improvement of grades; improved understanding of foundational concepts necessary for future courses; development of helpful study habits; more awareness of campus resources. For faculty, benefits include insight into student trends; better performing students; connection and awareness of academic support resources; increased student engagement with the course.

The faculty role in SI-PASS involves approving the SI-PASS leader selected for the course; meeting weekly with the SI-PASS leader to discuss their sessions; sharing exam grade data for tracking program effectiveness; advocating for students to attend sessions/seek academic support; encouraging high-performing students to apply for open positions; communicating concerns or ideas to the program.

(Please see presentation attached to these minutes for more information.)

Discussion:

There was a question about the benefits for the Si-PASS leaders. Samantha responded that there are many benefits, besides monetary compensation. They acquire people skills, leadership skills, time management skills, communication skills, abilities to make presentations, and more. There were some more questions about whether anyone could join any session at any time, and how the program is advertised. Is it meant to be a substitute for office hours? Samantha replied that the sessions are not a substitute for office hours. Our leaders advocate for students to go to instructor office hours if they need more help, or if there is a question they cannot answer. Our SI-PASS leaders make weekly announcements and email communication to the students, and the SI-PASS leaders will send messages and emails to the students during the week. So, advertising is a mix of in person and digital communication.

- “Our Shared Futures” – Jackie Wernz, Director of Office of Civil Rights and Investigations (OCRI) Jackie provided some background OCRI. The main point is that OCRI deals with protected statuses, race, color, national origin, religion, ethnic origin, ancestry, disability, sex, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, pregnancy and parenting and related conditions. Age above 40 plus military and veteran status are covered, and so is retaliation. OCRI interacts with a handful of Federal and State regulators (see attached presentation slides for more information).

One is the Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights, which governs the civil rights laws impacting students primarily, and then the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, dealing with employees. There are other regulatory entities that OCRI deals with as well, at both the state and federal level. We are given the rules, and we do our best to comply with them.

When Jackie came to OCRI in 2023, the office was quite narrowly focused on investigations. During the last year, they worked to expand their scope, including coordination and oversight of all the civil rights functions at the university, while continuing to provide investigations, which they can move along more quickly. Informal resolution and mediation have grown considerably. They work closely with the Dean of Students office, or Human Resources, to help ensure that people are getting the kinds of support they need, while they are engaged with OCRI. They have developed processes for responding to requests for accommodation for pregnancy and related conditions and for religion for students. They increased efforts to build up coordination with different offices. They also engage in prevention, education, and training, and are available to people who are unsure about the need to report. The staffing level has also improved considerably.

Changes in the White House have a strong impact on OCRI. Title VI is a law that protects students from discrimination based on race, national origin, color, religion, and ethnic background. This has come up in the last year, with respect to the war in Gaza. Colleges and universities are dealing with complaints about how they are handling and responding to these issues. We also are seeing lawsuits and settlements, and the numbers are massive millions of dollars that colleges and universities are paying, based on allegations that they were not paying enough attention to civil rights on their campuses. OCRI's job is to make sure that, as a university, we are doing what we are supposed to be doing. Athletic civil rights continue to be a huge issue with both gender equity and abuse allegations. Our demographics have changed, and novel issues must be addressed. We have many policies and procedures, especially on the employment side, some of which overlap considerably. There are big holes, for example, we do not have a clear policy prohibiting retaliation against students. So, they are in the process of working up new policies and procedures. But they need to keep growing to get our staffing up to a level that is appropriate for institutions of our size.

Discussion:

A senator asked whether OCRI assists people with situations outside of the university. Response: If someone reaches out with allegations, for example, of sexual harassment outside of university programs or activities which does not involve anybody in our campus community, they will help coordinate support. Often, support will come from other departments and units, but the office absolutely does help people in those situations. They will not investigate a complaint that does not involve someone affiliated with the university, and did not occur on our campus.

- Discussion on use of resolutions, continued – Tim Murphy, Vice Chair of Senate  
Tim opened the floor for questions and concerns. He did receive from Dean Corry the sort of process by which the organization considers whether to have a resolution. He doesn't think we intend to formalize that right now. It might be something to revisit over the year. At least for now, when resolutions come forward, one should not assume that there has been some formal vetting process behind it. It's coming to the Senate floor for you as senators to decide what you think about it. So, with that, questions or comments are welcome.

Discussion:

Kristin reiterated that anybody could create a resolution and bring it forward. Tim was talking primarily about having subcommittees of the Faculty Senate bring them to Senate. And that is absolutely the way it could go. But to be clear, anyone can make a resolution, ask it to be put on an agenda and discuss it. It does not need to be a top-down initiative.

**New Business:**

Next week, there will be a resolution on the agenda to continue the publication of the university class schedule. It has been a quiet conversation migrating from class schedule to a class search tool, see Class Schedule and Class Search links available here: <https://www.uidaho.edu/registrar/classes> . If you are not familiar with the class search tool, you are strongly advised to look at that prior to next week's meeting. Both the class search tool and the class schedule provide the same information, and the resolution is not about the information provided, but in the format provided and the effect on productivity. We can have that discussion in greater detail next week.

There was no additional new business.

**Adjournment:**

The agenda being completed, Chair Haltinner adjourned the meeting at 4:37pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

University of Idaho  
2024 – 2025 Faculty Senate Agenda

Meeting #8

Tuesday, October 1, 2024, at 3:30 pm  
Zoom Only

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes (Vote)
  - Minutes of the 2024-2025 Faculty Senate Meeting #7 (September 24, 2024)  
**Attach. #1**
- III. Chair's Report
  - Who We Are – Barb Kirchmeier, Director General Education/Director Independent Study in Idaho
- IV. Provost's Report
- V. Committee Reports
  - University Curriculum Committee (Vote)
    - UCC 402 Environmental Science (MS) – Jaap Vos, Department Head and Professor, Natural Resources and Society **Attach. #2**
- VI. Announcements and Communications
  - SI-PASS – Samantha Futhey, Senior Academic Coordinator Academic Support Programs and Mary Oswald, SI-PASS Faculty Liaison/Instructor Department of Biological Sciences
  - “Our Shared Futures” - OCRI, Jackie Wernz, Director Office of Civil Rights and Investigations
  - Discussion on use of Resolutions, Continued – Tim Murphy, Vice Chair Faculty Senate
- VII. New Business
- VIII. Adjournment

Attachments

- **Attach. #1** Minutes of the 2024-2025 Faculty Senate Meeting #7 (September 24, 2024)

- **Attach. #2** UCC 402 – Environmental Science (MS) Program Change Request

**2024 – 2025 Faculty Senate – Pending Approval**

**Meeting # 7**

Tuesday, September 24, 2024, 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm

Zoom only

**Present:** Barannyk, Borrelli, Buchen, Chapman, Corry, Hagen, Haltinner, Hu, Kenyon, Kirchmeier, Torrey Lawrence (w/o vote), Maas, McKenna, Miller, Murphy (vice chair), Pimentel, Ramirez, Raney, Remy, Rinker, Roberson, Roe, Sammarruca (w/o vote), Shook, Strickland, Tohaneanu, Thorne

**Absent:** Buchen

**Guests:** Kim Salisbury, Ken Udas

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

**Approval of Minutes (vote):**

Minutes of the 2024-25 Meeting #6 September 17, 2024

The minutes were approved as distributed.

**Chair’s Report:**

- Homecoming starts September 28 and goes until October 5.
- Midterm grades are due by noon, October 14, from MyUI.
- Look out for email regarding your mandatory training on Bridge.
- “Who we are” – Taylor Raney, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies, CEHHS Director of Teacher Education.

Taylor spoke about “Elevate Education,” a program from his college, EHHS, aimed at reviving interest in and excitement about teaching in young people. He showed photos from the McCall Outdoor Science School, a CNR facility. Twice a year, they collaborate with CNR to bring their elementary Ed students down there and learn how to teach science outside, rather than in a classroom. A major part of our elevation of education is to prepare high quality teachers. Last week, they hosted the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Debbie Critchfield, who wanted to learn about McCall Outdoor Science School and, generally, about teacher preparation at University of Idaho and in the State of Idaho. They hosted the McCall Donnelly Educator Appreciation event, with people across a broad spectrum of the profession. Part of the efforts to elevate education is the Educator Appreciation Game coming up on October 19th, where they honor teachers, principals, coaches, and support staff, who do great work with our students. They offer them an award and thank them for their service. Collaboration with CNR has been great.

**Provost’s Report (delivered by Vice Provost for Faculty Diane Kelly -Riley)**



- Next Tuesday at 5:00pm is the deadline for senators to submit nominations from their colleges for members of the promotion and tenure committee [https://forms.office.com/Pages/ResponsePage.aspx?id=Y2u8fpJXGUqyCwS4JgSIU8wgEFrYhyNO\\_nqCDVL5jNUREVSNURESkRCUzFFVlpUSFMxNFdNVk0xOS4u](https://forms.office.com/Pages/ResponsePage.aspx?id=Y2u8fpJXGUqyCwS4JgSIU8wgEFrYhyNO_nqCDVL5jNUREVSNURESkRCUzFFVlpUSFMxNFdNVk0xOS4u)
- Strategic Plans efforts are getting on their way. Some initial meetings will be held in October.
- The schedule of faculty gatherings can be found at <https://www.uidaho.edu/provost/faculty-gathering>  
Discussion:  
Some senators reported having difficulties recruiting people for the promotion committee. Any suggestions on how to be more successful? Vice Provost Kelly-Riley suggested to emphasize the value of this nomination and the importance of this service. The dates are Friday, January 24 and Friday, January 31, 2025, starting at 8:00am and proceeding through the day. Another senator suggested contacting people directly and encouraging them.

### **Committee Reports (vote)**

- Additional members in the Ad Hoc Committee on Salary (vote)  
New volunteers for the ad hoc committee on salary: Linda Chen, Patrick Hrdlicka, and Russ Meeuf.  
Motion to add the three volunteers to the ad hoc salary committee (Kirchmeier). Seconded by Kenyon.  
No additional discussion.  
Vote: 16/17 yes; 1/17 no. Motion passes.
- FSH 1580, Bylaws of the Faculty Senate – Kristin Haltinner, Faculty Senate Chair  
Fixed a typo in section 3. Edited the format for which votes are taken from a raise of hand to a ballot as raising hands is not practical on zoom.  
There was no discussion.  
Vote: 20/20 in favor. Motion passes.

### **Other Policy Items (informational)**

- APM 45.06 Allowable and Unallowable Sponsored Project Expenditures – Diane Kelly-Riley This was approved by the president as an interim policy to align with new NSF requirements. The revisions are in Section E-8, and amount to clarifying some definitions. There were no questions.
- APM 35.67 Laboratory Safety Program This policy was developed in collaboration with the Office of Research Assurances. It provides guidance and establishes baseline requirements for the laboratory safety program consistent with federal and state regulations and university policies for research and teaching laboratories. There were no questions.

### Announcements and Communications:

- Digital Learning – Ken Udas, Vice Provost for Digital Learning  
The spreadsheet at this link shows the approval process required for new academic program proposals: <https://www.uidaho.edu/-/media/uidaho-responsive/files/provost/academic-initiatives/planning/curricular-proposal-crosswalk-and-timelines.xlsx?la=en&rev=ad224e5c74cf461fbd83a0bdc05d0a20>  
Ken Udas started with a brief overview of his team, who they are, what they do, and how they can help. He then proceeded to describe the programs and enrollments. Some of the Digital Learning initiatives are funded through P3. Ken provided some background on the CAPE (Continuing, Adult, & Professional Education) initiative, its purpose and goals, performance, revenue model, and information sessions.  
The slides are attached to these minutes. The last slide shows the schedule for the CAPE information sessions.  
Discussion:  
There was a question about offering math classes online. Ken responded that he would provide a list.  
There was an inquiry about support for the CAPE project. Ken said that his office will launch a corporate engagement model for the project. Generally, all non-academic programs are handled administratively.
- FY2025 CEC Summary Update – Kim Salisbury, Associate Vice President, Budget and Planning  
Kim Salisbury displayed the FY25 CEC summary. [The slide is attached to these minutes.] The summary shows how the funds for general education and non-general education are used towards salaries during CEC. The table starts with 100% of target salaries. The data is extracted on April 1, and calculated out to September 1. As of September 1, 2024, we would have been at 179 million dollars of target salaries. This spring, total salaries amounted to 164.9 million, a large number, but not up to the target. Kim showed the starting average percent of target across faculty and staff, which was 88.73, lower than last year, when they started at 90.66%. The next section in the table shows the university-wide allocations, and the section after that displays additional funding from the units (“unit funded”). The university has the total general education funding from the state that goes into CEC. But there are staff and faculty who are not paid on general education funds. Hence, one can see “non-Gen. Ed.” on both the staff and faculty sides, as well as their total. The university-wide CEC Gen. Ed. dollars put in was 2.98 million dollars and, for non-Gen. Ed., 1.25 million dollars, for a total of 4.23 million into these university-wide CEC initiatives. This year, there was a 1% increase across the board, a change from the FY24 CEC,

where we had a flat \$600 per FTE across the board increase. There was a lot of pushback after that, and so the decision was made to go back to 1% across the board. There was also the initiative to bring up any employees who did not meet the classified or exempt wage minimums. The total amount needed to bring people up to 80% of target was 1.77 million. The university has been trying to get everyone up to at least 80% of their target for a number of years since market-based compensation started. As market salaries continue to go up, targets move up as well. The goal is to bring everyone up to a hundred percent of their target, but the funds to do that have not been available. As market rates increase, they do the best they can, but they haven't been able to keep up with it. The line that says "Decrease to 4,500 / 6% Cap" is in response to the funding that would have been needed to bring people up to 80% of their target this year. One of the reasons for that is the increase in the market rates. Also, a number of job families were put in place, to help with equitable pay across all sorts of different kinds of jobs. While a number of job families were put into place, not everyone was put into a job family. At the time of CEC (April), not everyone had been allocated into a job family. Now, when employees were placed into job families, many showed up as being further behind their target than they were the year before in their former classification. This is where a lot of the decrease in our starting average percent of targets came from. So, when we looked at the final data in April, a decision was made to ease that in over time, because this was only one CEC cycle and not everyone had been put into job families. It didn't seem equitable to give large increases to people who had been through the job family process, when other people in positions that hadn't been through the job family process would receive no or a smaller increase. The "cap" was put in place to try and adjust this issue, only for the up to 80% of targets. Nobody was capped in the across the board or the up to minimum classified exempt categories. Note that the number of employees still below 80% of target increased from 16 (last year) to 102 (this year). The majority of those are people who have been placed in job families and have not yet been brought up to 80% of their target. University-wide, that's the total amount that that we invested into CEC. Units are allowed to put in additional unit funded equity and merit increases, and those can be general education dollars or non-Gen. Ed. dollars. There was an additional 1.5 million dollars put into equity and merit by the units, and a few separate stipend adjustments, bringing the total investment in CEC for FY25 to 5.8 million dollars. This took us from 88.73% of target average to a 91.67% final average percent of target. Last year we ended at 94.34% of target. Hopefully, as the job families cycle through over the next couple of years, we will get back up there and even be able to make progress. We are always trying to request as much funding for CEC as possible from the State, which is the majority of our general education pool that goes into salaries.

Discussion:

**Senator:** Can you speak to how positions are moved into job families and how that move is shared or not shared with PIs managing grant funded positions?

**Kim Salisbury:** I do not work directly with job families, which are handled by HR. They work directly with the supervisor of the position. I do not know what that means for PIs, if you are not the supervisor of someone who is working on your grant.

**Senator:** Do you know who we might reach out to with more questions about that?

**Kim Salisbury:** I would suggest that you reach out to HR Classification and Compensation, email address [hr-classcomp@uidaho.edu](mailto:hr-classcomp@uidaho.edu)

**Senator:** I'm assuming university wide CEC comes from the legislative appropriation. Where does the unit funded money come from?

**Kim Salisbury:** **Unit-funded money can come from several sources.** For instance, if a Gen. Ed. funded position becomes vacant and is not filled, the funds in that vacant position could be put into CEC, and that would be general education funding within a college, essentially salary savings. Non-general education funding could be revenue. If there are revenue generating units having funds that are going to be sustainable over the next few years, they can use them, for instance, to give additional equity or merit increases, or on grant funded positions, if the grant is able to pay more.

**Diane Kelly-Riley:** I had some faculty ask about the philosophy behind merit increase, and why there is a cap on it. Can you talk about the philosophy of the merit increases in the CEC process?

**Kim Salisbury:** The philosophy of merit is that, in the state of Idaho, when the state gives us money, (I do not have the form or the memo in front of me), the funds are to be allocated based on merit. For the last few years, we have taken the total pool from the State and from tuition increases and generate dollars, approximately one third of which goes into merit funds.

**Senator:** You mentioned a memo that details why we need to have merit pay. Is that something you could share with us?

**Kim Salisbury:** Yes, I can find it and will share it.

**Senator:** Looking at the “eligible still below 80% of target” is helpful, because we can compare that to previous years. But suppose several people just left, who might not be below the 80% mark. Having that information on different deciles might provide a little more distributional information. My next question. How are administrators, from unit chairs to the president, being entered in here? We do have more deans now, so the total number is larger.

**Kim Salisbury:** The president is not included here. SBOE sets it. We have nothing to do with his salary. We will find out approximately the middle of June what the president is going to be paid for this year. Do you want to know a breakout of the number of eligible still below 80% of target?

**Senator:** I am asking how the administration entered in here. If you're a dean, you might be a full professor, but you are making double what a full professor salary is.

**Kim Salisbury:** Faculty administrators show up on the faculty side, not on the staff side. So let's take a dean, for example. A dean has a CIP code and a SOC code. The CIP code is going to be the same as every other faculty member. The dean has base faculty pay and an admin stipend. At CEC time, I am comparing a dean's base pay with their target salary on the CIP code side, and, at the same time, comparing their total pay. So, they have their base salary plus administrative stipend with their SOC code, but their CIP code is specific to the discipline they are in. We look at both, and the decision was made, when we first started market-based compensation for faculty administrators, that we would choose the comparison that is best for that individual on that year. That is, if a dean is further behind in their SOC code, we work with SOC codes that year and ignore the CIP code – and vice versa. We're not comparing a SOC code for a dean with the faculty CIP code.

**Senator:** I was just trying to wrap my head around the general methodology. So, for example, if we have 6 more deans, then it will take a lot of salary to bring them up to the 80% or a hundred percent.

**Kim Salisbury:** Yes, if they were below 80%.

**Diane Kelly-Riley:** Could I help clarify how it works for faculty administrators? For faculty positions, we have been really trying to hire faculty in at least 90% of their target, especially so for deans. Thus, they are not “absorbing” funds meant to bring people up to a certain level. We are intentionally trying to make all our hires higher than the bottom threshold, so we do not have to make adjustments.

**Senator:** Can target salaries go above 100% of market rate for faculty or staff?

**Kim Salisbury:** You could get merit pay, but your target would not go up. Someone can be paid above their target. It would have to be from merit. You would never get there with this 80%.

You might get there with the across the board 1% raise if you were at a hundred percent of your target. You would still get a 1% increase and be above your target.

**Senator:** My understanding is that, in 2018, an analysis of faculty salaries was done, broken down by rank, unit, and gender. Have you done any similar analysis since? Or is it something that we could ask to have done?

**Kim Salisbury:** It is absolutely something we could do. I have done more analyses this year, but not broken down by gender. I am trying to make sure that I do not have any groups less than 5 in my analysis. That will be shared. Patrick did help with that analysis back then. It is something that could be done again.

**Senator:** The committee that we charged could help.

**Senator:** I remember some years ago, when we started using the market rate for salaries, we had some kind of policy that, if you served for over 3 years, you would get 100% of the market. If you served for less than 3 years, you would get 80%. I hear that nobody will get to 100%, but I think we have had some people get to 100% since they served in the position over 3 years. So, I think there is a gap for people who have been serving in their positions for many years and are still below 80% of the market rate.

**Kim Salisbury:** I think you are talking about the longevity targets on the faculty side.

That is something that could also be looked at in more detail. The longevity target is how we produce the target per person. So, once you have been in the position for 5 or 12 years, if you are a full professor, then your target is 100% of the market rate. During that time, you are growing each year in your position, but, once you reach that, it does cap out at a hundred percent. And so maybe you are asking for more information on who has been in a position for a long period of time, but still at a low percent of their target. Correct?

**Senator:** That's right.

**Kim Salisbury:** **There could be many reasons for that.** I will point out that each year there are employees not eligible for CEC, which affects people's promotion and tenure. But somebody not eligible for years wouldn't be getting those increases every year and would fall further behind their target. Furthermore, they are probably not going to be tenured or promoted into the next rank. So, that might be a self-solving situation. But that's something that could be looked at. For people who are at 100% of the market, the target is 100% of the faculty rank for their CIP code.

**Senator:** When we submit a grant, we can charge some of our salary on that grant. Could we request an increase, such as a merit-based increase, to raise our salary through that grant? Would the raise apply just during the grant period, or would it continue after the grant? It seems a way to motivate people to get more grants.

**Kim Salisbury:** I will defer to Diane Kelly Riley on the faculty salary side. I do not deal with the grant side of things and setting your salary based on grants. So I defer to Diane on whether that's possible.

**Senator:** My understanding is, if you are a 9-month faculty and you write a grant, you can ask for summer salary. If you are a 12-month faculty, you do not ask for summer salary. Why couldn't we write in an increase to bring us up to the target rate or more?

**Diane Kelly-Riley:** Grants operate with an institutional based salary, by Federal regulation. Your salary must fall within a certain range, based on the position you have been hired for. If you qualify for those increases, perhaps you can charge them on your grant. There are sponsoring agencies that factor in salary increases that need to happen. That becomes an obligation for the institution, once the grant is over, to continue that funding.

**Senator:** This question is also for Diane. It concerns administrative stipends for deans, associate deans, etc. Are increases based on a flat rate, or are they based on a percentage of the person's salary?

**Diane Kelly-Riley:** Each college has its own practice. Some set a flat rate, and some set a percentage of base salary. That decision is made at the college level. The percentages of their base salaries increase when the person's salary increases, while the flat rates do not. At the dean level, salaries are guided by the SOC codes, a benchmark of common academic positions held at institutions in the US.

**Adjournment:**

The agenda was not completed. Motion to adjourn (Murphy, Barannyk). Chair Haltinner adjourned the meeting at 5:00pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

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



University  
of Idaho

# DIGITAL LEARNING INITIATIVES

*FALL 2024*





# OVERVIEW

- a) Who We Are
- b) What We Do
- c) How Can We Work Together
- d) Continuing, Adult, and Professional Education



# ONLINE LEARNING - PROFILE

## PROGRAMS & ENROLLMENTS

- The Number of Online Programs has grown 123% since 2017
  - 15 Undergraduate/29 Graduate/4 Minors/37 Certificates (2024-2025)
- The Number of Fully Online Learners has grown 17% since 2021
  - 1,051 (Fall 2023)
- The Number of Online Credits awarded has grown 53% since 2019
- The Percentage of Learners taking some online courses has hovered around 50% since 2019.



# P3 INVESTMENTS

## DLI FUNDED PROGRAMS

- Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA)
- Master of Business Administration (MBA)
- Master of Science in Geographic Information Systems (MS GIS)
- Math Courses
- Continuing, Adult, and Professional Education (CAPE)

Insights/Considerations: These are financially supported programs.



# CAPE

## CONTINUING, ADULT, & PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

- I** Background
- I** Purpose/Goals
- I** Pilot & Performance
- I** Revenue Model
- I** Information Sessions

### **CAPE Info Sessions:**

1. Tuesday, 10/8 at 8:30 am and 1:30 pm;
2. Wednesday, 10/9 at 10:00 am and 3 pm;
3. Tuesday 10/22 at 8:30 am and 3 pm;
4. Wednesday 10/23 at 8:30 am and 1:00 pm.

NOTE: All times are Pacific Standard Time.

Insights/Considerations: Jed Breinholt will lead CAPE Information Sessions in October.

FY2025 CEC SUMMARY Snapshot as of 05.13.2024	STAFF			FACULTY			TOTAL			STAFF % OF TOTAL	FACULTY % OF TOTAL
	GENERAL EDUCATION	NON-GENERAL EDUCATION	TOTAL	GENERAL EDUCATION	NON-GENERAL EDUCATION	TOTAL	GENERAL EDUCATION	NON-GENERAL EDUCATION	TOTAL		
FY2025 Target Salary	\$ 53,236,956	\$ 47,731,869	\$ 100,968,825	\$ 52,121,320	\$ 26,836,768	\$ 78,958,087	\$ 105,358,276	\$ 74,568,636	\$ 179,926,912	56.12%	43.88%
Pre-CEC Salary Excluding Separate Stipends	\$ 45,784,592	\$ 47,724,484	\$ 93,509,076	\$ 46,290,639	\$ 25,153,158	\$ 71,443,797	\$ 92,075,231	\$ 72,877,643	\$ 164,952,873	56.69%	43.31%
Across the Board 1% Increase	\$ 462,076	\$ 483,286	\$ 945,363	\$ 466,341	\$ 253,941	\$ 720,282	\$ 928,417	\$ 737,228	\$ 1,665,645	56.76%	43.24%
Up to Minimum Classified/Exempt Minimums	\$ 18,619	\$ 25,418	\$ 44,037	\$ -	\$ 907	\$ 907	\$ 18,619	\$ 26,326	\$ 44,945	97.98%	2.02%
Up to 80% of Target	\$ 929,005	\$ 504,927	\$ 1,433,932	\$ 246,941	\$ 97,063	\$ 344,004	\$ 1,175,946	\$ 601,990	\$ 1,777,936	80.65%	19.35%
Decrease to \$4,500 / 6% Cap	\$ (342,415)	\$ (186,088)	\$ (528,503)	\$ (27,033)	\$ (34,372)	\$ (61,404)	\$ (369,448)	\$ (220,460)	\$ (589,907)	89.59%	10.41%
Merit Pool Funds	\$ 524,053	\$ -	\$ 524,053	\$ 434,613	\$ -	\$ 434,613	\$ 958,666	\$ -	\$ 958,666	54.66%	45.34%
Promotion and Tenure Increments	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 267,853	\$ 105,315	\$ 373,168	\$ 267,853	\$ 105,315	\$ 373,168	0.00%	100.00%
University-Wide CEC	\$ 1,591,339	\$ 827,543	\$ 2,418,882	\$ 1,388,715	\$ 422,855	\$ 1,811,570	\$ 2,980,054	\$ 1,250,398	\$ 4,230,452	57.18%	42.82%
Additional Unit Funded Non-Merit	\$ 236,226	\$ 460,907	\$ 697,134	\$ 125,100	\$ 104,079	\$ 229,178	\$ 361,326	\$ 564,986	\$ 926,312	75.26%	24.74%
Additional Unit-Funded Merit	\$ 8,184	\$ 335,322	\$ 343,506	\$ 28,539	\$ 233,581	\$ 262,119	\$ 36,722	\$ 568,903	\$ 605,625	56.72%	43.28%
Additional Unit-Funded Increases	\$ 244,410	\$ 796,230	\$ 1,040,639	\$ 153,638	\$ 337,659	\$ 491,298	\$ 398,048	\$ 1,133,889	\$ 1,531,937	67.93%	32.07%
Separate Stipend Adjustments	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 26,666	\$ 24,624	\$ 51,289	\$ 26,666	\$ 24,624	\$ 51,289	0.00%	100.00%
<b>Total CEC Investment in Salaries</b>	<b>\$ 1,835,748</b>	<b>\$ 1,623,773</b>	<b>\$ 3,459,521</b>	<b>\$ 1,569,019</b>	<b>\$ 785,138</b>	<b>\$ 2,354,157</b>	<b>\$ 3,404,767</b>	<b>\$ 2,408,911</b>	<b>\$ 5,813,678</b>	<b>59.51%</b>	<b>40.49%</b>
Final FY2025 Salary Excluding Separate Stipends	\$ 47,620,340	\$ 49,348,257	\$ 96,968,597	\$ 47,825,653	\$ 25,921,012	\$ 73,746,665	\$ 95,445,994	\$ 75,269,269	\$ 170,715,262	56.80%	43.20%
Overall Increase in Salary over FY2024	4.01%	3.40%	3.70%	3.32%	3.05%	3.22%	3.66%	3.28%	3.49%		
Total Merit Increases (Pool + Unit Funds)	\$ 532,237	\$ 335,322	\$ 867,559	\$ 463,151	\$ 233,581	\$ 696,732	\$ 995,388	\$ 568,903	\$ 1,564,291	55.46%	44.54%
Starting Average % of Target			88.05%			90.12%			88.73%		
Average Increase as % of Target			3.23%			2.91%			2.95%		
Final Average % of Target			91.27%			93.03%			91.67%		
# Eligible Employees			1,516			748			2,264	66.96%	33.04%
# Employees Not Eligible for CEC			138			20			158		
# Employees Brought Towards 80% of Target			330			92			422	78.20%	21.80%
# Employees Receiving Merit			506 33.4%			333 44.5%			839 37.1%	60.31%	39.69%
# Eligible Still Below 80% of Target			86			16			102	84.31%	15.69%

Calculations do not include employees ineligible for CEC or the President (SBOE determines)

# 402: ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE (MS)

---

## In Workflow

1. 257 Chair (jvos@uidaho.edu)
2. 11 Curriculum Committee Chair (shook@uidaho.edu)
3. 11 Dean (drbecker@uidaho.edu)
4. Provost's Office (kudas@uidaho.edu; stoutm@uidaho.edu; jvalkovic@uidaho.edu; gwen@uidaho.edu; cari@uidaho.edu; brenadah@uidaho.edu; sandeschlueter@uidaho.edu)
5. Degree Audit Review (rfrost@uidaho.edu; sandeschlueter@uidaho.edu)
6. Graduate Council Chair (mcmurtry@uidaho.edu; slthomas@uidaho.edu; sandeschlueter@uidaho.edu)
7. Registrar's Office (none)
8. Ready for UCC (none)
9. UCC (none)
10. Faculty Senate Chair (stoutm@uidaho.edu; cari@uidaho.edu; nvietz@uidaho.edu)
11. Provost's Office (kudas@uidaho.edu; stoutm@uidaho.edu; jvalkovic@uidaho.edu; gwen@uidaho.edu; cari@uidaho.edu; brenadah@uidaho.edu; sandeschlueter@uidaho.edu)
12. State Approval (stoutm@uidaho.edu; gwen@uidaho.edu; sandeschlueter@uidaho.edu)
13. NWCCU (stoutm@uidaho.edu; sandeschlueter@uidaho.edu; gwen@uidaho.edu)
14. Catalog Update (sbeal@uidaho.edu)

## Approval Path

1. Fri, 29 Mar 2024 19:19:44 GMT  
Jaap Vos (jvos): Approved for 257 Chair
2. Fri, 29 Mar 2024 19:33:19 GMT  
Steven Shook (shook): Approved for 11 Curriculum Committee Chair
3. Fri, 29 Mar 2024 19:54:42 GMT  
Dennis Becker (drbecker): Approved for 11 Dean
4. Fri, 29 Mar 2024 20:04:42 GMT  
Gwen Gorzelsky (gwen): Approved for Provost's Office
5. Fri, 29 Mar 2024 21:28:02 GMT  
Rebecca Frost (rfrost): Approved for Degree Audit Review
6. Mon, 22 Apr 2024 15:31:02 GMT  
Stephanie Thomas (slthomas): Approved for Graduate Council Chair
7. Wed, 21 Aug 2024 15:55:08 GMT  
Theodore Unzicker (tunzicker): Approved for Registrar's Office
8. Tue, 10 Sep 2024 17:14:51 GMT  
Sydney Beal (sbeal): Approved for Ready for UCC
9. Tue, 17 Sep 2024 16:28:44 GMT  
Sydney Beal (sbeal): Approved for UCC

## History

1. Apr 7, 2023 by Sydney Beal (sbeal)

Date Submitted: Fri, 29 Mar 2024 19:19:11 GMT

**Viewing: 402 : Environmental Science (MS)**

**Last approved: Fri, 07 Apr 2023 18:08:12 GMT**

**Last edit: Thu, 08 Aug 2024 15:30:02 GMT**

Changes proposed by: Jaap Vos

### Faculty Contact

Faculty Name	Faculty Email
Jaap Vos	jvos@uidaho.edu

### Change Type (Choose all that apply)

Change existing program (major) from face to face to on-line delivery (including program components if applicable)

### Description of Change

This is a clerical entry to correctly align the offering with inventories at the SBOE and NWCCU. Over time, curriculum has become available online, thus the delivery modality of fully online is now available and we are marketing the program as such.

**Will this request have a fiscal impact of \$250K or greater?**

No

**Academic Level**

Graduate

**College**

Natural Resources

**Department/Unit:**

Environmental Science

**Effective Catalog Year**

2025-2026

**Program Title**

Environmental Science (MS)

**Program Credits**

30

**CIP Code**

03.0104 - Environmental Science.

**Curriculum:**

## **Master of Science. Major in Environmental Science.**

Each student will design a study plan in consultation with an advisor. The study plan is subject to approval by the director and the Graduate College.

There are five requirements for the M.S. in Environmental Science:

1. Depth requirement: the graduate program is structured around three option areas: biological science, physical science, or social science. A student must complete a minimum of 12 credits (thesis degree) or 15 credits (non-thesis degree) in one of the three option areas;
2. Breadth requirement: A student must complete a minimum of 3 credits at the 5000-level in each of the other two option areas;
3. A student must complete one course (3 credits) in appropriate research methods or statistics at the 5000-level;
4. A student must complete ENVS 5010 (2 credits); and
5. A student must complete ENVS 5000 (6 credits, thesis degree) or ENVS 5990 (3 credits, non-thesis degree).

These requirements may be augmented to compensate for undergraduate deficiencies.

The thesis degree is a campus-based program that consists of at least 30 graduate credits, including at least 6 credits and a maximum of 10 credits of thesis and a minimum of 24 credits of coursework. For the thesis option, at least 21 credits in the option and supporting area must be at the 5000-level, including a minimum of 6 hours of ENVS 5000 (Master's Research and Thesis).

The non-thesis option can either be completed on campus or fully online. It requires at least 30 graduate credits, including a minimum of 3 credits of ENVS 5990 (Non-thesis Master's Research) and 27 credits of course work. For the non-thesis option, at least 21 credits in the option and supporting area must be at the 5000-level.

For both thesis and non-thesis options, a student can take up to 9 credits at the 4000-level in the option and supporting area (one class can be at the 3000-level in a supporting area, with committee approval). The thesis or non-thesis research part of the program for each student consists of a substantial project in which the student demonstrates the ability to do rigorous independent work.

### **Distance Education Availability**

To comply with the requirements of the Idaho State Board of Education (SBOE) and the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) the University of Idaho must declare whether 50% or more of the curricular requirements of a program which may be completed via distance education.

**Can 50% or more of the curricular requirements of this program be completed via distance education?**

Yes

**If Yes, can 100% of the curricular requirements of this program be completed via distance education?**

Yes

Note: Existing programs transitioning from less than 50% of its curricular requirements to 50% or more of its requirements being available via distance education is considered a Group B change and must complete the program proposal formwork before these changes will be processed.

## Geographical Area Availability

In which of the following geographical areas can this program be completed in person?

Coeur d'Alene  
Moscow

## Student Learning Outcomes

Have learning outcomes changed?

No

## Learning Objectives

1. Student will be able to demonstrate advanced skill to design interdisciplinary research and analysis for environmental problem-solving.
2. Student will be able to apply mastery of key principles and core concepts in environmental science with a depth of knowledge in either physical, biological, or social sciences.
3. Student will be able to collaborate with a faculty advisor and graduate committee to implement interdisciplinary research.
4. Student will be able to communicate effectively, professionally, and within group settings.

**A clearly stated rationale for this proposal must be included or the University Curriculum Committee will return the proposal for completion of this section. The rationale should provide a detailed summary of the proposed change(s). In addition, include a statement in the rationale regarding how the department will manage the added workload, if any.**

This is a clerical entry to correctly align the offering with inventories at the SBOE and NWCCU. Over time curriculum has become available online thus the delivery modality of fully online is now available and we are marketing the program as such.

## Reviewer Comments

**Sydney Beal (sbeal) (Thu, 08 Aug 2024 15:30:02 GMT):** Changed to four-digit course numbers per MISC proposal 118 (university-wide course number change)

Key: 402