Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   - Minutes of the 2007-08 Faculty Council Meeting #12, November 13, 2007

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.

VI. Committee Reports.

   University Curriculum Committee:
   - FC-08-018a: NOI: College of Science, BS in Chemistry (forensics option)
   - FC-08-018b: NOI: College of Science, BS in Chemistry (full proposal)
   - FC-08-022: Regulation J-3
   - FC-08-023: Provisional Admittance Policy
   - FC-08-024a: NOI: College of Graduate Studies: M.S. in Bioregional Planning & Community Design
   - FC-08-024b: Full Proposal: M.S. in Bioregional Planning & Community Design
   - FC-08-025: Academic Certificate in Bioregional Planning & Community Design
   - FC-08-026: NOI: College of Education: add 2 options, B.S. Technology: Business Technology and Industrial Technology

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Don Crowley, Chair 2007-2008, Faculty Council

Attachments:
Minutes of 2007-2008 FC Meeting #12, November 13, 2007
FC-08-018a, FC-08-018b, FC-08-022, FC-08-023: Sent previously
FC-08-024a: NOI: College of Graduate Studies: M.S. in Bioregional Planning & Community Design
FC-08-024b: Full Proposal: M.S. in Bioregional Planning & Community Design
FC-08-025: Academic Certificate in Bioregional Planning & Community Design
FC-08-026: NOI: College of Education: add 2 options, B.S. Technology: Business Technology and Industrial Technology
University of Idaho  
FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES  
2007-2008 Meeting #12, Tuesday, November 13, 2007

Present: Adams (w/o vote), Baker, Crowley (chair), Fritz, Griff, Guilfoyle, Hubbard, Keim-Campbell, McCaffrey, McColough, McDaniel, Mihelich, Miller, Murphy, Odom, Ripplinger, Schmeckpeper, Schmiege, Sullivan, Ch. Williams, Wilson. Liaisons: Stauffer (Boise), Newcombe (Coeur d’Alene).  
Absent: Rowland, Ci. Williams; Liaison: Crepeau  
Observers: 8

It was moved and seconded (Miller, Wilson) to approve the minutes of November 6th as distributed. The motion carried with one abstention.

Chair’s Report: The chair apologized to the liaisons from Boise and Idaho Falls about the inability to include them in the meeting dedicated to health insurance on October 30th. Ann Thompson had tried repeatedly, over a twenty-minute period before the meeting began, to dial them up into the conference call but was unable to do so—another case of the technology not quite being up to the need for it.

He also introduced Professor Ed Schmeckpeper, newly elected by the College of Engineering to replace Professor John Munson. In connection with the College of Engineering he reminded the representatives from that college that they still needed to nominate candidates from their college to the University Promotions Committee. The provost and chair would be meeting this Monday to make the final determinations.

He noted that we would not be meeting next week, due to Thanksgiving Break, but that there would be a university faculty meeting on Monday, November 26th (in the University Auditorium (Ad Aud), beginning at 3:30 p.m.) and, if we were unable to get through our very full agenda today, we would be meeting on Tuesday, November 27th. Between now and then he hoped that everyone would have a relaxing and productive break.

Provost’s Report: The provost noted that the search committee was still soliciting nominations for the next faculty secretary. He emphasized the importance of the position and the search. The current secretary provided some information about the duties, responsibilities, and perquisites of the office.

FC-08-013: FSH 3710, Leave Policies for All Employees: The chair reintroduced the discussion of the leave policy, a seconded motion coming from Faculty Affairs, by noting that there had been considerable e-mail correspondence among the council leadership and university counsel’s office concerning Faculty Council’s discussion of section A-3 and the amendment Faculty Council had made to it. Danielle Hess, senior associate general counsel saw no problem with leaving out the first of Faculty Council’s excisions, “as recognized by Idaho state law,” but saw the second excision, “other than the relationship of spouse,” as being inconsistent with the “marriage amendment” to the state constitution, particularly its statement of purpose (for full text, see below). The upshot of these discussions had been the suggestion that that phrase be reinserted by footnoting the statement, “Due to the 2006 “marriage amendment” to the Idaho Constitution the university is unable to include domestic partnerships.” The chair also noted that he had been in contact with the senate presidents at the other state institutions of higher education in Idaho and all were interested in an on-going discussion of the issue and perhaps some sort of joint statement to the board in favor of providing benefits to domestic partners.

Linda Peavey, Director of Benefit Services, reiterated the Human Resources department’s desire to provide benefits to domestic partners and said that family medical leave benefits would be possible, under the form of sick leave, since a health crisis concerning one’s partner would provoke enough stress and anxiety in the employee to warrant his or her taking sick leave.
The council took up the possibility of establishing a second foundation to which contributions could be made to provide benefits for domestic partners, though the discussion was hampered by the lack of knowledge of possible legal and financial ramifications in setting up such a foundation.

It was moved and seconded (McCollough, Fritz) to ask the Faculty Affairs Committee to consider the possibility and practicability of establishing a special foundation to accept donations to cover benefits for domestic partners. In the subsequent discussion it was suggested that this foundation, if it were to come into being, might include all institutions of higher education or, indeed, all state employees. The motion carried with one abstention.

Returning to the leave policy itself, it was moved and seconded (Fritz, Odom) to accept the “new proposal” (i.e., the rewording that the council leadership and general counsel had proposed). A-3 would, under this amendment read:

Unless otherwise noted, for purposes of this policy, “immediate family member” includes: your spouse as recognized by Idaho State law, your child, parent, brother, sister, grandparent, and these same relationships of a spouse, by marriage, adoption, or foster arrangement. An immediate family member may also include an individual who has assumed a similar relationship to those above, other than the relationship of spouse*, and for whom the employee or individual has had financial responsibility. …

*Due to the 2006 “marriage amendment” to the Idaho Constitution, the university is unable to include domestic partnerships.

The debate on this amendment on how far the university should/could bend its cultural values in light of the constitution, whether a stronger statement was appropriate, even at the potential cost of a presidential veto of the whole draft leave policy, and whether this policy was the appropriate vehicle for making such a statement. As one consequence of the discussion the proposed amendment was itself amended (with the agreement of the mover and seconder) to read, “…the university, despite the wishes of the Faculty Council, is unable…”

The question was called and there being no further discussion the vote to accept the new amendment (with its friendly amendment) was nine to seven with three abstentions.

The council then turned to the other sections of the leave policy. Linda Peavey explained that the intent of the revisions was to make the policy congruent with current federal regulations and to make it more family-friendly. By friendly amendment C-3 was changed to read from, Sick-leave eligibility may be accumulated without limit to Sick-leave may be accumulated without limit. In the discussion it was noted that an employee returning from sick-leave might need accommodations in his or her job. Ms. Peavey said that such accommodations could be handled on a case-by-case basis. The motion, as amended, carried 13-1-3.

FC-08-014: FSH 3065, Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Opportunity Hiring and FC-08-015, FSH 3085, Recruitment Procedures for UI Employees: April Preston, Director of Employment Services, provided some background on this proposal to combine these two sections of the Handbook which was coming to Faculty Council as a seconded motion from Faculty Affairs. The revisions were to make the Handbook congruent with current federal and state law. Because there was so much redundancy between the two sections, the proposal was to combine them into one section. In the discussion it was noted that since the title of B-3 had been changed (from Protected Groups Definitions to Minorities and Persons of Color), there was no longer a definition for C-1-d’s line 5 protected-group organizations. By friendly amendment that phrase was changed to organizations representing the interests of minorities and
women. More than one councilor noted the irony that the university’s anti-discrimination statement was in clear conflict with its leave policy. The motion to accept the revisions to and combination of FSH 3065 and 3085 carried with two abstentions.

**FC-08-016: FSH 3520 H-2, Third-Year Review:** The provost provided some background on this proposal which also came to Faculty Council as a seconded motion from Faculty Affairs. The specifics being added to this section had previously been required by memo from his office. On balance it seemed better to include them in the *Handbook* for ease of reference. By friendly amendment it was agreed to create a cross-reference from 3570, the section dealing with professional portfolios to this section. The motion carried with two abstentions.

The council then turned to a number of seconded motions from the University Curriculum Committee.

**FC-08-020: NOI: Art & Architecture: Change BFA to BID Interior Design:** Rula Awwad-Rafferty, Associate Professor of Architecture and Interior Design, explained that the request to change the name of the degree was to bring this program into congruence with the other professional programs in the department. In response to a question she said that this change, if adopted, would mean that the program would be accredited by a different accrediting body but that that was not the driving force for the change. The motion carried unanimously.

**FC-08-019: NOI: Agricultural & Life Sciences: Discontinue Extension Nutrition Program Certificate:** There was no discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

**FC-08-018: NOI: College of Science, BS in Chemistry (forensics option):** Questions arose concerning possible costs of the new option. There being no representative from the department to answer them, further discussion was postponed until council’s next meeting.

**Adjournment:** It was moved and seconded (McDaniel, Wilson) to adjourn and return to the discussion of the unfinished portion of the agenda on November 27th. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Q. Adams,
Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Council
**IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**  
**ACADEMIC/PROFESSIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION**  
**NOTICE OF INTENT**  
To initiate a  
New, Expanded, Cooperative, Discontinued, program component or Off-Campus Instructional Program or Instructional/Research Unit  

**Institution Submitting Proposal:** University of Idaho  
**Name of College, School, or Division:** College of Graduate Studies  
**Name of Department(s) or Area(s):** Landscape Architecture, Architecture, Conservation Social Sciences, Civil Engineering, Political Science, Geography, Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology.  

Indicate if this Notice of Intent (NOI) is for an Academic or Professional Technical Program  
Academic ☒ Professional - Technical ☐  
A New, Expanded, Cooperative, Contract, or Off-Campus Instructional Program or Administrative/Research Unit (circle one) leading to:  
M.S. in Bioregional Planning and Community Design with emphasis in one of several areas: land use planning; environmental planning; economic development planning; transportation planning; public land planning; and housing, social and community development planning.  
(Degree or Certificate)  

**Proposed Starting Date:** Summer 2008  
**For New Programs:**  
Program (i.e., degree) Title & CIP 2000  
Program Component (major/minor/option/emphasis) ☒  
Off-Campus Activity/Resident Center ☐  
Instructional/Research Unit ☐  
Addition/Expansion ☐  
Discontinuance/consolidation ☐  
Contract Program ☐  
Other ☐  

**Dean signature on file**  
Margrit Von Braun, Dean CGS 8/28/2007  
**Chief Fiscal Officer (Institution)** Date  
**Chief Academic Officer (Institution)** Date  

**Revised 8/28/07**
Before completing this form, refer to Board Policy Section III.G. Program Approval and Discontinuance.

1. Briefly describe the nature of the request e.g., is this a new program (degree, program, or certificate) or program component (e.g., new, discontinued, modified, addition to an existing program or option).

As part of the Building Sustainable Communities Initiative: A New University and Community Partnership, The University of Idaho proposes a new Bioregional Planning and Community Design (BioP) program housed in the College of Graduate Studies. The initiative includes: 1) an academic program in bioregional planning and community design, including an interdisciplinary graduate degree, graduate certificate, and courses for other majors; 2) a Learning and Practice Collaborative that engages UI faculty and students to assist communities with sustainable community planning and development; and 3) a Collaborative for Effective Planning and Governance that delivers non-credit training to improve the competencies of local elected leaders and professionals to plan and manage community resources for sustainable futures.

The initiative requires approval of a new M.S. degree in Bioregional Planning and Community Design. The joint, interdisciplinary graduate degree program involves faculty from Conservation Social Sciences, Geography, Architecture, Landscape Architecture, Political Science, Environmental Science, Civil Engineering, Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Law, and UI Extension.

2. Provide a statement of need for program or a program modification. Include student and state need, demand, and employment potential. Attach a Scope and Sequence, SDPTE Form Attachment B, for professional-technical education requests. (Use additional sheets if necessary.).

The initiative is critical to Idaho for two reasons. First, Idaho was the nation’s third fastest growing state between 2004 and 2005. From 1990 to 2005, Idaho’s population increased by 41% to over 1.4 million residents, making it the fourth fastest growing state in the U.S. By 2050, urban and suburban development in Idaho is expected to double and quadruple, respectively, resulting in a loss of 4.5 million acres of ranch, farm, and open space land. Community leaders and professionals will need the skills and knowledge to guide this growth in a sustainable manner that preserves and enhances Idaho’s rich cultural and natural resources.

Second, while neighboring states offer planning degree programs, Idaho does not. Building upon the unique strengths of UI programs and faculty, and drawing on state-of-the-art practice from around the world, the initiative coordinates existing UI and statewide assets to create and implement internationally recognized programs in planning education, service learning, and community engagement.

3. Briefly describe how the institution will ensure the quality of the program (e.g., accreditation, professional societies, licensing boards, etc.).

The Planning Accreditation Board (PAB) has accredited educational programs leading to baccalaureate and master degrees in planning since 1984. The accreditation of U.S. planning programs is intended to foster high standards for professional education in planning.
planning accreditation program is a cooperative undertaking sponsored jointly by the American Institute of Certified Planners, the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, and the American Planning Association. “The planning accreditation program reflects an assumption that all parties to the planning enterprise - practitioners, educators, students, elected officials, and citizens - have a vital stake in the quality of the nation's programs of planning education” (Planning Accreditation Board 2006, 5).

The M.S. in Bioregional Planning and Community Design will be developed and implemented to ensure that after 5 years the program meets the five preconditions required for accreditation by the Planning Accreditation Board: 1) degrees granted to at least 25 students; 2) the program’s parent institution is accredited by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation or its successor organization; 3) the word “planning” is used in the title of both the program and degree; 4) for graduate students seeking a first professional degree in planning, a minimum of two academic years of full-time study or the equivalent is provided; and 5) the primary focus of the degree is on the preparation of professional planning practitioners.

In addition to the BioP program becoming fully accredited, many of the departments that will be offering the M.S. degree to their students have their own accrediting bodies.

4. Identify similar programs offered within the state of Idaho or in the region by other colleges/universities. If the proposed request is similar to another program, provide a rationale for the duplication. This may not apply to PTE programs if workforce needs within the respective region have been established.

Boise State University is currently in the process of developing a Notice of Intent for an M.S. degree and certificate in community and regional planning. We are in regular contact with this group and are coordinating our efforts. Much smaller in scale, at least initially, than the UI’s planning program, the BSU program will focus on issues and challenges related to urban planning. This makes sense given their location in the Boise metro area and the unique growth pressures experienced in that region. The UI program will complement the BSU program in its bioregional focus, and emphasis on engagement with local communities through the LPCs. In addition to the LPCs, the BioP program differs from the BSU effort with respect to an in-service professional development program for local elected and appointed officials and professional planners.

Table 3 lists universities in the West that offer masters degrees in planning. The majority of these programs focus on urban planning and train graduates to address issues related to city and regional concerns. The Bioregional Planning program at Utah State University is the most similar to the proposed program. However, in conversing with faculty heading the USU program, it is apparent that the USU program does not have the same level of institutional support, nor does it offer a certificate to non-planning majors or have a training component for elected officials.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Degree/Certificate</th>
<th>Accredited?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>Master of Science, Urban &amp; Environmental Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>Master of Science, Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Master of Science, Science, City &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cal Poly, Pomona</td>
<td>Master of Science, Urban &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Jose State University</td>
<td>Master of Science, Urban Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>Master of Science, City Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of California, Irvine</td>
<td>Master of Science, Urban &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>Master of Science, Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>Master of Science, Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>University of Colorado</td>
<td>Master of Science, Urban &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td>Certificate Program in Community &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>University of New Mexico</td>
<td>Master of Science, Community &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Master of Science, Planning</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>University of Nevada, Reno</td>
<td>Master of Science, Land Use Planning Policy</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>Master of Science, Urban &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>Master of Science, Community &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>Utah State University</td>
<td>Master of Science, Bioregional Planning</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>Master of Science, Urban Planning</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Eastern Washington University</td>
<td>Master of Science, Urban &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>Master of Science, Urban Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WY</td>
<td>University of Wyoming</td>
<td>Master of Science, Planning</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The UI BioP program will be distinguished from other university planning programs in two ways: 1) it incorporates a university-wide, interdisciplinary approach that fully integrates education and research with community engagement; and 2) it supports, promotes and advances bioregional planning, which is an integrated decision process that layers the geographic boundaries of watersheds and ecoregions with political, historical, economic and cultural knowledge to arrive at solutions that respond more effectively to a region’s limits, needs, and potentials.
Enrollment and Graduates (i.e., number of majors or other relevant data) By Institution for the Proposed Program. Last three years beginning with the current year and the 2 previous years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Relevant Enrollment Data</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Previous Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees offered by school/college or program(s) within disciplinary area under review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution and Degree name</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Specializations within the discipline (to reflect a national perspective)</th>
<th>Specializations offered within the degree at the institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Describe how this request is consistent with the State Board of Education's policy or role and mission of the institution. (i.e., centrality).

The SBOE's 8-Year Plan for Delivery of Academic Programs states that “the effectiveness of the [higher-education] system relates to the provision of courses and programs that respond to the identified needs of Idaho education stakeholders such as students and businesses. System efficiency relates to delivery of education and minimizes costs by avoiding unnecessary
duplication of programs and courses.” The creation of the BioP program has been the result of campus and Extension faculty, as well as statewide community stakeholders identifying the need for the only accredited planning program in the state. To ensure the program’s fit with the needs of Idaho’s citizens, between August and November 2006, nearly a dozen listening sessions were hosted in several locations across Idaho. These sessions gave stakeholders the opportunity to describe their community’s needs and to characterize the vital competencies required by our graduates if they are to become planners in their communities. Stakeholder input is being used to refine our understanding of how to link UI resources to community priorities. Furthermore, these developmental listening sessions are establishing credibility for the initiative locally, providing publicity about the initiative, and forming the basis for productive partnerships that will be developed.

Furthermore, in the 8-Year Plan, the SBOE explains that it is their intent to “optimize the delivery of academic programs while allowing institutions to grow and develop consistent with an appropriate alignment of strengths and sharing of resources.” The BioP program brings together eight academic departments/programs, seven UI colleges, UI Extension, and eight units/organizations in and outside UI in interdisciplinary graduate research, education, and outreach to Idaho’s communities to implement practices and policies that improve social, economic, and environmental conditions to strengthen and enhance quality of life. Faculty and staff resources are brought together from across the institution and engaged with local communities to find integrated solutions to real-world problems. The program builds on the strengths of campus and Extension faculty and enhances resource effectiveness by sharing professional, facility and research resources.

In addition to meeting the SBOE’s policies and missions for higher education, the BioP program meets and exceeds those for the University of Idaho. The UI’s mission states that it is “a land-grant institution committed to undergraduate and graduate-research education with extension services responsive to Idaho and the region’s business and community needs.” The academic programs emphasized at the UI are agriculture, forestry, mining and metallurgy, engineering, architecture, law, foreign languages, teacher preparation and international programs. In these specific focus areas, the UI offers a wide range of masters, doctoral and professional programs and also coordinates and conducts extensive research programs that are consistent with state needs. The interdisciplinary BioP program will contribute to the UI’s mission by providing graduate research-based education that is responsive to the needs of Idaho’s businesses and communities.

The BioP program also specifically relates to recent strategies developed at the UI. In 2004, the Vision and Resources Task Force identified seven strategic themes the university community should strive to promote:

1) Building Human Potential through Innovative Engagement
2) Creative and Performing Arts
3) Economic Development through Technology Transfer and New Venture Creation
4) Evolutionary Biology
5) Global and Regional Environmental Systems
The goals of the planning program are consistent with themes 1, 3, 5, 6, and 7. The program is also aligned with the Vision and Resource Task Forces' vision statement that the UI will “maintain strategically selected programs to serve and benefit the people of Idaho, the United States, and the world.” Program graduates will fill an important niche in the Intermountain West and have the knowledge and skills to be effective planners in other parts of the world. The initial focus of the program will be on Idaho. However, over time, the focus will be expanded to include regional, national and international opportunities.

6. Is the proposed program in the 8-year Plan? Indicate below.

   Yes [X]  No 

   If not on 8-year plan, provide a justification for adding the program.

8. Resources--Faculty/Staff/Space Needs/Capital Outlay. (Use additional sheets if necessary.):

   I. PLANNED STUDENT ENROLLMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. New enrollments</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Shifting enrollments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   II. EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Personnel Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Director</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty (2 in FY08, 4 in FY09)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Current Faculty (Reallocation)</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>$232,696</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Academic Coordinator (summer)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>$6,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Graduate/instructional Assistant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$128,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. LPC Coordinator</td>
<td>$23,400</td>
<td>$24,336</td>
<td>$25,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>$32,240</td>
<td>$33,530</td>
<td>$34,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Fringe (33% Admin. Asst, 38% others)</td>
<td>$199,611</td>
<td>$253,098</td>
<td>$310,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Total FTE Personnel & Costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$ 809,146</th>
<th>$ 1,003,557</th>
<th>$ 1,212,374</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Operating expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Travel</td>
<td>$ 4,680</td>
<td>$ 4,867</td>
<td>$ 5,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Computer services</td>
<td>$ 4,680</td>
<td>$ 4,867</td>
<td>$ 5,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Operating Budget</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td>$ 31,500</td>
<td>$ 33,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>$ 116,860</td>
<td>$ 139,034</td>
<td>$ 161,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Capital Outlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Library resources</td>
<td>$ 300</td>
<td>$ 300</td>
<td>$ 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Equipment (furnishings, computers, software)</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Outlay:</td>
<td>$ 30,300</td>
<td>$ 300</td>
<td>$ 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Physical facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction or major Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Indirect costs (overhead)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GRAND TOTAL EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$ 956,006</th>
<th>$ 1,142,591</th>
<th>$ 1,373,685</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### III. REVENUES

A. Source of funds

1. Appropriated funds – Reallocation | $ 333,333 | $ 333,333 | $ 333,333 |

   MCO (Strategic Initiative Grant)

2. Appropriated funds – New -MCO

3. Federal funds

4. Other grants

5. Fees (dedicated, summer, course, non-credit) | $ 39,471  | $ 67,259 | $ 84,421 |

6. Other: Indirect Returns | $ 10,500  | $ 14,000 | $ 19,250 |

7. New Faculty Commitments from Colleges | $ 153,615 | $ 319,519 | $ 498,450 |

8. Current Faculty Reallocations | $ 432,814 | $ 449,623 | $ 467,105 |

9. Community Matches for LPCs | $ 20,000   | $ 30,000 | $ 40,000 |

10. Grants, including NIATT startup support | $ 52,500   | $ 52,500 | $ 52,500 |

11. Project Donations | $ 9,500   | $ 14,000 | $ 19,250 |

### GRANT TOTAL REVENUES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$ 1,051,733</th>
<th>$ 1,280,234</th>
<th>$ 1,514,309</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

B. Nature of Funds

1. Recurring* | $ 718,400   | $ 946,901 | $ 1,180,976 |

2. Non-recurring** | $ 333,333 | $ 333,333 | $ 333,333 |

### GRAND TOTAL REVENUES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$ 1,051,733</th>
<th>$ 1,280,234</th>
<th>$ 1,514,309</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* Recurring is defined as ongoing operating budget for the program, which will become of the base.

** Non-recurring is defined as one-time funding in a fiscal year and not part of the base.
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Before completing this form, refer to "Board Policy Section III.G. Program Approval and Discontinuance.

1. Describe the nature of the request. For example, is this a request for a new on-campus program? Is this request for the expansion or extension of an existing program, or a new cooperative effort with another institution or business/industry or a contracted program costing greater than $150,000 per year? Is this program to be delivered off-campus or at a new branch campus? Attach any formal agreements established for cooperative efforts, including those with contracting party(ies). Is this request a substantive change as defined by the NWASC criteria?

The University of Idaho proposes a new Bioregional Planning and Community Design (BioP) program housed in the College of Graduate Studies. The program requires approval of a new M.S. degree in Bioregional Planning and Community Design. The M.S. degree is part of the larger Building Sustainable Communities Initiative (BSCI) funded by President White’s New Strategic Initiatives reinvestment program. In addition to the academic program, the initiative includes outreach to communities with sustainable community planning and development projects through the Learning and Practice Collaboratives (LPCs), and training for elected officials and professionals to plan and manage community resources for sustainable futures out of the Center for Effective Planning and Governance (CEPG). The new degree complements a parallel effort at Boise State University to establish a Masters in Community and Regional Planning. Our conversations are ongoing, our relationship is growing, and as our programs unfold we are committed to developing collaborative mechanisms that maximize complementarity and minimize duplication. Such a partnership would represent a new level of collaboration between our two institutions. Building on our strength areas, the focus of the UI program will be on sustainable planning, design, and utilizing UI Extension to conduct planning outreach with Idaho communities, leaders, and professionals.

This interdisciplinary graduate degree program involving faculty from Conservation Social Science; Geography; Architecture; Landscape Architecture; Political Science; Environmental Science; Civil Engineering; Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology; Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance; and UI Extension. Within UI, the program employs mechanisms similar to other interdisciplinary programs that fully engage departments and colleges. Each participating department/college will be represented on the Governance Board. The various specializations, which closely mirror those identified by the American Planning Association, will be closely aligned with the related department. For instance, the requirements for the sustainable transportation track will be recommended by the Civil Engineering Department and approved by the governing board. The program will offer several specializations including: land use planning; environmental planning; economic development planning; transportation planning; public land planning; and housing, social and community development planning. As with other university wide interdisciplinary programs, all degrees and certificates will be granted and counted as achievements by participating departments and colleges. Colleges and departments will utilize, promote and advertise program degrees and certificates within the guidelines established by program participants. Students will be counted in the department and college of their major professor/advisor, with all productivity referenced to the newly established Bioregional Program.

The program is also unique in the deep involvement of students in the interdisciplinary Learning and Practice Collaboratives (LPCs). From there first class, interdisciplinary student teams will be connected with an Idaho community via the LPCs. The LPC will serve as an integrating context for all of their learning, and in turn will result in planning and design solutions for those communities. The student will also be encouraged to continue their involvement with their LPC community in their thesis/project work.

The mission of the BioP academic program is to prepare future public leaders, create and disseminate new knowledge, and assist communities and organizations in planning for sustainable development, sustainable efficient conservation planning and management, and sustainable human quality-of-life within and across bioregions. A bioregional approach to planning layers the geographic boundaries of regional watersheds and eco-regions (a “bio-region”) with political, historical, economic, and cultural knowledge to arrive at solutions that respond more effectively to the limits and potentials of a region.1 To train students in bioregional planning, BioP faculty, staff, and students will work with communities through Learning and Practice Collaboratives (LPCs) to create

---

community-based plans, programs and policies that sustain and enhance their culture, resource base, built environment and economic vitality.

The overarching goal of the BSCI is to transform the University of Idaho into one of the top institutions in North America for producing quality graduates, conducting research, and engaging communities in the area of bioregional planning and community design. Additional objectives of the BioP program are to:

- Increase efficiencies by coordinating and integrating existing courses into the planning program;
- Create new courses and seminars designed to meet critical curricular gaps;
- Coordinate faculty hires across programs and departments to meet critical programmatic needs;
- Broaden research collaborations among campus and Extension faculty;
- Strengthen collaborations with communities, local, state, and federal governmental agencies;
- Enhance effectiveness of UI outreach programs;
- Educate students to effectively address complex planning and design issues in Idaho, the Intermountain West, and other parts of the world.

2. **Quality** – this section must clearly describe how this institution will ensure a high quality program. It is significant that the accrediting agencies and learned societies which would be concerned with the particular program herein proposed be named. Provide the basic criteria for accreditation and how your program has been developed in accordance with these criteria.

The Planning Accreditation Board (PAB) has accredited educational programs leading to baccalaureate and master degrees in planning since 1984. The accreditation of U.S. planning programs is intended to foster high standards for professional education in planning. The planning accreditation program is a cooperative undertaking sponsored jointly by the American Institute of Certified Planners, the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, and the American Planning Association. “The planning accreditation program reflects an assumption that all parties to the planning enterprise - practitioners, educators, students, elected officials, and citizens - have a vital stake in the quality of the nation's programs of planning education” (Planning Accreditation Board 2006, 5).

The M.S. in Bioregional Planning and Community Design will be developed and implemented to ensure that after 5 years the program meets the five preconditions required for accreditation by the Planning Accreditation Board (http://showcase.netins.net/web/pab_fi66/overview.htm):

1) degrees granted to at least 25 students;
2) the program’s parent institution is accredited by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation or its successor organization;
3) the word “planning” is used in the title of both the program and degree;
4) for graduate students seeking a first professional degree in planning, a minimum of two academic years of full-time study or the equivalent is provided; and
5) the primary focus of the degree is on the preparation of professional planning practitioners.

Once a program meets the five preconditions for accreditation, it can apply for candidacy status. If a program is advanced to candidacy status, it may apply for an initial accreditation review. Advancement to candidacy status occurs when the program demonstrates that it is ready in all respects to undergo initial accreditation review. The program must demonstrate this in general through its Application for Candidacy Status and in specific through its attached information in a Self-Study Report concerning substantial compliance with the accreditation criteria by which all programs are judged.

The accreditation criteria outlined by the Planning Accreditation Board are as follows:

1) Mission, Goals and Objectives
2) Institutional Relations
3) Academic Autonomy and Governance
4) Curriculum, which should cover the following 4 areas:
   a. Human settlement
   b. Historical and contemporary planning practice, policy and processes
   c. Skills to practice planning in a variety of venues and in ways that are consistent with ethical norms
   d. Values and ethical standards affecting the practice of planning
PAB Guideline 5.2.2 states that “to assure preparation of students for professional planning practice, the faculty should include a mix of individuals with credentials including accredited degrees in planning, significant experience in planning, PhDs in planning, degrees and experience in related fields, and membership in AICP.” PAB Guideline 5.5 states that “programs offering one degree for which accreditation is sought should have a minimum of five full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty.” Thus it will be a high priority of the program to hire a critical mass of BioP faculty with Ph.D. degrees and other degrees in planning, and experience in planning.

In addition to the BioP program becoming fully accredited, many of the departments that will be offering the M.S. degree to their students have their own accrediting bodies. These accrediting bodies are listed in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM</th>
<th>ACCREDITATION BODY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art &amp; Architecture</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>LAAB (Landscape Architecture Accred. Board)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>NAAB (National Architectural Accreditation Board)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>Conservation Social Science</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>ABET (Accreditation Board for Eng. &amp; Technology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters, Arts &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Life Sciences</td>
<td>Ag. Econ. &amp; Rural Sociology</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Health, Phys. Ed., Rec., and Dance</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Studies</td>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These departments do not have individual accreditation bodies

There are numerous professional and scholarly societies that current faculty and future faculty and students may participate. The three main organizations are the American Planning Association, the American Institute of Certified Planners, and the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning. Additional societies include, but are not limited to, the Society for American City and Regional Planning History, the Environmental Design Research Association, the Regional Science Association International, the Urban Affairs Association, the Urban and Regional Information Systems Association, the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture, the Association of Public Policy Analysis and Management, National Association of Schools of Public Administration and Affairs, and the American Society of Landscape Architects.

The M.S. program will be dedicated to the highest standards of scholarship, informed by theory and empirical evidence, and employ multiple thinking strategies such as problem solving, creative design processes, the scientific method, and critical thinking. While it is anticipated that new courses will be created, the program will also utilize a significant number of courses already present in several different programs. The curriculum and program requirements will be designed so that graduates will meet the American Institute of Certified Planners eligibility standards for becoming a certified planner. These standards include 1) being a current member of the American Planning Association (APA); 2) being engaged in professional planning, either currently or in the past; and 3) meeting the combination of education and corresponding years of professional planning experience (e.g., graduate degree in planning from a program accredited by PAB and 2 years professional planning experience).

In addition to preparing students to become professional planning practitioners, the academic program will advance the state of knowledge in the field of bioregional planning by engaging faculty and students in planning-related
research, the results of which will be shared with others through public and professional presentations, journal articles, technical reports, and other appropriate media. The program will also provide planning assistance to Idaho communities and rural areas through the LPCs, emphasizing the integration of bioregional planning process, methods, and theory with other substantive planning knowledge in actual applications of community and regional plan making and policy analysis.

Further, if this new program is a doctoral, professional, or research, it must have been reviewed by an external peer-review panel (see page 7, “Guidelines for Program Review and Approval). A copy of their report/recommendations must be attached.

Three sets of recommendation and review materials are attached: 1) Strategic Initiative recommendation letters (Attachment A), 2) UI Blue Ribbon Committee Summary Comments (Attachment B), and 2) External Review Proposal Ratings (Attachment C). The original strategic initiative proposal is available at the BSCI website - http://www.bioregionalplanning.uidaho.edu/

a. Curriculum – describe the listing of new course(s), current course(s), credit hours per semester, and total credits to be included in the proposed program.

The curriculum for the M.S. degree will provide a broad base in bioregional planning, while allowing students to select a specialization in one of several areas: land use planning; environmental planning; economic development planning; transportation planning; public lands planning; and housing, social and community development planning. The degree of M.S. in Bioregional Planning and Community Design requires 32 credits of course work, 8 to 10 studio credits, and 3 to 6 credits for a community-based project and professional paper, or thesis, for a total of 43 to 48 credits. A maximum of 12 credits may be transferred from another institution. The following sections summarize specific requirements for the M.S. degree.

**Master of Science with a major in Bioregional Planning and Community Design**

**Core Courses**
The following courses, equaling 34 to 39 credits, are required for all M.S. students:
- BioP 501 Seminar (2 cr)
- BioP 520 Bioregional Planning and Practice (3 cr)
- BioP 521 Planning History and Theory (3 cr)
- BioP 500 Master's Research and Thesis (no more than 10 credits) or BioP 599 Nonthesis Master's Research (no more than 5 credits)
- GIS Competency (3 cr.) – one of the following:
  - LArc 495 Computer-Aided Regional Landscape Planning (3 cr)
  - Geog 475 Advanced GIS (3 cr)
  - OR Demonstrated GIS competency (e.g., GIS certificate)
- Environmental Philosophy and Ethics (3 cr.) – one of the following:
  - Phil 457 Natural Resources Ethics (3 cr)
  - Phil 552 Environmental Philosophy (3 cr)
  - Phil 556 Religion and the Environment (3 cr)
  - Phil 571 Ecological Jurisprudence (3 cr)
  - PEP 570 Ethical Practice and Communication in Physical Activity
  - PEP 591 Moral Development in Physical Activity
- Policy and Economics (3 cr.) – one of the following:
  - Acct 530 Accounting for Public Sector Entities (3 cr)
  - Bus 413 Leadership and Organizational Behavior (3 cr)
  - Bus 462 Principles of Financial Planning (3 cr)
  - Law 944 Local Government and Land Use Law (3 cr) (with permission of instructor)
  - PolS 539 Public Policy (3 cr)
  - PolS 557 Governmental Budgeting (3 cr)
  - PolS 571 Intergovernmental Relations (3 cr)
  - PolS 572 Local Governmental Politics and Administration (3 cr)
- Research Methods (3 cr.) – one of the following:
CSS 506  Fundamentals of Research (4 cr)
For 510  Fundamentals of Research (3 cr)
PolS 556  Governmental Policy and Program Analysis (3 cr)
PEP 581  Research in Physical Activity, Theory, and Design (3 cr)

Landscape/Social Ecology (3 cr.) – one of the following:
For 429 Landscape Ecology (3 cr)
For 527 Landscape Ecology of Forests and Rangelands (3 cr)
WLF 440 Conservation Biology (3 cr)
PEP 532 Health and Community Development (3 cr)

Studio I (4-5 cr.) – one of the following:
Arch 553  Architectural Design VII (5 cr)
LArc 559 The Northern Rocky Regional Landscapes (4 cr)

Studio II (4-5 cr.) – one of the following:
Arch 553  Architectural Design VII (5 cr)
LArc 560 Cultural Interpretation of Regional Landscapes (4 cr)

**Area of Specialization** (9 cr.)
Core courses may count toward a student’s area of specialization once the core requirements are satisfied. The following list of courses is meant to guide students in their areas of specialization; this list will be revised and updated regularly. The initial list of recommended courses is provided below.

**Land Use Planning:**
- Geog 520 Land and Environment (3-6 cr, max 6)
- Geog 544 Environmental Assessment (4 cr)
- LArc 559 The Northern Rocky Regional Landscapes (4 cr)
- LArc 560 Cultural Interpretation of Regional Landscapes (4 cr)
- Law 944 Local Government and Land Use Law (3 cr)

**Environmental Planning:**
- CSS 573 Planning and Decision Making for Watershed Management (3 cr)
- EnvS 555 Environmental Planning (3 cr)
- EnvS 579 Introduction to Environmental Regulations (3 cr)
- Geog 420 Land, Resources and Environment (3 cr)
- Geog 544 Environmental Assessment (4 cr)
- Law 942 Water Law (3 cr)
- Law 947 Environmental Law I (3 cr)
- PolS 564 Environmental Politics and Policy (3 cr)

**Public Lands Planning:**
- AIST 401 Contemporary American Indian Issues (3 cr)
- Law 906 Seminar, Natural Resources Law and Policy (3 cr) (with permission of instructor)
- Law 937 Natural Resources Law and Legal History (3 cr) (with permission of instructor)
- Law 948 Public Land Law (3 cr) (with permission of instructor)
- Law 949 Indian Law (3 cr) (with permission of instructor)
- PolS 562 Natural Resource Policy
- CSS 571 Human Dimensions of Ecosystem Management
- CSS 572 Human Dimensions of Restoration Ecology
- EnvS 582 Natural Resource Policy and Law

**Economic Development Planning:**
- CSS 541 Issues of Renewable Natural Resources Industries (2 cr)
- Geog 550 Geography of Development (3-4 cr)
- Geog 409 Rural Development (3 cr)

**Transportation Planning:**
- CE 474 Traffic Systems Design (3 cr)
- CE 571 Traffic Flow Theory (3 cr)
- CE 573 Transportation Planning (3 cr)
- CE 574 Public Transportation (3 cr)
Collaborative Management
Comm 434  Advanced Dispute Management (3 cr)
Comm 436  Conflict Mediation (3 cr)
CSS 486  Public Involvement in Natural Resource Management (3 cr)
CSS 510  Applications of Communication Theory in Natural Resource Management (3 cr)
Law 917  Negotiation and Alternative Dispute Resolution (2 cr) (with permission of instructor)

Housing, Social and Community Development Planning
Arch 483  Urban Theory and Issues (3 cr)
Geog 330  Urban Geography (3-4 cr)
PolS 521  Political Leadership (3 cr)
PolS 554  Public Organizational Theory (3 cr)
H&S 535  Principles of Behavior Change

New Course Descriptions:

BioP 500  Master’s Research and Thesis (cr arr)

BioP 520  Bioregional Planning Theory and Practice (3 cr)
This class introduces first semester Bioregional Planning and Community Design students to bioregional planning concepts and current implementation practices.

BioP 521  Planning Theory and Process (3 cr)
This course is based on the premise that good planning practice should be grounded in good planning theory. Many of these theories are insightful attempts at understanding the unique historical conditions that have led to the rapid transformation of human society into an urban society in recent centuries. And many are accompanied by suggestions—some more useful than others—on how to exploit urbanization, guide it, tame it, moderate its impacts, and even reverse it. Public actions based on the more forceful theories sometimes changed development patterns in desirable ways. At other times they have made conditions worse, and many times they made no difference at all. Examining planning theories in an historical perspective is, therefore, a useful exercise for those of us searching for a solid theoretical foundation for our planning practice today.

BioP 599  (s) Non-thesis Master’s Research (cr arr)

b. Faculty – include the names of full-time faculty as well as adjunct/affiliate faculty involved in the program. Also, give the names, highest degree, rank and specialty. In addition, indicate what percent of an FTE position each faculty will be assigned to the program. Are new faculty required? If so, explain the rationale including qualifications.

Twenty-seven faculty from eight departments and colleges will participate in the BioP program, holding faculty status in one of nine departments in eight colleges. Participating faculty are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. List of BioP Program Faculty at the University of Idaho.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (%FTE)</th>
<th>Department/Unit</th>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Drown (25% yr. 1, 10% thereafter)</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>Community Design</td>
<td>MLA</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Hollenhorst (25% yr. 1, 10% thereafter)</td>
<td>Conservation Social Sciences</td>
<td>Protected Areas Policy</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul McCawley (15% yr. 1, 7.5% thereafter)</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>Extension Outreach/Rangeland Ecology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Assoc. Dir., UI Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorie Higgins (15% yr. 1, 5% thereafter)</td>
<td>Ag. Econ &amp; Rural Sociology</td>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Assist. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Kyte (10% yr. 1, 5% thereafter)</td>
<td>National Institute for Advanced Transportation Technology</td>
<td>Transportation Planning</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Pinel (100%)</td>
<td>Conservation Social Sciences</td>
<td>Land Use Planning</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammi Laninga (100% of .5 FTE appointment)</td>
<td>Conservation Social Sciences</td>
<td>Land Use Planning</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy McClure (23.5% yr. 1, 1% thereafter)</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Community Design</td>
<td>MArch</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harley Johansen (15% yr. 1, 5% thereafter)</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Crowley (5%)</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Law and Social Change</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Sanyal (5%)</td>
<td>Conservation Social Sciences</td>
<td>Human Dimensions</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry McKibben (50%)</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Community Design</td>
<td>MArch</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William McLaughlin (10%)</td>
<td>Conservation Social Sciences</td>
<td>Conservation Planning</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Schneplf (25 yr. 1, 10% thereafter)</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>Community Forestry</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Assist. Ext. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Austin (10%)</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>Community Design</td>
<td>MLA</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Harris (10%)</td>
<td>Conservation Social Sciences</td>
<td>Env. Mgt. Policy and Planning</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Dezzani (10%)</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Spatial Geography</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdasue Steele (5%)</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Assist. Ext. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priscilla Salant (5%)</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Research Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Wilson (10%)</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Environmental Policy</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Young (10%)</td>
<td>Career &amp; Professional Planning Sociology/CSS</td>
<td>Environmental Policy</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Adj. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Dixon (10%)</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>Transportation Planning</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rula Awwad-Rafferty (10%)</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Interior Design Planning</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tracy (5%)</td>
<td>IWRRI</td>
<td>Water Resources</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Whiteman (10%)</td>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>International Env. Policy</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Adj. Assoc. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Paul (25%)</td>
<td>HPERD</td>
<td>Physical Activity Behavior</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Assist. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Eisenbarth (10%)</td>
<td>HPERD</td>
<td>Health Planning</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Assist. Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Watson (100%)</td>
<td>Ag. Econ. &amp; rural Sociology</td>
<td>NR Economics</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Assist. Prof.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to meet accreditation standards up to six new faculty with PhDs from accredited planning programs will be hired by the participating departments. These new faculty will be the core group that supports the M.S. degree, the LPCs and the CEPG.

Faculty involvement in the BioP program will consist of teaching courses in bioregional planning and community design; engaging students and communities in participatory research and mutual learning that creates community-based plans, programs and policies that sustain and enhance Idaho communities’ culture, resource base, built environment and economic vitality; and serving on graduate committees of M.S. students in the program.

The BioP program will be housed as an autonomous unit under the College of Graduate Studies and jointly administered by a Management Board representing the participating units (Figure 1). As other departments and units join the program, a representative from that unit will be added to the Management Board. The resulting program will have sufficient autonomy, suitable governance, and competent leadership to support and advance the program's goals and objectives, and to enhance the program's overall quality.

c. Students – briefly describe the students who would be matriculating into this program.

Students enrolling in the proposed BioP program will have a variety of backgrounds ranging from bachelor's in planning, environmental design, architecture, geography, sociology, engineering, public administration, political science, history and other degrees. Because the M.S. degree in BioP will give students the ability to become certified planners, it is also assumed that some students enrolling in the program may be returning to school after spending several years working in the areas of planning or community development.

Students enrolling in the M.S. degree program will have bachelor degrees from a four-year institution. We are committed to the development and maintenance of rigorous selection and retention standards. Students applying for the Masters program will be expected to have completed a bachelor’s degree. The undergraduate degree expectations will differ depending on area of specialization. For instance, students interested in working with Civil Engineering faculty in the area of sustainable transportation planning may be required to have an undergraduate
degree in civil engineering, transportation engineering, or related field. On the other hand, students with a general interest in community and regional planning may come with varied backgrounds, from humanities and the arts to the sciences.

Students will be admitted through a competitive process involving a review of their academic and work history, GRE scores, references, writing sample, and research goals. It is expected that most students will be enrolled full-time, with a small portion participating in the program on a part-time basis. The BioP program will be offered state-wide. For students residing in any of the off-campus locations in Boise, Twin Falls, Idaho Falls, or Coeur d’Alene, they will participate in the common course elements of the program either by traveling to the Moscow campus or using distance-learning technology.

Figure 1: Organizational Chart for the Bioregional Planning and Community Design Program

d. Infrastructure support – clearly document the staff support, teaching assistance, graduate students, library, equipment and instruments employed to ensure program success.

Management Board, Director/Program Head, and Staff: The BioP program, and the larger Building Sustainable Communities Initiative, will be administered by a management board, director/program head, and an administrative assistant, and two coordinators. The management board will be composed of faculty representatives from seven colleges involved in the program. For the first four years the director/program head (1.0 FTE), an administrative assistant (1.0FTE), and a LPC/CEPG coordinator will be supported through the Building Sustainable Communities Initiative. The Director will report to the Management Board, and will be responsible for the oversight of all three initiative components: the academic program, the LPC, and the CEPG. A staff-level person will also be hired as the coordinator of both the LPC and CEPG. A full-time administrative assistant will be hired as the program financial and office manager and an Extension program coordinator will be hired to coordinate the involvement of UI Extension.
Graduate Assistantships:
The Building Sustainable Communities Initiative provides funds for four years to support five full-time students at $16,000 each. Additional assistantships will be offered based on faculty’s ability to secure grant funding.

Support Personnel:
Support staff, faculty and scientists working for faculty at the University of Idaho will provide assistance to graduate students in the BioP program as they do to students currently enrolled in respective graduate programs across campus.

Library:
Current space, personnel and books in the University of Idaho library are adequate to support the Bioregional Planning and Community Design degree. However, there are three journals that should be added to the current list of planning-related journals available at the library. These journals are: Environment and Planning A: Urban & Regional; Journal of Planning Education and Research; and Journal of Planning Literature. Six additional journals would also contribute to the program, including: Environment & Planning C: Government & Policy; Journal of Architectural and Planning Research; Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning; International Planning Studies; Planning Theory; and State and Local Government Review. Many of these journals are available at WSU, so it may not be necessary to acquire them all.

Equipment and Instruments:
No new facilities, equipment or technology will be required to initiate the BioP program. Each of the departments hiring new faculty have existing office space for the new hires. Furthermore, existing faculty participating in the program will continue to utilize the research facilities available to them at the University of Idaho. Classroom facilities at the UI campuses are adequate to deliver courses. Studio space is available, but has not been formally dedicated to the program. The BioP program is working with deans and department heads to find space in collaboration with other programs. The BioP program will initially share office space with Landscape Architecture in the College of Art and Architecture, Room 209. No renovation costs are required to occupy this space.

e. Future plans – discuss future plans for the expansion or off-campus delivery of the proposed program.

Faculty housed at all University of Idaho campuses (Boise, Idaho Falls, Twin Falls, and Coeur d’Alene), as well as other Idaho institutions (i.e., Boise State University and Idaho State University) are committed to statewide integration of research, education, and outreach in planning and community design, to develop a coordinated statewide strength in this critical area. Faculty participating in the proposed Bioregional Planning and Community Design program support statewide integration and the proposed program contributes to these integrating efforts (see below under 3. Duplication).

3. Duplication – if this program is unique to the state system of higher education, a statement to that fact is needed. However, if the program is a duplication of an existing program in the system, documentation supporting the initiation of such a program must be clearly stated along with evidence of the reason(s) for the necessary duplication. Describe the extent to which similar programs are offered in Idaho, the Pacific Northwest and states bordering Idaho. How similar or dissimilar are these programs to the program herein proposed?

Simultaneous with this UI proposal, Boise State University is advancing a proposal to create a Masters in Community and Regional Planning. Together, the two programs represent the first planning degree programs in the State of Idaho. This will provide opportunities for collaboration with the University of Idaho BSCI program. Our conversations are ongoing, our relationship is growing, and as our programs unfold we are committed to developing collaborative mechanisms that maximize complimentary and minimize duplication. Such a partnership would represent a new level of collaboration between our two institutions. The UI program will complement the Boise State program in its bioregional focus, and emphasis on partnering with the UI Extension system to engage with local communities through the LPCs. The UI program also integrates Extension into the delivery of an in-service professional development program for local elected and appointed officials and professional planners.

Specifically, Boise State University course offerings will be available to UI students enrolled in the graduate architecture program and the proposed M.S. in Bioregional Planning & Community Design program. Course
offerings by UI faculty resident at the Idaho Urban Research and Design Center (IURDC) in Boise, along with selected online UI courses, will be available to Boise State University students enrolled in the Community and Regional Planning program. Courses that UI teaches are listed in Appendix B. A list of additional courses that UI teaches is provided in Appendix B as well. New courses or courses not included in either of these lists that could apply to the Master of Community and Regional Planning Masters at Boise State University in the future will be reviewed and approved by both programs prior to being adopted and taught to avoid duplication into the future.

Table 3 lists universities in the West that offer masters degrees in planning. The majority of these programs focus on urban planning and train graduates to address issues related to city and regional concerns. The Bioregional Planning program at Utah State University is the most similar to the proposed program. However, in conversing with faculty heading the USU program, it is apparent that the USU program does not have the same level of institutional support, nor does it offer a certificate to non-planning majors or have a training component for elected officials.

Table 3. Planning Programs at Western Universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Degree/Certificate</th>
<th>Accredited?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>Master of Science, Urban &amp; Environmental Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>Master of Science, Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Master of Science, Science, City &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cal Poly, Pomona</td>
<td>Master of Science, Urban &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Jose State University</td>
<td>Master of Science, Urban Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>Master of Science, City Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of California, Irvine</td>
<td>Master of Science, Urban &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>Master of Science, Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>Master of Science, Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>University of Colorado</td>
<td>Master of Science, Urban &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td>Certificate Program in Community &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>University of New Mexico</td>
<td>Master of Science, Community &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>University of Nevada, Reno</td>
<td>Master of Science, Land Use Planning Policy</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>Master of Science, Urban &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>Master of Science, Community &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>Utah State University</td>
<td>Master of Science, Bioregional Planning</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>Master of Science, Urban Planning</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Eastern Washington University</td>
<td>Master of Science, Urban &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>Master of Science, Urban Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WY</td>
<td>University of Wyoming</td>
<td>Master of Science, Planning</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The UI BioP program will be distinguished from other university planning programs in two ways: 1) it incorporates a university-wide, interdisciplinary approach that fully integrates education and research with community engagement; and 2) it supports, promotes and advances bioregional planning, which is an integrated decision process that layers the geographic boundaries of watersheds and ecoregions with political, historical, economic health, and cultural knowledge to arrive at solutions that respond more effectively to a region’s limits, needs, and potentials.
4. **Centrality** – documentation ensuring that program is consistent with the Board’s policy on role and mission is required. In addition, describe how the proposed program relates to the Board’s current Statewide Plan for Higher Education as well as the institution’s long-range plan.

The State Board of Education’s mission for higher education in the State of Idaho is to promote institutions that “provide a wide variety of educational, training, research, continuing education and service programs to meet the personal and professional needs of Idaho citizens and Idaho employers.” The BioP program aids the SBOE in meeting the goals of its mission by providing a rich and diverse educational, training, and research opportunity for the citizens of Idaho. Furthermore, it will produce certified planners who can assist in the thoughtful and sustainable design and development of Idaho communities.

The SBOE’s 8-Year Plan for Delivery of Academic Programs states that “the effectiveness of the [higher-education] system relates to the provision of courses and programs that respond to the identified needs of Idaho education stakeholders such as students and businesses. System efficiency relates to delivery of education and minimizes costs by avoiding unnecessary duplication of programs and courses.” The creation of the BioP program has been the result of campus and Extension faculty, as well as statewide community stakeholders identifying the need for the only accredited planning program in the state. To ensure the program’s fit with the needs of Idaho’s citizens, between August and November 2006, nearly a dozen listening sessions were hosted in several locations across Idaho. These sessions gave stakeholders the opportunity to describe their community’s needs and to characterize the vital competencies required by our graduates if they are to become planners in their communities. Stakeholder input is being used to refine our understanding of how to link UI resources to community priorities. Furthermore, these developmental listening sessions are establishing credibility for the initiative locally, providing publicity about the initiative, and forming the basis for productive partnerships that will be developed.

Furthermore, in the 8-Year Plan, the SBOE explains that it is their intent to “optimize the delivery of academic programs while allowing institutions to grow and develop consistent with an appropriate alignment of strengths and sharing of resources.” The BioP program brings together nine academic departments/programs, eight UI colleges, UI Extension, and eight units/organizations in and outside UI in interdisciplinary graduate research, education, and outreach to Idaho’s communities to implement practices and policies that improve social, economic, health and environmental conditions to strengthen and enhance quality of life. Faculty and staff resources are brought together from across the institution and engaged with local communities to find integrated solutions to real-world problems. The program builds on the strengths of campus and Extension faculty and enhances resource effectiveness by sharing professional, facility and research resources.

In addition to meeting the SBOE’s policies and missions for higher education, the BioP program serves the mission and strategic plan for the University of Idaho. The UI’s mission states that it is “a land-grant institution committed to undergraduate and graduate-research education with extension services responsive to Idaho and the region’s business and community needs.” The academic programs emphasized at the UI are agriculture, forestry, mining and metallurgy, engineering, architecture, law, foreign languages, teacher preparation and international programs. In these specific focus areas, the UI offers a wide range of masters, doctoral and professional programs and also coordinates and conducts extensive research programs that are consistent with state needs. The interdisciplinary BioP program will contribute to the UI’s mission by providing graduate research-based education that is responsive to the needs of Idaho’s businesses and communities.

The BioP program also specifically relates to recent strategies developed at the UI. In 2004, the Vision and Resources Task Force identified seven strategic themes the university community should strive to promote:

1. Building Human Potential through Innovative Engagement
2. Creative and Performing Arts
3. Economic Development through Technology Transfer and New Venture Creation
4. Evolutionary Biology
5. Global and Regional Environmental Systems
6. Natural Resources Protection and Resource Development
7. Sustainable Agriculture
The goals of the planning program are consistent with themes 1, 3, 5, 6, and 7. The program is also aligned with the Vision and Resource Task Forces’ vision statement that the UI will “maintain strategically selected programs to serve and benefit the people of Idaho, the United States, and the world.” Program graduates will fill an important niche in the Intermountain West and have the knowledge and skills to be effective planners in other parts of the world. The initial focus of the program will be on Idaho. However, over time, the focus will be expanded to include regional, national and international opportunities.

Furthermore, the program specifically addresses two of the seven core values identified by the Vision and Resource Task Force report. The program fosters the creation of a “barrier-free community” through its collaborative nature by encouraging “productive, unhindered interaction between disciplines” and “interdisciplinary instructional, research, and outreach activities.” The BioP program also aims to “make a difference” to the people of Idaho, the nation, and the world through its community-based participatory nature by enhancing the “scholarly, economic and environmental” impact in local communities, promoting “public discourse” about important issues, and cultivating “an educated and involved citizenry.”

The BioP program also directly relates to three of President White’s five thematic areas of excellence for the University, which are “Stewarding the Environment,” “Understanding Sustainable Design and Life Style,” and “Catalyzing Entrepreneurial Innovation.”

Finally, the program is consistent with both the UI Research Office’s Action Plan and the UI’s land-grant mission. The Research Office’s Action Plan encourages “faculties that cross disciplinary boundaries to enhance scholarly activity.” The BioP program, drawing on the strengths of eight colleges and nine academic departments directly fulfills this goal. Furthermore, the program will serve as a model of effective land grant engagement with citizens of the state through the LPC. The LPC will serve as a vehicle to engage the university to assist communities in fulfilling their visions for sustainable growth. The LPC will bring together of faculty, students, and the people and institutions in Idaho communities and tribes, to work together to improve quality of life and build sustainable futures. The collaboratives will bring to communities research-based knowledge and problem-solving expertise related to a variety of sustainability issues, but will contribute particularly to the application of bioregional planning and sustainable design principles.

The bioregional approach to planning and community design promoted by the M.S. degree considers the ecological functions and human settlement patterns of a region, builds more inclusive civic constituency, and emphasizes regional resources and energy sources in an effort to inform community and economic development policy and design. As a result, the program adheres to all the SBOE and the University of Idaho missions and strategic plans and goals at some level. The BioP program, building upon the unique strengths of UI programs and faculty, will coordinate existing UI and statewide assets to create and implement an internationally recognized program in planning education, service learning, and community engagement.

5. Demand – address student, regional and statewide needs.

a. Summarize the needs assessment that was conducted to justify the proposal. The needs assessment should address the following: statement of the problem/concern; the assessment team/the assessment plan (goals, strategies, timelines); planning data collection; implementing data collection; dissemination of assessment results; program design and on-going assessment. (See the Board’s policy on outcome assessment.)

Idaho was the nation’s third fastest growing state between 2004 and 2005 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006). From 1990 to 2005, Idaho’s population increased by 41% to over 1.4 million residents, making it the fourth fastest growing state in the U.S. Kootenai and Canyon counties grew more than 75% and the state’s immigrant population more than doubled. The Census Bureau projects that by 2030 population will increase by 52%. By 2050, urban and suburban development is expected to double and quadruple, respectively, resulting in a loss of 4.5 million acres of ranch, farm, and open space land. This growth will be accompanied by increased energy consumption (Idaho already leads the Northwest in per capita consumption), and a projected three-fold increase in municipal water use.

The effects of rapid growth are not limited to metropolitan counties. Boise County, considered rural in 1990, has grown by 95%, with more than a third of its workforce now commuting to Ada and Canyon Counties. Increasingly,
Communities across Idaho are struggling to deal with the transportation impacts of new residential and community development, and to incorporate state transportation initiatives into their comprehensive plans. Concurrently, the economies and populations of many rural communities are stagnant or shrinking. While urban school systems are unable to build facilities fast enough to accommodate the flood of new students, many rural districts have adopted a 4-day school week to offset lost revenues and shrinking student numbers.

Approximately 66% of Americans between 20 and 74 yrs are considered overweight or obese, which represents a 30% increase in less than 30 years. In children between the ages of 6 and 19 yrs, 17% are considered overweight, a 37% increase in less than 15 yrs. State-wide surveys of obesity taken between 1991 and 2006 indicate that Idaho is generally ranked in the middle third in the nation. Nation-wide medical expenditures due to overweight and obesity are estimated at approximately $75 billion per year ($227 million of that total from Idaho). Recent literature indicates that the physical design of communities (urban, suburban, and rural) may be contributing increased incidences of overweight and obesity, through reduced opportunities for physical activity and/or access to healthy foods. Given the significant health care costs and loss of quality of life associated with weight gain and obesity, the BioP degree program and the Building Sustainable Communities Initiative will institute a multidisciplinary approach to address this issue from a perspective unique to UI.

Along with these demographic changes, the roles, responsibilities, and structure of local government are changing and becoming more complex. Today’s community leaders must consider the changing views of the role of government, new technologies, devolution of public services, citizen demands for control of public spending, performance review, and privatization of many public functions. The responsibilities assigned to these officials range from public health to public transportation, criminal justice, sewage treatment, and protecting quality of life. They must set public policy, collect and direct use of public funds, decide who can develop land where and for what purpose, administer the organizational structure of government, manage personnel, and manage risk within their counties and communities; all while being responsive to a wide-variety of state and federal mandates.

Given the growing complexity of administering the public trust, public officials increasingly need special knowledge, skills and leadership abilities to plan and manage their communities to be economically, environmentally, and socially sustainable. In addition, many problems these leaders face are not just local problems, but ones created when both local and state governmental units are not prepared, do not work together effectively, and do not have mechanisms to jointly deal with development pressure.

Despite a rapidly growing, migrating, and diversifying population, along with the increasingly complex demands placed on local officials, none of Idaho’s higher education institutions have programs that prepare professional planners; nor are there any significant programs preparing other professionals or community leaders and elected officials with the planning skills they need to be effective community leaders.

To address the challenges facing Idaho, and many other Western states, the M.S. in Bioregional Planning and Community Design will prepare new professionals with cutting edge planning knowledge and skills. Furthermore, the program will facilitate UI faculty and student engagement with communities in participatory research and mutual learning that fosters sustainable community planning, design and development. Finally, it will build on important work already occurring at UI and other Idaho higher education institutions, including: 1) increasing efforts within several academic departments and Extension to assist communities with planning and other development challenges, 2) the establishment of the UI Urban Research and Design Center (URDC) in Boise, and 3) emergence of a critical mass of faculty research and service learning activity in the area of collaborative community development.

Another way to assess demand is to look at enrollment in graduate planning programs in other states. Table 3 includes enrollment in masters planning programs at Universities in the contiguous Western states. These enrollment figures affirm the opportunity and need for graduate planning programs in Idaho. Demand in Idaho is further increased by the fact that many municipalities and counties have only recently begun establishing planning offices. The challenge in coming decades will be to provide a sufficient pool of qualified planners for these planning offices as they build their capacity to deal with the tremendous growth projected for their communities.
Table 3. States, State Population and 2005/6 Enrollment in Masters Planning Programs at Western Universities (including both accredited and non-accredited programs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>M.S. Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>6,166,318</td>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Arizona University</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>36,457,549</td>
<td>Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cal Poly, Pomona</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego State U.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Jose State University</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of California, Irvine</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>4,753,377</td>
<td>University of Colorado at Denver</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>1,466,465</td>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td>Certificate only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>1,954,599</td>
<td>University of New Mexico</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>944,632</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>2,495,529</td>
<td>University of Nevada, Reno</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>3,700,758</td>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>2,550,063</td>
<td>Utah State University</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>6,395,798</td>
<td>Eastern Washington University</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WY</td>
<td>515,004</td>
<td>University of Wyoming</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Students – explain the most likely source of students who will be expected to enroll (full-time, part-time, outreach, etc.). Document student demand by providing information you have about student interest in the proposed program from inside and outside the institution. Differentiate between the projected enrollment of new students and those expected to shift from other program(s) within the institution.

Students enrolling in the proposed BioP program will have a baccalaureate degree from an accredited four-year institution. Prospective students currently employed by government agencies and in the private sector can enroll as part-time students. Full and part-time students will have access to courses offered at all University of Idaho campuses and through distance learning options (e.g., internet and compressed video). A number of the courses listed for the program have a distance learning option; additional courses will be offered this way in the future.

Since the Building Sustainable Communities Initiative’s proposal was selected for funding in April 2006 by President White, interest in the Bioregional Planning and Community Design degree has been high. Numerous prospective students have inquired with Graduate Studies, Graduate Admissions, and professors in the eight sponsoring departments about the M.S. degree. According to an administrator in Graduate Admissions, one prospective student has applied to the program, which has yet to be officially offered. It is assumed that a small number of current students may shift into the new program from existing programs at the University of Idaho. However, overall the majority of students enrolling in the program will be new students.
c. Expansion or extension – if the program is an expansion or extension of an existing program, describe the nature of that expansion or extension. If the program is to be delivered off-campus, summarize the rationale and needs assessment.

The M.S. degree in Bioregional Planning and Community Design will be the only planning degree offered in the State of Idaho. The program, once established, will be available to students on all the University of Idaho campuses including Boise, Idaho Falls, Twin Falls and Coeur d’Alene. In some cases, courses at these other campuses may be offered utilizing distance learning technologies. However these students will have the same opportunity to participate in the Learning and Practice Collaborative research opportunities that Moscow campus-based students and faculty will be engaged in. This is due to the fact that LPC projects will be selected throughout the state and will be closely linked with UI-Extension faculty and programs.

6. Resources – fiscal impact and budget. On this form, indicate the planned FTE enrollment, estimated expenditures, and projected revenues for the first three fiscal years (FY) of the program. Include both the reallocation of existing resources and anticipated or requested new resources. Second and third year estimates should be in constant dollars. Amounts should reflect explanations of subsequent pages. If the program is a contract related, explain the fiscal sources and the year-to-year commitment from the contracting agency(ies) or party(ies).

I. PLANNED STUDENT ENROLLMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. New enrollments</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Shifting enrollments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Personnel Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Director</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty (2 in FY08, 4 in FY09)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Current Faculty (Reallocation)</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>$232,696</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Academic Coordinator (summer)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>$ 6,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Graduate/instructional Assistant</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>$232,696</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. LPC Coordinator</td>
<td>$ 23,400</td>
<td>$ 24,336</td>
<td>$ 25,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>$ 32,240</td>
<td>$ 33,530</td>
<td>$ 34,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Fringe (33% Admin. Asst, 38% others)</td>
<td>$ 199,611</td>
<td>$ 253,098</td>
<td>$ 310,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FTE Personnel &amp; Costs:</td>
<td>$ 809,146</td>
<td>$ 1,003,557</td>
<td>$ 1,212,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Operating expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Travel</td>
<td>$ 4,680</td>
<td>$ 4,867</td>
<td>$ 5,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Computer services</td>
<td>$ 4,680</td>
<td>$ 4,867</td>
<td>$ 5,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Operating Budget</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td>$ 31,500</td>
<td>$ 33,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Materials &amp; supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rentals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Repairs &amp; maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Materials &amp; goods for manufacture &amp; resale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Graduate Student Recruitment</td>
<td>$ 7,500</td>
<td>$ 7,800</td>
<td>$ 8,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sub-Awards: LPC Projects</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
<td>$ 40,000</td>
<td>$ 60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Faculty Startup Packages</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>$ 116,860</td>
<td>$ 139,034</td>
<td>$ 161,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Capital Outlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Library resources</td>
<td>$15000</td>
<td>$ 300</td>
<td>$ 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Equipment (furnishings, computers, software)</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Outlay:</td>
<td>$ 30,300</td>
<td>$ 300</td>
<td>$ 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Physical facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction or major Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Indirect costs (overhead)

GRAND TOTAL EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$956,006</td>
<td>$1,142,591</td>
<td>$1,373,685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. REVENUES

A. Source of funds

1. Appropriated funds -- Reallocation
   MCO (Strategic Initiative Grant)
   $333,333

2. Appropriated funds -- New MCO

3. Federal funds

4. Other grants

5. Fees (dedicated, summer, course, non-credit) $39,471

6. Other: Indirect Returns $10,500

7. New Faculty Commitments from Colleges $153,615

8. Current Faculty Reallocations $432,814

9. Community Matches for LPCs $20,000

10. Grants, including NIATT startup support $52,500

11. Project Donations $9,500

GRANT TOTAL REVENUES:

$1,051,733

B. Nature of Funds

1. Recurring* $718,400

2. Non-recurring** $333,333

GRAND TOTAL REVENUES: $1,051,733

* Recurring is defined as ongoing operating budget for the program which will become part of the base.

** Non-recurring is defined as one-time funding in a fiscal year and not part of the base.

a. Faculty and Staff Expenditures

Project for the first three years of the program, the credit hours to be generated by each faculty member (full-time and part-time), graduate assistant, and other instructional personnel. Also indicate salaries. After total student credit hours, convert to an FTE student basis. Please provide totals for each of the three years presented. Salaries and FTE students should reflect amounts shown on budget schedule. Project the need and cost for support personnel and any other personnel expenditures for the first three years of the program.

Staff support for the Bioregional Planning and Community Design program includes a part-time (50%) administrative assistant, a full-time LPC Coordinator, a full-time Extension Coordinator, and summer salary for an Academic Coordinator. Funds for these positions are provided through the Building Sustainable Communities Initiative. See section “e” below for how these positions will be funded past the initiative grant.

FACULTY EXPENDITURES (INSTRUCTIONAL) for FY08 - FY10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Annual Salary Rate</th>
<th>FTE to Program</th>
<th>Program Salary Dollars</th>
<th>Student Cr. Hrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>FY08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Drown</td>
<td>$91,395</td>
<td>$95,051</td>
<td>$98,853</td>
<td>.25 yr. 1., .1 after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Hollenhorst</td>
<td>$103,979</td>
<td>$108,138</td>
<td>$112,464</td>
<td>.25 yr. 1., .1 after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul McCawley</td>
<td>$101,878</td>
<td>$105,953</td>
<td>$110,191</td>
<td>.15 yr. 1., .075 after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorie Higgins</td>
<td>$56,472</td>
<td>$58,731</td>
<td>$61,080</td>
<td>.15 yr. 1., .05 after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Kyte</td>
<td>$110,864</td>
<td>$115,299</td>
<td>$119,911</td>
<td>.10 yr. 1., .05 after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy McClure</td>
<td>$82,784</td>
<td>$86,095</td>
<td>$89,539</td>
<td>.25 yr. 1., .1 after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harley Johansen</td>
<td>$100,984</td>
<td>$105,023</td>
<td>$109,224</td>
<td>.15 yr. 1., .05 after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Crowley</td>
<td>$89,065</td>
<td>$92,628</td>
<td>$96,333</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Sanyal</td>
<td>$50,668</td>
<td>$52,695</td>
<td>$54,803</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry McKibben</td>
<td>$50,585</td>
<td>$52,608</td>
<td>$54,713</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William McLaughlin</td>
<td>$75,233</td>
<td>$78,242</td>
<td>$81,372</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### STAFF EXPENDITURES FY 07-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Position</th>
<th>Annual Salary Rate</th>
<th>FTE Assigned to Program</th>
<th>Program Salary Dollars</th>
<th>Percent of Salary Dollars to Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>FY08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Assistant</td>
<td>$32,240</td>
<td>$33,530</td>
<td>$34,871</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC Coordinator</td>
<td>$23,400</td>
<td>$24,336</td>
<td>$25,310</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Coordinator</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$28,100</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### b. Administrative Expenditures

Describe the proposed administrative structure necessary to ensure program success and the cost of that support. Include a statement concerning the involvement of other departments, colleges, or other institutions and the estimated cost of their involvement in the proposed program.

The administrative structure of the Bioregional Planning and Community Design program consists of a management board, a director, and six faculty. The Director will oversee the academic program as well as the other two components of the Building Sustainable Communities Initiative: the Learning and Practice Collaboratives (LPCs) and the Center for Effective Planning and Governance (CEPG). One core faculty member, to be hired, will coordinate the M.S. degree and certificate programs. The other five core faculty members, to be hired, will work with students, teach core and elective curriculum, and engage in the LPCs. The director, core faculty, and management board (consisting of one faculty from each of the eight participating departments) will set guidelines for curriculum issues, program assessment and evaluation, and recruitment and admissions.

### ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENDITURES FY 07-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name, Position &amp; Rank</th>
<th>Annual Salary Rate</th>
<th>FTE Assigned to Program</th>
<th>Program Salary Dollars</th>
<th>Percent of Salary Dollars to Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>FY08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>-- $105,000</td>
<td>$109,200</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. Operating Expenditures. Briefly explain the need and cost for operating expenditures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$ 4,500</td>
<td>$ 4,680</td>
<td>$ 4,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC</td>
<td>$ 7,500</td>
<td>$ 7,800</td>
<td>$ 8,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEPG</td>
<td>$ 7,500</td>
<td>$ 7,800</td>
<td>$ 8,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$ 4,000</td>
<td>$ 4,160</td>
<td>$ 4,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer services</td>
<td>$ 4,266</td>
<td>$ 4,436</td>
<td>$ 4,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design process</td>
<td>$ 22,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subawards to LPC communities</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty startups</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic program operations</td>
<td>$ 12,500</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td>$ 31,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC/CEPG operations</td>
<td>$ 12,500</td>
<td>$ 13,000</td>
<td>$ 13,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistantships</td>
<td>$ 80,000</td>
<td>$ 166,400</td>
<td>$ 173,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Leader Training Scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing/Recruiting graduate students</td>
<td>$ 7,500</td>
<td>$ 7,800</td>
<td>$ 8,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing/Recruiting LPC and CEPG</td>
<td>$ 7,800</td>
<td>$ 8,112</td>
<td>$ 8,436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operating expenses include computer services travel, student recruitment, general office operations, computer services, sub-awards for LPC projects, and new faculty start-up packages. Travel includes funds to assist BioP faculty and Extension faculty to participate in interdisciplinary faculty and student activities (e.g., project preparation, seminars, proposal preparations). It will also cover travel expenses incurred by the Program director to travel statewide and nationally to identify grants funding, and to attend professional conferences to promote the new UI planning program. Student recruitment costs include funds for development of program brochures and a website, advertisement at professional meetings, and other advertising activities.

d. Capital Outlay
   (1) Library resources
      (a) Evaluate library resources, including personnel and space. Are they adequate for the operation of the present program? If not, explain the action necessary to ensure program success.

      The Library holding will be expanded to include the SAGE Urban Studies and Planning Package, the Environment and Planning Parts A-D package, and the Environmental Planning Historic Archives. The total cost is $14,498.

      (b) Indicate the costs for the proposed program including personnel, space, equipment, monographs, journals, and materials required for the program.

      The total cost is $14,498.

      (c) For off-campus programs, clearly indicate how the library resources are to be provided.

      The above collects are electronic and therefore will be accessible to all off-campus students. There are well-established library research facilities in Boise and Idaho Falls. Furthermore, most of the journals of interest to planning students are available through the Internet. Students affiliated with any of the University of Idaho campuses have access to many of the journals through the library website.

      (2) Equipment/Instruments. Describe the need for any laboratory instruments, computer(s), or other equipment. List equipment, which is presently available and any equipment (and cost), which must be obtained to support the proposed program.

      Existing resources are adequate and available. The Building Sustainable Communities Initiative has provided funds for one-time capital outlays for new faculty, the director and program staff including furnishings, computers, and software.
e. Revenue Sources

(1) If funding is to come from the reallocation of existing state appropriated funds, please indicate the sources of the reallocation. What impact will the reallocation of funds in support of the program have on other programs?

The Building Sustainable Communities Initiative and the BioP program will be funded through FY 2010 from President White’s New Strategic Initiative program. The award has been made for $333,333 for five years, for a total of $1,666,665. Additional revenues of $817,235 are expected in the form of fees, matches from communities, projected program grants, returns of indirect charges, and donations

(2) If an above Maintenance of Current Operations (MCO) appropriation is required to fund the program, indicate when the institution plans to include the program in the legislative budget request.

Not applicable for the proposed program.

(3) Describe the federal grant, other grant(s), special fee arrangements, or contract(s) to fund the program. What does the institution propose to do with the program upon termination of those funds?

The University of Idaho Strategic Initiative process has provided $1.6 million over 5 years to launch the Building Sustainable Communities Initiative, which includes creation of an M.S. degree in Bioregional Planning and Community Design, initiation of Learning and Practice Collaboratives, and development of the Center for Effective Planning and Governance. After FY10, the program will become self-sufficient. A transition to self-sufficiency has been designed into the program in several ways. First, the program captures a diverse array of revenue streams and leveraged resources that will continue after the grant ends. These include the faculty hires from the colleges, involvement from current faculty, for-credit and non-credit tuition and fee revenues, community LPC matches, projected grant revenues, and development. Second, only a small portion of grant funds are dedicated to permanent personnel. In fact, these funds are limited to the Director summer salary and stipend, the LPC coordinator, an administrative assistant, and an Extension program coordinator. These continuing costs will be offset by the additional revenue to the program and UI from increased student FTE’s and indirect returns on external grants. Third, the major share of grant funds is used to support graduate assistantships and support for LPC projects. After 5 years, it is expected that grants and donations will support these programs. Also, by building an international reputation, the academic program will be able to attract quality graduate students who are self-supporting and pay full fees, thereby lowering the need to offer assistantships.
March 3, 2006

To: Blue Ribbon Review Committee  
Idaho Strategic Reinvestment Initiatives Program  

From: Lead Principal Investigators and Interdisciplinary Academic Program Directors

A common thread of interdisciplinarity and sustainability links together several of the Strategic Initiative programs. These bridges do not impinge on the independence of any program, but rather act to complement the programs in ways that are synergistic. The following synergy bridges are included in multiple proposals and are endorsed by each of the lead Principal Investigators and Program Directors, each of whom have signed this letter and included it within the Appendix of their proposal.

- The Sustainable Idaho, Building Sustainable Communities, Water of the West, Institutionalizing Team-based Interdisciplinary Research and Education, and Idaho Professional Ethics programs, as well as the existing interdisciplinary programs, including Environmental Science, Neuroscience and Bioinformatics and Computational Biology, strongly encourage funding a development officer position within the University of Idaho Development Office. We see this development officer position dedicated to identifying donors and fundraising for University Wide Interdisciplinary Programs.
- Faculty participating in the Building Sustainable Communities Program, the Water of the West Program, the Institutionalizing Team-based Interdisciplinary Research and Education and the Idaho Professional Ethics Program will participate in the faculty development workshops on integration of sustainability into University of Idaho courses to be offered by the Sustainable Idaho Program.
- Research and innovation developed through the Sustainable Idaho Program, the Water of the West Program, and the Institutionalizing Team-based Interdisciplinary Research and Education Program could be disseminated through the two engagement components of the Building Sustainable Communities Program: the Learning and Practice Collaborative and Collaborative for Effective Planning and Governance.
- Faculty and students in the Water of the West Program, Sustainable Idaho and Building Sustainable Communities program will participate in and benefit from the proposed interdisciplinary coursework, summer workshop, and assessment of interdisciplinary programs that are outlined in the Institutionalizing Team-based Interdisciplinary Research and Education proposal.
- If funded the directors of each of the programs mentioned above will also join the University Wide Program Directors Council, which is currently chaired by the Dean of the College of Graduate Studies and includes the directors of the existing interdisciplinary programs (EnvS, BCB, NS).
- The programs mentioned above will work to develop a shared sustainability focused conference in year three of the program.
- Course complementation will be achieved by managing the academic programs of the above mentioned programs so that classes developed in each program will contribute to the course offerings of the programs. This will provide integration and scaling synergies between all of the programs.

Lead PIs Signatures:

Sustainable Idaho Initiative  
Building Sustainable Communities Initiative  
Water of the West Initiative  
Institutionalizing Team-based Interdisciplinary Research and Education Initiative  
Idaho Professional Ethics Initiative

Existing University Wide Interdisciplinary Academic Programs

Environmental Science Program  
Neuroscience Program  
Bioinformatics and Computational Biology Program  
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February 28, 2006

Steven Hollenhorst
Department of Conservation Social Sciences
College of Natural Resources
University of Idaho
Moscow, Idaho 83844-1144

Re: Bioregional Planning and Community Design Program

Steve,

The Idaho Chapter of The Nature Conservancy wholeheartedly supports the proposed "Bioregional Planning and Community Design Program." Idaho and the rest of the world desperately need thoughtful, multi-disciplinary practitioners and approaches to the complex issues of balancing the conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services with the challenges that confront societies from human population growth and development. For over a half century, The Nature Conservancy has strived to protect the natural capital of the earth through non-confrontational, market-based approaches, and is now the largest conservation organization in the world with chapters in every state and over 28 countries. The proposed program fits very well with TNC’s Conservation by Design approach which has as its heart community-based conservation. In Idaho, TNC is addressing loss of habitat as a result of human development, invasive species, altered fire regimes, altered hydrology, overgrazing, and the biggest challenge - - global climate change. TNC is working across Idaho -- e.g., Henry's Lake, the Owyhees, Silver Creek, Hells Canyon, the upper Salmon River valleys, the Kootenai River valley -- to conserve large functional landscapes. Over the past decade, TNC has completed eco-regional conservation assessments (ERA) across Idaho and beyond. We use a Conservation Action Planning process (CAP) to translate the ERA’s to more local conservation. We'll be initiating three Conservation Action Planning (CAP) efforts this spring -- Silver Creek, north Idaho, and the upper Salmon River valleys. Lemhi County has asked us to collaborate with them in developing planning efforts in their area using TNC’s CAP approach and tools.

We regularly are asked to get involved in issues of sprawl, energy development, and community planning but our expertise is limited to biodiversity conservation. What a relief it would be to team with professional community planners and the university in addressing such issues as sustainable development, sprawl, energy development, etc, and what a rewarding experience for our staff to help train and work with future community planners, decision makers, and natural resource professionals. That's basic to retaining any real hope for the future of Idaho's natural
landscapes and human quality of life. When the program is realized we'd be pleased to participate in a variety of ways – for example, guest lectures to classes, participation on graduate advisory committees, possibly internships with TNC, and participation in bioregional planning.

We sincerely hope the university supports the proposal and look forward to working with you in its evolutions.

Best regards,

[Signature]

Signing for Jeff Yeo

Jeff Yeo
Director of Conservation Science
The Nature Conservancy
116 First Avenue North
Hailey, Idaho 83333
(208) 788-8988 ext. 22
jyeo@tnc.org
February 28, 2006

Dr. Margrit von Braun, Chair
University of Idaho Strategic Reinvestment Blue Ribbon Committee
Morrill Hall 104
University of Idaho
Moscow, ID 83844-3017

Dear Dr. von Braun and Blue Ribbon Committee Members:

The purpose of this letter is to express the Idaho Planning Association’s support for the Building Sustainable Communities initiative proposal. This work and assistance is in great demand in Idaho today as many communities struggle with community planning. It also represents a new and refreshing way that the University’s expertise can be harnessed and channeled to improve the lives and learning opportunities for Idahoans. Dozens of communities will benefit from the intensive on-the-ground research, problem-solving and educational activities. The comprehensive approach, evidenced by the number of colleges, units and departments committed to the project, will provide high quality community-based projects and graduate education.

As a section of the Western Central Chapter of the American Planning Association, IPA supports the formal Ethical Principles in Planning, which include the following principle and excerpted statements related to planning education:

“APA members who are practicing planners continuously pursue improvement in their planning competence as well as in the development of peers and aspiring planners. They recognize that enhancement of planning as a profession leads to greater public respect for the planning process and thus serves the public interest.

APA Members who are practicing planners:
1. Participate in continuing professional education;
2. Share the results of experience and research which contribute to the body of planning knowledge;
3. Contribute time and information to the development of students, interns, beginning practitioners and other colleagues;
4. Strive to increase the opportunities for women and members of recognized minorities to become professional planners.”
To embody our professional principles, we will support the program in the following ways, and in any additional endeavors identified by the University:

1) IPA can provide technical advice as the M.S. degree program is being designed.
2) Our network of almost 200 Idaho planners can participate in internships and possible Learning Practice Collaboratives (LPCs) where teams of students and faculty assist a community with a planning challenge.
3) IPA can provide access to technical experts who would be willing to present seminars and workshops as part of the Center for Effective Planning and Governance.
4) IPA can help disseminate information on the program throughout the state.

We encourage your selection of this proposal.

Sincerely yours,

Patricia A. Nilsson, AICP
President

PAN:pan

cc: Dr. Steve Hollenhorst
March 1, 2006

Strategic Investment in Academic Areas, Blue Ribbon Committee
University of Idaho
104 Administration Bldg
P.O. Box 443152
Moscow, ID 83844-3152

Dear Blue Ribbon Committee Members:

The purpose of this letter is to express support from the Idaho Rural Partnership and Idaho Community Review Steering Committee for the “Building Sustainable Communities” strategic reinvestment initiative proposal. The program described in the proposal is an innovative and comprehensive response to current community planning needs in the state of Idaho. It also represents a new and promising way of coordinating University resources to improve the lives and learning opportunities for Idahoans. This program, if funded, will fully engage Idaho’s land grant institution through intensive on-the-ground research, problem-solving and educational activities. The sheer number of colleges, units and departments committed to the project suggests high quality community-based projects and graduate education will result, but the most impressive aspect of the proposal for us is the comprehensive approach to planning issues represented by the three program components.

The planning degree will be unique in Idaho and is timely given Idaho’s increasing planning challenges in rapidly urbanizing areas of the state. Through both the Learning and Practice and the Effective Governance Collaboratives, the hands-on nature of the degree program will offer additional benefits. Specifically, they will build the capacity of communities and elected leaders to meet the challenges of growth (and decline) head on. Taken together, the program components meet complementary needs in the area of community and regional planning and design. Moreover, the close ties between the program’s students and Idaho’s communities, mean increased opportunities for bioregional planning graduates to secure employment in Idaho.

Idaho Rural Partnership will support the Building Sustainable Communities Initiative in any way feasible, including our membership serving on the early program design committee, assisting with statewide communication and

The Idaho Rural Partnership (IRP) joins diverse public and private resources in innovative collaborations to strengthen communities and improve life in rural Idaho.
networking needs, and aligning our resources as appropriate to create synergy in meeting the needs of Idaho's communities.

We also look forward to a partnership between the Initiative and the Idaho Community Review program. As a statewide team, the Community Review Steering Committee plans, coordinates and implements the community review process. This involves bringing a team of fifteen experts from a wide range of Idaho's community, economic and human service providers to communities for an intensive two-day assessment. The assessment culminates in a written report to the community, but the volunteer nature of the program means it lacks the consistent ability to provide follow-up assistance to communities that want to implement projects identified by the assessment team. Not only can faculty associated with the initiative participate in community reviews, the engagement features of the initiative, the Learning and Practice Collaborative and the Collaborative for Effective Planning and Governance, will allow initiative participants to focus community-based project efforts on communities that have undergone the review process.

Idaho is in need of the "Building Sustainable Communities" program envisioned in this proposal. Its strength comes from partnerships between the University, the state's residents and other institutions that are working to ensure a sustainable future for all communities. We have every confidence that this University of Idaho Initiative will deliver an effective and sorely needed set of programs to our great state, and we look forward to becoming partners in that effort.

Sincerely,

Dale Dixon
2/28/2006

Dr. Margrit von Braun, Chair
University of Idaho Strategic Reinvestment Blue Ribbon Committee
Morrill Hall 104
University of Idaho
Moscow, ID 83844-3017

Re: Building Sustainable Communities Strategic Initiative

Dear Dr. von Braun and Blue Ribbon Committee Members:

I offer this letter of support for the “Building Sustainable Communities: A New University and Community Partnership” strategic initiative on behalf of the Career and Professional Planning office of Academic Service Learning.

We view this as an especially exciting initiative given the numerous areas where our office can strategically add to and provide direct support for programs outlined in the initiative. Of particular note in the initiative are activities outlined in the Learning and Practice Collaborative portion of the initiative. Our office is ready to commit staff expertise and time to assist with LPC planning, advisory board participation, community outreach efforts (including integrating the LPC efforts with other community outreach efforts undertaken by CAPP’s office of Service Learning), providing faculty training in service learning pedagogy, and providing staff support to faculty and students for service learning efforts embedded in academic courses.

We envision extremely close collaboration and synergy between staff in our office and the Learning and Practice Collaborative Coordinator. I believe that our combined efforts can substantially enhance the presence and overall quality of service learning at the University of Idaho as we seek to empower faculty and provide opportunities to students for engagement with community partners.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in your efforts and feel free to contact me if you have any additional questions about our potential collaborative efforts.

With best wishes,

Dr. Larry Young
Manager for Academic Collaboration
Career and Professional Planning

To enrich education through diversity the University of Idaho is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer.
1 March 2006

Dr. Margrit von Braun, Chair
University of Idaho Strategic Reinvestment Blue Ribbon Committee
Morrill Hall 104
University of Idaho
Moscow, ID 83844-3017

Dear Dr. von Braun and Blue Ribbon Committee Members:

The purpose of this letter is to express my support for the Building Sustainable Communities strategic initiative proposal.

The University’s National Institute for Advanced Transportation Technology has long focused on issues that relate to sustainability, including environmental and energy issues. During 2005, NIATT took the lead in planning for and hosting a conference on sustainable transportation on the University of Idaho campus. This conference attracted over 200 participants from the campus and the community, and helped, in at least some small way, to shape the vision for at least two proposals now being considered by the Blue Ribbon Committee.

One of the direct outcomes of this conference is the seminar on sustainable transportation that I am leading this semester. The seminar includes university faculty and students, as well as Moscow Mayor Nancy Chasey, city councilman Aaron Ament, and two other staff from local agencies. Our work is focused on the ring road project, a transportation concept that will have great impact on the future development of the city and surrounding county areas. This seminar is a first step in establishing the kinds of community-university endeavors that will help both groups. We intend to continue our seminar series during the fall semester.

NIATT will continue to support activities that relate our transportation research program to sustainable communities. In this regard, I will commit $5,000 per year for the next five years to support undergraduate interns working with local communities on sustainable transportation issues.

Best regards,

Michael Kyle
Director

Michael Kyle, Director

To enrich education through diversity, the University of Idaho is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer.
February 28, 2006

Dr. Margrit von Braun, Chair
University of Idaho Strategic Reinvestment Blue Ribbon Committee
Morrill Hall 104
University of Idaho
Moscow, ID 83844-3017

Dear Dr. von Braun and Blue Ribbon Committee Members:

I am writing to express my support for the Building Sustainable Communities strategic initiative proposal. I have discussed this proposal with Dr. Michael Kyte, one of the principal investigators for this project. This project, if approved, would fund an exciting new bio-regional planning program as well as an extensive outreach program in which students and faculty would engage local and state agencies to work on critical planning problems throughout the state of Idaho.

During my three years as director, the Idaho Transportation Department has embarked on renewed efforts in planning and construction programs throughout the state. This focus is highlighted by Governor Kempthorne, through his “Connecting Idaho Initiative,” and is based on a long term visioning process that the Transportation Board and our planning staff recently completed. In order for these initiatives to be successful, we need better trained planners and engineers at all levels of government who can actively address a variety of critical issues that are a part of all transportation planning and construction projects. Both the "Learning and Practice Collaborative" and the "Collaborative for Effective Planning and Governance," key parts of the Building Sustainable Communities Initiative, will provide the means to engage university faculty and students with community leaders in a way that will benefit both groups.

I am very excited about this proposal and the opportunities that it will generate. We will work closely with the University of Idaho to identify projects that will be of mutual benefit to both of us, and to find opportunities for internships for university students to work on planning projects that are important to transportation. I know that there are other opportunities that we can identify for cooperation and collaboration through future discussions between our two organizations.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

DAVID S. EKERN, P.E.
Director

cc: Dr. Michael Kyte
March 1, 2006

President Tim White
Blue Ribbon Committee Members
Building Sustainable Communities Initiative
University of Idaho
Moscow, ID 83844

Re: Building Sustainable Communities Initiative

Dear President White and Committee Members:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Building Sustainable Communities Initiative presently being considered by your committee.

As the Co-Chair of the Idaho Association of Counties/Association of Idaho Cities Relations Taskforce, I am excited to see this proposal from the University of Idaho. The Collaboration for Effective Planning and Governance (CEPG) would be an important resource for local units of governments throughout Idaho to gain valuable leadership skills and governance training necessary to fulfill their legal and statutory obligations.

In an ever-increasing climate of legislative change, community growth, and legal mandates, such a program as the CEPG would enable local elected officials, appointed commission members and thousands of volunteers serving in their communities, with readily accessible training and development. Supported by University of Idaho, this important initiative would enhance and strengthen the critical link between Idaho’s universities and our communities.

Again, I look forward to your serious consideration of the Building Sustainable Communities as we continue to seek ways to build the bridge between education and community. Together, we will build a stronger and better Idaho for all of our citizens. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Kimmell, Co-Chair
Idaho Cities/Counties Taskforce
Latah County Commissioner
Attachment B

UI Blue Ribbon Committee Summary Comments
April 2006

Project: Building Sustainable Communities: A New University and Community Partnership

Summary: Overall, the Committee felt that the proposed project would address a significant need for Idaho and the region (lack of integrated planning programs) by building on existing strengths within the University of Idaho. The project engages many parties both within the UI and externally as well; it also incorporates Extension, which is a strong point. The “dismount” is not very strong; there were questions regarding whether new faculty would really be new lines or re-assigned positions, and projected revenues from course fees, small communities, and other potential sources seemed unrealistically high. For example, the Committee felt it was impractical to expect communities that are so strapped for funds that they are cutting school days to contribute several thousand dollars to the process. The proposed project will require a great deal coordination, but the PIs seem to be well along in their thinking about how the project will work, and the Committee felt that the dedicated team could accomplish the work.

1. Advances the President’s Plan for Renewal, especially excellence in the strategic academic themes; The proposal addresses most of the 5 themes in some manner; it seems geared in particular towards “Understanding Sustainable Design and Lifestyle” and “Stewarding the Environment”. The team proposes partnerships within and beyond the UI. Because they expect significant input from stakeholders, they will need to be particularly sensitive about the potential for projects to become politicized and should take measures to avoid that. The degree program seems well thought out, and will produce tangible results (namely students with degrees, certificate, etc). There were concerns that “developing partnerships” might amount to just more talk; PIs should ensure that the integrated activities actually relate to and accomplish community planning. The faculty involved have appropriate expertise for developing such a program – it could be a magnet program for attracting the best undergrads and grads.

2. Enhances collaborative, integrative, and/or multi-interdisciplinary activities; The project proposes broad engagement on and off campus. Although seven colleges are listed as involved, the bulk is in LARCH and CSS. As in the pre-proposal, the involvement of traditional sciences and engineering is weak. The plan for a graduate program and curriculum development is positive, though there will be less application for undergraduates. There is significant potential to include Law in the program, because planning amounts to little if it is not incorporated into zoning and other laws/administrative schemes. The fact that this proposal will provide outreach to city and county governments indicates a serious dedication to bridging academia to public policy and planning practices, and the opportunity for professional development of people in these areas. BSU, ISU, and Idaho National Lab might be potential future partners.

3. Addresses the land grant mission of teaching and learning, discovery and creative activity, and outreach and engagement; The proposed project fits well. Teaching and learning are strong, as is outreach to local and regional communities. There is potential to transform/expand some of the traditional role of Extension. The teaching and outreach components of this project seems to be the drivers for the proposed topic. There is considerable emphasis on planning, but lack of emphasis on assessment. Although the proposal mentions the use of “research-based planning” they don’t present evidence of actual research; rather the program seems more geared towards applied activities, not discovery.

4. Enhances and promotes diversity, including developing international dimensions and perspectives This criterion could have been more strongly addressed in the proposal; there is probably more potential than the authors described. Diversity will be provided in part through outreach to traditionally
disadvantaged communities. There is potential to integrate the minority cultures of the state into the analysis, and to look to non-American models for planning.

5. *Contributes to Idaho’s environmental, economic, social, and cultural well-being:* The focus on Idaho communities’ needs is excellent. The project will help to create a planning balance to Idaho’s competing environmental, economic, social and cultural well-being needs. There is the potential for excellent outcomes. However, a lot turns on whether all of this will have a real effect on how the state grows, which is affected by politicians’ ideas and views on development. The Legislature/State Board or other appropriate governing body should have recognized the need for planning programs and provided the Universities with new revenue to develop them. In the absence of such foresight, the current mechanism will do, since planning programs are sorely needed. There is concern about politicization of the program, especially given the proposal’s emphasis on responding to stakeholders. Training people and providing degrees does not necessarily result in a tangible outcome with respect to better or improved planning. One would hope that this will be true, but how can this be determined or assessed? Therefore, assessment could be more strongly incorporated into the project.

6. *Leverages existing resources demonstrating a high degree of commitment from units, e.g. new funds or redirection of current resources:* There is a good business plan/model and commitments from college deans (suggests possible realignment of resources). Commitment from units is in the form of people’s time, and verbal/written support of the initiative. The involvement of so many colleges seems to indicate that for a little from each College, the University will get quite a lot. A lot of the budget comes from diversion of existing resources that go into teaching. The Committee wondered what things we are doing now will no longer be done once the project gets underway.
Attachment C

Compilation of External Reviewer Proposal Ratings
Project: Building Sustainable Communities: A New University and Community Partnership

Rating scale:  Strong (could be a strong rationale as to why a criterion was not met)
               Moderate
               Weak/no information

REVIEWER 1

1. Advances the President’s Plan for Renewal, especially excellence in the strategic academic themes;

Rating: Strong

Analysis: I concur with the Pre-proposal Ratings and the obvious strengths in environmental stewardship, advancement and integration of the liberal arts and science, and understanding sustainable design and lifestyle. I am very optimistic that the educational initiative, by virtue of its holistic approach, will actually stimulate new, creative ideas and scientifically grounded solutions and applied, problem-solving knowledge serving Idaho communities. Thus, this approach has excellent potential to stimulate innovative thinking as the essential catalyst for change, opening the way for entrepreneurially-motivated products, services and technologies to address challenging, complex problems affecting the future quality of life of Idaho’s citizens.

2. Enhances collaborative, integrative, and/or multi-interdisciplinary activities;

Rating Strong

Analysis: There appears to be a broad mix of disciplines represented by the faculty departments and affiliations with university institutes, programs and cooperative extension. An important question for analysis by the select Committee concerns the area(s) of specialization and faculty expertise in bioregional planning, water resources management (critical), and ecological sciences within the broad disciplines (Geography, Landscape Architecture/Architecture, Social Sciences) represented by a high percentage of the lead faculty. On balance, the multidisciplinary make-up of faculty and staff looks broad-based; in this field of community-based environmental planning, I would give less weight to technological/engineering capabilities and emphasize competencies in socio-political human dimensions and an orientation to adaptive management concepts.

3. Addresses the land grant mission of teaching and learning, discovery and creative activity, and outreach and engagement;

Rating Strong

Analysis: Certainly one of the proposal’s strongest elements as it is directly responsive to the land grant mission in multiple ways. The Learning and Practice Collaborative (LPC) is the core of both the academic curriculum and the outreach service component of the land grant university. Using Local Extension Advisory Boards to identify LPC-host communities is a good starting point, but I would not restrict the nomination and selection process to a single entity involved with local communities. Open the nomination process to a wide variety of environmental and community NGO’s, and county and municipal planning offices where they exist, and make the process as inclusive as possible.
4. Enhances and promotes diversity, including developing international dimensions and perspectives

Rating Moderate

Analysis: The engagement of diverse constituencies in the LPC may promote diversity, however the proposal does not specifically address how that will be accomplished in an active way. Exactly how will those underserved constituencies be brought to the table in the first place? There needs to be a well-thought strategy to make it happen. Appropriately, the proposal concentrates on achieving state and regional success in the first five years, before striving for global applications of the lessons learned in Idaho-based projects. In my view, it is important to publish in international journals and professional planning publications and present at international meetings to communicate with those external audiences, especially in Canada, New Zealand, European Union countries, and other nations where there are precedents and institutions in place to apply the experiences, insights, and tools gained by the Idaho initiative.

5. Contributes to Idaho’s environmental, economic, social, and cultural well-being;

Rating Strong

Analysis: This is the proposal’s strongest aspect as it directly responds to contemporary societal issues with profound, far-reaching implications for the future quality of life of Idaho communities.

6. Leverages existing resources demonstrating a high degree of commitment from units, e.g. new funds or redirection of current resources;

Rating Moderate

Analysis: Apparently the units have each committed a faculty/staff appointment from current personnel; however the formula for percentage of teaching time is not specified, nor is it clear if the redirection of teaching resources is firm for the full initial term of the project. It is vitally important that an arrangement be put in place at the outset to assure equity and parity among participating units in the work load.

7. Generates new resources that will allow for continuation and possible growth of the proposed activity;

Rating Moderate

Analysis: I have reservations about the expectation that a self-supporting program of workshops and short courses for public officials and community leaders can be achieved that can meet delivery costs, much less generate surplus income to grow the program. On the other hand, the undergraduate certificate makes sense both academically and financially by directing tuition dollars to maintain faculty lines and grad teaching assistantships supporting students in the Masters degree program.

8. Engages the commitment and passion of people and units.

Rating Strong

Analysis: The community-based service work and outcomes benefiting Idaho communities has intrinsic rewards going beyond the professional fulfillment to participating faculty involved in launching and building a new academic degree program. In this regard, I sharply disagree with the UI Pre-proposal
Ratings that this “...is just another degree program” and certainly feel the innovative concept will serve to energize the university people (and external partners) who understand and appreciate the strong motivation derived from experiential learning for both instructors, and most importantly, graduates who will receive more than a sheepskin.

Is the budget appropriate for the proposed scope of work? Probably not. Funding of 95 graduate students projected over six years is my major concern.

Will assistantship tuition/stipends from units to participating faculty travel outside the department to this new initiative to support student recruitment? To be competitive for the best students, the expectation is for four semesters and one summer of support at half time level. If the cost per MS student to degree is $50,000 now, with inflation student funding costs alone six years out will surpass $6 million.

Does this proposal promise to advance excellence in the strategic academic themes, deliver positive and lasting impacts across the breadth of the University, and build capacity and produce excellence in outcomes? Yes, to all points.

Should this proposal be promoted for other funding sources from public and private sources, with help from the Research Office and the Office of Advancement? Yes. Both public and private sources have an interest in sustainable “smart growth”. Some states, Pennsylvania and Maryland come to mind, have established major grant programs to support smart growth regional planning initiatives. If sufficient political support can be garnered in these days of tight budgets, might the Governor/Legislature be approached to fund a special appropriation to match or help underwrite the University’s commitment?

Other Comments:

I think it was wise to make this a full degree program administered by the Graduate School, rather than an Option or Minor tagged on other degrees offered by various units and disciplines. Assuming the program goes forward, selection of the first one or two LPC communities is critical. I think it vital that the first LPC chosen have achievable and reasonable deliverables, an established network of local partners and commitment to assure a high probability of success.

REVIEWER 2

Overall rating: Strong. This is a superb proposal that will lead to an exceptional academic initiative and multiple long-term benefits for Idaho and the nation.

1. Advances the President’s Plan for Renewal, especially excellence in the strategic academic themes;

Rating: Strong

Analysis: There is no doubt this initiative covers all five of the President’s Plan, and does so without “faking it”. I believe that this program, if it were implemented as per its planned schedule, would allow the University of Idaho to “leapfrog” other institutions in terms of bioregional planning, sustainable community design, participatory integration within the university, and campus-community integration.

2. Enhances collaborative, integrative, and/or multi-interdisciplinary activities;

Rating: Strong
Analysis: Virtually all potential players and participants seem to have been enfranchised in the process of generating this proposed initiative. I especially appreciate that most potential “turf wars” seemed to have been design out of this initiative.

3. Addresses the land grant mission of teaching and learning, discovery and creative activity, and outreach and engagement;

Rating: Strong

Analysis: This proposal could teach a thing or two to other land grant universities about how best to reciprocally serve and benefit from an engaged public. Many universities manage to only give lip service to outreach and public reciprocity. This proposal would set a model.

4. Enhances and promotes diversity, including developing international dimensions and perspectives

Rating: Strong

Analysis: Given the rapid growth and rapidly diversifying Idaho population, I believe this proposal would more than adequately promote diversity. Since it would be only the second American university (after Utah State University) to establish a “bioregional planning” program, the stage is set for a considerable head start by UI to lead the world in this evolving field.

5. Contributes to Idaho’s environmental, economic, social, and cultural well-being;

Rating: Strong

Analysis: This criterion, in a nutshell, is what this initiative does best. Enough said.

6. Leverages existing resources demonstrating a high degree of commitment from units, e.g. new funds or redirection of current resources;

Rating: Strong

Analysis: Given my evaluation on #7 below, this proposal does an admirable job of leveraging and coalescing existing resources to achieve probable success. Left out of the proposal (perhaps out of modesty) is the inevitability of existing faculty members who will be attracted sufficiently by the scope, scale, and future orientation of this proposal such that they make the initiative’s goals coincident with those of their own teaching, research and scholarship programs. When this happens (I believe it will) true academic economies will be realized for the good of all.

7. Generates new resources that will allow for continuation and possible growth of the proposed activity;

Rating: Moderate

Analysis: In a perfect world, UI would fund the overall program and unit directors out of new funds. At minimum, if the tripartite nature of the initiative is to be successful, LPC and CEPG will probably need separate administrators, even though their respective missions are somewhat intertwined. One would hope that such an initiative would generate additional sources of revenue.
8. Engages the commitment and passion of people and units.

Rating; Strong

Analysis: To me as a reviewer, this is obviously the case. Rarely have I seen this kind of cross-college, cross-disciplinary participation in academe.

Is the budget appropriate for the proposed scope of work? Yes - See comments, #6 & #7.

Does this proposal promise to advance excellence in the strategic academic themes, deliver positive and lasting impacts across the breadth of the University, and build capacity and produce excellence in outcomes? Absolutely Yes. An interesting thing is happening in academia: the “local” is becoming a valid subject for research, scholarship, creative interpretation, and education. Interestingly, I am certain that if UI pulls this off, it will significantly contribute to the global, international dialogue by setting an example. In the future, as the post-oil peak realities take hold, the physical environment will actually re-localize (physical systems, goods, resources, infrastructure, etc.), while the informational world will continue to globalize. Hence, the big, upcoming intellectual question all universities face is: “What should be local, and what should be global?” This initiative sets UI up to provide early clues to this overarching intellectual challenge.

Should this pre-proposal by promoted for other funding sources from public and private sources, with help from the Research Office and the Office of Advancement? Yes. There are numerous philanthropic organizations that would support this.

REVIEWER 3

1. Advances the President’s Plan for Renewal, especially excellence in the strategic academic themes;

Rating: Strong

Analysis: The three inter related goals address all five academic themes plus the land grant mission. The academic themes 1, 2, 4, and 5 are particularly well represented.

2. Enhances collaborative, integrative, and/or multi-interdisciplinary activities;

Rating: Strong

Analysis: Ten departments, six colleges, and extension provide a broad and substantive base from which to operate.

3. Addresses the land grant mission of teaching and learning, discovery and creative activity, and outreach and engagement;

Rating: Strong

Analysis: The Learning and Practice Collaborative Studio will serve as the focus for the entire initiative. The curriculum committee should consider offering the studio in the first year. It is from this area that new learning initiatives, research proposals and outreach activities will germinate. This is also the area where graduate theses will take form.
4. Enhances and promotes diversity, including developing international dimensions and perspectives

Rating: Moderate

Analysis: Success here will depend on the rewards ($ + tenure/promotion) provided to the faculty which in turn impacts their motivation.

5. Contributes to Idaho’s environmental, economic, social, and cultural well-being;

Rating: Moderate to strong

Analysis: Here again success will depend on rewards for faculty and graduates of the program. The professional market for graduates will have to be cultivated very carefully by the academic units and extension.

6. Leverages existing resources demonstrating a high degree of commitment from units, e.g. new funds or redirection of current resources;

Rating: Weak to moderate

Analysis: The administrative costs (department head plus coordinator plus administrative assistant) start 2007 at $240,000 new money is high compared to the University’s commitment of $300,000. It is also difficult to ascertain whether the colleges will be able to maintain faculty commitments over the five year period. University budgets are notoriously unpredictable. It is not unusual for a unit to withdraw in kind obligations due to various financial exigencies which may surface in the future.

7. Generates new resources that will allow for continuation and possible growth of the proposed activity;

Rating: Weak/no information

Analysis: A large private endowment would help to maintain and provide stability to the academic programs and community collaborative. The search for such a foundation should be the top priority with respect to a continuation of the program. It should also be noted that most foundations do not respond well to long-term salary commitments.

8. Engages the commitment and passion of people and units.

Rating: Moderate to strong

Analysis: It will depend on the first three years of rewards for faculty and successes in the public arena. The development of research proposals emanating from this period will also provide a clearer picture of how well the program is taking root in each of the three areas (academic, research, outreach).

Is the budget appropriate for the proposed scope of work? Yes

Does this proposal promise to advance excellence in the strategic academic themes, deliver positive and lasting impacts across the breadth of the University, and build capacity and produce excellence in outcomes? Maybe – Here again it will depend on rewards and support given faculty. The kinds of activities which are suggested in the proposal do not follow typical science/publication formats.
Consequently, there will be the need to quietly educate colleagues and associates to a new range of promotion and tenure activities.

Should this proposal be promoted for other funding sources from public and private sources, with help from the Research Office and the Office of Advancement? No – A majority of the funding should come from the President’s Strategic Investment Program, even though the proposal moves into new applied (academic and research) territories, it will provide, if funded, desperately needed planning professionals to direct future land use and population growth in Idaho and the region.

Other Comments:

The following represents some general thoughts on the proposal not necessarily expressed in the above analysis. The program would be an extremely important addition not only to the academic, research, and outreach activities of the university but also to the people in the State of Idaho. It is recommended that the program be targeted primarily at the graduate level with particular emphasis on research/policy/outreach activities region wide. The degree title might also be modified to Masters of Science in Bioregional Planning. The use of the term “sustainable” currently lacks clear professional and public understanding and, as such, suffers in its current application in practice. It is recommended to use a program of specializations within the degree which may help provide some currency to participating departments, e.g. Conservation of Energy and Water Resources, Geography/GIS Applications, Economics and Rural Sociology, Sustainable Communities, Environmental Law and Policy. This provides a broader base for faculty to add or delete subject areas as the program develops.

It is important to emphasize in the curriculum a research/applied thesis in order to provide a research foundation for faculty associated with the degree program and its various emphases. This could be noted via the standard “A Thesis” or “B Project”.

The initial time table and enrollment numbers appear very ambitious. It will take time for the program faculty to identify and agree upon the content and structure of the curriculum. A low, but manageable number of students in the first several years of the program, would help to establish a rigorous tutorial approach to the learning environment. A relatively small number (6-8) of well-qualified, highly-motivated graduates is preferred in contrast to a high number (15-25) of good but average-performing professionals. If there is a need in the future, the numbers can be expanded marginally while maintaining an emphasis on accepting highly-qualified applicants.

Lastly, it is also recommended to engage in fewer projects during the first three years in order to maximize both faculty and student energies focused on key issues within the state and region; e.g. air and water quality, conservation of critical lands, recreation and tourism, ecosystem services, etc. It will be important to the continuance of and support of the program to maintain very high visibility as a land use planning agent within the region.
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1. Briefly describe the nature of the request e.g., is this a new program (degree, program, or certificate) or program component (e.g., new, discontinued, modified, addition to an existing program or option).

The University of Idaho proposes a new graduate certificate in Bioregional Planning and Community Design to be granted by the College of Graduate Studies. This 16-credit Certificate is designed for graduate students enrolled in various professional disciplines (e.g., transportation engineering, environmental and natural resource management, architecture, landscape architecture, public administration), who want an emphasis in planning, but have chosen not to enroll in the Bioregional Planning and Community Design M.S. degree. Students earning the certificate will gain knowledge, skills, and values in bioregional planning and be able to effectively employ planning concepts and principles within their discipline.

2. Provide a statement of need for program or a program modification. Include student and state need, demand, and employment potential. Attach a Scope and Sequence, SDPTE Form Attachment B, for professional-technical education requests. (Use additional sheets if necessary).

The graduate certificate in Bioregional Planning and Community Design will provide students with the background necessary to tackle complex planning and design issues from within their selected disciplines. This background will be particularly salient for employment in the state of Idaho, which was the nation’s third fastest growing state between 2004 and 2005 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006). The Census Bureau projects that by 2030 population will increase by 52%. By 2050, urban and suburban development is expected to double and quadruple, respectively, resulting in a loss of 4.5 million acres of ranch, farm, and open space land. This growth will be accompanied by increased energy consumption (Idaho already leads the Northwest in per capita consumption), and a projected three-fold increase in municipal water use.

While population growth is being felt throughout the state, from Boise, Kootenai and Canyon counties, in other areas, populations are stagnant or shrinking. In Boise County, for example, considered rural in 1990, the population has grown by 95%, with more than a third of its workforce now commuting to Ada and Canyon Counties. Concurrently, the economies and populations of many rural communities are stagnant or shrinking. While urban school systems are unable to build facilities fast enough to accommodate the flood of new students, many rural districts have adopted a 4-day school week to offset lost revenues and shrinking student numbers.

Along with these demographic changes, the roles, responsibilities, and structure of local government are changing and becoming more complex. Today’s community leaders must consider the changing views of the role of government, new technologies, devolution of public services, citizen demands for control of public spending, performance review, and privatization of many public functions. The responsibilities assigned to these officials range from public health to public transportation, criminal justice, sewage treatment, and protecting quality of life. They must set public policy, collect and direct use of public funds, decide who can develop land where and for what purpose, administer the organizational structure of government, manage personnel, and manage risk within their counties and communities; all while being responsive to a wide-variety of state and federal mandates.

Given the growing complexity of administering the public trust, public officials increasingly need special knowledge, skills and leadership abilities to plan and manage their communities to be economically, environmentally, and socially sustainable. In addition, many problems these leaders face are not just local problems, but ones created when both local and state governmental units are not prepared, do not work together effectively, and do not have mechanisms to jointly deal with development pressure.

To address the challenges facing Idaho, and many other Western states, the graduate certification in Bioregional Planning and Community Design will prepare new professionals with cutting edge planning knowledge and skills. Students earning the certificate will participate with UI faculty and students in the M.S. in Bioregional Planning and Community Design to foster sustainable community planning, design and development with
3. Briefly describe how the institution will ensure the quality of the program (e.g., accreditation, professional societies, licensing boards, etc.).

The Planning Accreditation Board has accredited educational programs leading to bachelors and masters degrees in planning since 1984. The accreditation of U.S. planning programs is intended to foster high standards for professional education in planning. The planning accreditation program is a cooperative undertaking sponsored jointly the American Institute of Certified Planners, the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, and the American Planning Association.

The graduate certificate will be offered as part of the accredited Bioregional Planning and Community Design program. The BioP program will become accredited through the Planning Accreditation Board in 5 years, after meeting the five preconditions required for accreditation: 1) degrees granted to at least 25 students; 2) the program’s parent institution is accredited by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation or its successor organization; 3) the word “planning” is used in the title of both the program and degree; 4) for graduate students seeking a first professional degree in planning, a minimum of two academic years of full-time study or the equivalent is provided; and 5) the primary focus of the degree is on the preparation of professional planning practitioners.

The graduate certificate, as part of the BioP program, will be dedicated to the highest standards of scholarship, informed by theory and empirical evidence, and employ multiple thinking strategies such as problem solving, creative design processes, the scientific method, and critical thinking. While it is anticipated that new courses will be created, the certificate program will also utilize a significant number of courses already present in several different programs.

Students in the certificate program will have the opportunity to participate in real-life planning projects through the Learning and Practice Collaboratives (LPCs). The LPCs consist of community/university partnerships aimed at providing planning assistance to Idaho communities and rural areas. This hands-on community planning, design and development assistance is primarily possible due to the involvement of the UI Extension in the BioP program. This effort will enhance the capacity of campus-based faculty to engage community leaders, underrepresented populations, and community organizations throughout the state, and serve as a model of effective land grant engagement with citizens of the state.

4. Identify similar programs offered within the state of Idaho or in the region by other colleges/universities. If the proposed request is similar to another program, provide a rationale for the duplication. This may not apply to PTE programs if workforce needs within the respective region have been established.

Boise State University offers a certificate in community and regional planning, which is focused primarily on issues and challenges related to urban planning. This makes sense given their location in the Boise metro area and the unique growth pressures experienced in that region. The UI certificate in Bioregional Planning and Community Design will complement the BSU program in its bioregional focus and emphasis on engagement with local communities through the LPCs. We are working together to insure collaboration between our programs.
Table 1. Enrollment and Graduates (i.e., number of majors or other relevant data) By Institution for the Proposed Program Last three years beginning with the current year and the 2 previous years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Relevant Enrollment Data</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Previous Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Degrees (Certificates) offered by school/college or program(s) within disciplinary area under review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution and Degree name</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Specializations within the discipline (to reflect a national perspective)</th>
<th>Specializations offered within the degree at the institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSU</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Describe how this request is consistent with the State Board of Education's policy or role and mission of the institution. (i.e. centrality).

The State Board of Education’s mission for higher education in the State of Idaho is to promote institutions that “provide a wide variety of educational, training, research, continuing education and service programs to meet the personal and professional needs of Idaho citizens and Idaho employers.” The BioP program aids the SBOE in meeting the goals of its mission by providing a rich and diverse educational, training, and research opportunity to the citizens of Idaho, which includes a graduate certificate of completion and an M.S. degree.

The SBOE’s 8-Year Plan for Delivery of Academic Programs states that “the effectiveness of the [higher-education] system relates to the provision of courses and programs that respond to the identified needs of Idaho education stakeholders such as students and businesses. System efficiency relates to delivery of education and minimizes costs by avoiding unnecessary duplication of programs and courses.” The creation of the BioP program, and specifically, the graduate certificate, has emerged as a result of campus and Extension faculty, and statewide community stakeholders identifying the need for an accredited planning program in the state of Idaho. To ensure the program’s fit with the needs of Idaho’s citizens, between August and November 2006, nearly a dozen listening sessions were hosted in several locations across Idaho. These sessions gave stakeholders the opportunity to describe their community’s needs and to characterize the vital competencies required by BioP graduates if they are to become planners in their communities.

In addition to meeting the SBOE’s policies and missions for higher education, the BioP program meets and exceeds those for the University of Idaho. The UI’s mission states that it is “a land-grant institution committed to undergraduate and graduate-research education with extension services responsive to Idaho and the region's business and community needs.” The academic programs emphasized at the UI are agriculture, forestry, mining and metallurgy, engineering, architecture, law, foreign languages, teacher preparation and international
programs. In these specific focus areas, the UI offers a wide range of certificates of completion, masters, doctoral and professional programs and also coordinates and conducts extensive research programs that are consistent with state needs. The interdisciplinary BioP program will contribute to the UI’s mission by providing a graduate research-based certificate that is responsive to the needs of Idaho’s businesses and communities.

6. Is the proposed program in the 8-year Plan? Indicate below.

Yes  X  No  ____

If not on 8-year plan, provide a justification for adding the program.

7. Resources--Faculty/Staff/Space Needs/Capital Outlay. (Use additional sheets if necessary.):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Fiscal Impact</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>$25,133</td>
<td>$26,139</td>
<td>$27,184</td>
<td>$78,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 new faculty positions</td>
<td>$115,500</td>
<td>$240,240</td>
<td>$374,774</td>
<td>$730,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current faculty reallocations</td>
<td>$326,589</td>
<td>$339,274</td>
<td>$352,467</td>
<td>$1,018,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad. Coordinator (summer salary)</td>
<td>$ 6,673</td>
<td>$6,940</td>
<td>$ 7,218</td>
<td>$20,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC Coordinator (50% time)</td>
<td>$23,400</td>
<td>$24,336</td>
<td>$ 25,310</td>
<td>$73,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>$32,240</td>
<td>$33,530</td>
<td>$34,871</td>
<td>$100,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe (33% Admin Asst., 38% others)</td>
<td>$199,611</td>
<td>$253,098</td>
<td>$310,550</td>
<td>$763,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Salary and Fringe</td>
<td>$729,146</td>
<td>$923,557</td>
<td>$1,132,374</td>
<td>$2,785,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Operating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program operating budget</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$31,500</td>
<td>$ 33,075</td>
<td>$94,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer services</td>
<td>$ 4,680</td>
<td>$4,867</td>
<td>$ 5,062</td>
<td>$14,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistantships</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$166,400</td>
<td>$173,056</td>
<td>$419,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student Recruitment</td>
<td>$ 7,500</td>
<td>$7,800</td>
<td>$ 8,112</td>
<td>$23,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Awards: LPC Projects</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$ 60,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$ 4,680</td>
<td>$4,867</td>
<td>$ 5,062</td>
<td>$14,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty startup packages @ $25,000 each</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>$196,860</td>
<td>$305,434</td>
<td>$334,367</td>
<td>$836,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Capital Outlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings, computers, software</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Facilities</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TOTAL EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$ 956,006</th>
<th>$1,228,991</th>
<th>$ 1,466,741</th>
<th>$ 3,651,738</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### B. Source of Funds

1. Appropriated-reallocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiative grant</td>
<td>$333,333</td>
<td>$333,333</td>
<td>$333,333</td>
<td>$999,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New faculty commitments from colleges</td>
<td>$153,615</td>
<td>$319,519</td>
<td>$498,450</td>
<td>$971,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current faculty reallocation</td>
<td>$432,814</td>
<td>$449,623</td>
<td>$467,105</td>
<td>$1,349,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees (dedicated, summer, course, non-credit)</td>
<td>$39,471</td>
<td>$67,259</td>
<td>$84,421</td>
<td>$191,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community matches for LPCs</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants, including NIATT startup support</td>
<td>$52,500</td>
<td>$319,519</td>
<td>$52,500</td>
<td>$157,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect returns</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$19,250</td>
<td>$43,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project donations</td>
<td>$9,500</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$19,250</td>
<td>$42,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total reallocated: $1,051,733 $1,280,238 $1,514,309 $3,846,276

2. Appropriated – New

   $ - $ - $ - $ -

3. Federal

4. Other:

   Returned to University/UI Foundation
   - Fees (grad, non-res. tuition, summer) $69,036 $117,452 $164,694 $351,182
   - Indirect returns (projected grants *.30) $67,500 $82,500 $105,000 $255,000
   - UI Foundation fees on donations (@5%) $500 $1,250 $1,750 $3,500

   Related Revenue Activity
   - Projected faculty external grants (.70) $105,000 $140,000 $192,500 $437,500

TOTAL FUNDS

AVAILABLE FOR PROGRAM¹ $1,051,733 $1,280,238 $1,514,309 $3,846,276

RETURNED TO UI/UI FOUNDATION $137,036 $201,202 $271,444 $609,682

C. Nature of Funds

1. Recurring *

2. Non-recurring ** (expires after fives years)

   $718,400 $946,901 $1,180,976 $2,846,277
   $333,333 $333,333 $333,333 $999,999

TOTAL: $1,051,733 $1,280,238 $1,514,309 $3,846,276

¹ Budget shows a positive balance of $194,538. These funds, along with other revenue sources, will be used to support the Learning Practice Collaborative and Professional Development components of the program.

**Budget Note: Transition to Self Sufficiency**

A transition to self-sufficiency has been designed into the program in several ways. First, the program captures a diverse array of revenue streams and leveraged resources that will continue after the grant ends. These include the faculty hires from the colleges, involvement from current faculty, for-credit and non-credit tuition and fee revenues, community LPC matches, projected grant revenues, and development. Second, only a small portion of grant funds are dedicated to permanent personnel. In fact, these funds are limited to the Director summer salary and stipend, the LPC coordinator, an administrative assistant, and an Extension program coordinator. These continuing costs will be offset by the additional revenue to the program and UI from increased student FTE’s and indirect returns on external grants. Third, the major share of grant funds is used to support graduate assistantships and support for LPC projects. After 5 years, it is expected that grants and donations will support these programs. Also, by building an international reputation, the academic program will be able to attract quality graduate students who are self-supporting and pay full fees, thereby lowering the need to offer assistantships.
Academic Certificate (Graduate Level)

BioP 501  Seminar (2 cr)
BioP 520  Bioregional Planning and Practice (3 cr)
BioP 521  Planning History and Theory (3 cr)
Studio I (4-5 cr.) – *one of the following:*
   LArc 559 The Northern Rocky Regional Landscapes (4 cr)
   Arch 553  Architectural Design VII (5 cr)

One additional course in a substantive planning specialization such as land use planning; environmental planning; community and economic development planning; health planning; transportation planning; housing, social and community development planning. Written approval by the Bioregional Planning and Community Design faculty advisor is required.
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1. Briefly describe the nature of the request e.g., is this a new program (degree, program, or certificate) or program component (e.g., new, discontinued, modified, addition to an existing program or option).

The department of Adult, Career & Technology Education (ACTE) seeks approval to add a Business Technology option and an Industrial Technology option to the B.S. in Technology, Training and Development degree (B.S. Tech.). Students will prepare to teach business, marketing, and business technology subjects for private sector and government organizations, as well as post-secondary institutions (primarily post-secondary two-year programs). The student’s preparation will address the requirements for Professional-Technical certification at the post-secondary level. This is an important certification as it then allows the program for which they teach to receive state and national funds for equipment, professional development, and program improvement. The need for certified professionals to teach professional-technical courses in business and marketing is increasing regionally and nation-wide as more people enroll in two-year programs supported with Carl Perkins vocational funds.

Students will enroll for and take many courses that are presently required of business and marketing teacher education students, including completing the same College of Business & Economics courses as our K-12 business and marketing education students. Because the B.S. Tech. students are not preparing for a career in the public schools, they will not be required to take the Education Core subjects required for a secondary teaching certificate, nor will they be required to complete a secondary teaching internship. We believe these students will be best served by majoring in Technology, Training and Development with an emphasis in Business Technology.

This proposal has the support of the director of professional development and certification at the Idaho State Division of Professional-Technical Education

2. Provide a statement of need for program or a program modification. Include student and state need, demand, and employment potential. Attach a Scope and Sequence, SDPTE Form Attachment B, for professional-technical education requests. (Use additional sheets if necessary.)

The demand for qualified individuals to teach business, marketing and technology classes in community colleges, professional-technical career centers and in industry is increasing. More money is spent on training and development in this country than is spent on all public education – primary grades through university. There are jobs available for people who can design and implement training programs to meet the needs of business, industry, and government agencies. In addition, the demand for trained workers who have excellent computer skills is high and graduates of this program will have these skills, allowing them employment options that are in addition to training and development activities.

Existing resources will remain the same and we believe enrollment will increase. The program aligns well with industry needs for training and development to keep personnel current, particularly in the areas of computers and technology. In addition, many students and potential students express an interest in teaching and training but they do not want to teach children and youth. They want to teach and train adults.
This program should help increase enrollment, which is good for our department, the college and the University of Idaho.

3. Briefly describe how the institution will ensure the quality of the program (e.g., accreditation, professional societies, licensing boards, etc.).

The curriculum meets the National Business Education Standards and the Idaho Standards for Professional-Technical post-secondary certification. Students will take classes from the College of Business and Economics as well as Professional-Technical certification courses, a methods course, and several state-of-the art technology courses.

4. Identify similar programs offered within the state of Idaho or in the region by other colleges/universities. If the proposed request is similar to another program, provide a rationale for the duplication. This may not apply to PTE programs if workforce needs within the respective region have been established.

Idaho State University has a bachelor’s degree in Corporate Training. It is similar in some respects but it does not include a strong focus on technology. It also does not include a focus on post-secondary teaching of business, marketing, and technology courses. In addition, this program will not be delivered in the southeastern part of the state and thus, it will not directly compete for students.

Enrollment and Graduates (i.e., number of majors or other relevant data)
By Institution for the Proposed Program
Last three years beginning with the current year and the 2 previous years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Relevant Enrollment Data</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Previous Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees offered by school/college or program(s) within disciplinary area under review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution and Degree name</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Specializations within the discipline (to reflect a national perspective)</th>
<th>Specializations offered within the degree at the institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Describe how this request is consistent with the State Board of Education's policy or role and mission of the institution. (i.e., centrality).

The Business Technology option to the BS in Technology is unique. Similar programs do not exist in northern Idaho, eastern Washington, or the Treasure Valley. The option will align closely with the Business and Marketing Teacher Education program. Students will attend existing classes that have capacity. Every year students inquire about the business and marketing education major but walk away when they learn there is no option for them to complete a business and marketing education program without having to complete a public school teaching internship. Some students are working full or part-time and want to pursue a degree without having to quit their job or take a semester leave of absence. This would provide them with a workable and practical solution.

6. Is the proposed program in the 8-year Plan? Indicate below.

   Yes   No   X

   If not on 8-year plan, provide a justification for adding the program.

This is not a new program. It is an option to a program that already exists and which uses curriculum that is already in place. It will provide students with an additional choice, which they do not have now. It will allow students to specialize in teaching business technology, business and marketing at the post-secondary level. They do not need or want the Education Core subjects or the 6-12 student internship requirement.
8. Resources--Faculty/Staff/Space Needs/Capital Outlay. (Use additional sheets if necessary.):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Fiscal Impact</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Operating</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Capital Outlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **B. Source of Funds**  |         |         |         |       |
| 1. Appropriated-        | x       | x       | x       | x     |
| reallocation            |         |         |         |       |
| 2. Appropriated – New   |         |         |         |       |
| 3. Federal              |         |         |         |       |
| 4. Other:               |         |         |         |       |
| **TOTAL:**              |         |         |         |       |

| **B. Nature of Funds**  |         |         |         |       |
| 1. Recurring *          | x       | x       | x       | x     |
| 2. Non-recurring **     |         |         |         |       |
| **TOTAL:**              | $500    | $500    | $500    | $1,500|

* Recurring is defined as ongoing operating budget for the program, which will become of the base.
** Non-recurring is defined as one-time funding in a fiscal year and not part of the base.
Designed to prepare students for both technical and professional careers in industry and business, particularly for supervisory and other mid-management level positions.

Required course work includes the university requirements (see regulation J-3) and one of the following options:

**A. Business Technology**

The Business Technology option is for students interested in teaching/training Business Technology, Business, and Marketing subjects at the postsecondary/workforce level, or for those interested in a well-rounded degree with a focus on Business Technology and training. Additional coursework is required to qualify for a standard Idaho Secondary Teaching Certificate with teaching endorsements in Business Technology, Marketing Technology, and Economics.

Acct 201  Introduction to Financial Accounting and Acct 202  Introduction to Managerial Accounting or Acct 205  Fundamentals of Accounting (4-6 cr)
AdOL 410  Foundations of Human Resource Development (3 cr)
AdOL 473  Foundations of Adult Education and Adult Development (3 cr)
Bus 211  Introduction to Management (3 cr)
Bus 321  Marketing (3 cr)
Comm 201  Fundamentals of Public Speaking (2 cr)
Econ 201 Principles of Economics and Econ 202 Principles of Economics (3 cr) or Econ 272 Foundations of Economic Analysis (4-6 cr)
Engl 313  Business Writing (3 cr)
Acct 201  Introduction to Financial Accounting and Acct 202  Introduction to Managerial Accounting or Acct 205  Fundamentals of Accounting (4-6 cr)
AdOL 410  Foundations of Human Resource Development (3 cr)
AdOL 473  Foundations of Adult Education and Adult Development (3 cr)
Bus 211  Introduction to Management (3 cr)
Bus 321  Marketing (3 cr)
Comm 201  Fundamentals of Public Speaking (2 cr)
Econ 201 Principles of Economics and Econ 202 Principles of Economics (3 cr) or Econ 272 Foundations of Economic Analysis (4-6 cr)
Engl 313  Business Writing (3 cr)

**Suggested Electives:**

- Bus 425  Retail Distribution Management (3 cr)
- PTTE 411  Web Graphics and Animation (3 cr)
- PTTE 420  Evaluation in Professional-Technical Education (3 cr)
- PTTE 428  Computer Integrated Systems (3 cr)

**B. Industrial Technology**

Designed to prepare students for both technical and professional careers in industry and business, particularly for supervisory and other mid-management level positions.

BLaw 265  Legal Environment of Business or PTTE 443  Government Contract Law (3 cr)
Bus 311  Introduction to Management (3 cr)
Bus 370  Introduction to Operations Management or ME 410  Principles of Lean Manufacturing or CE 482 Project Engineering (3 cr)
Bus 441  Labor Relations or PTTE 446  Labor Law (3 cr)
Bus 456  Quality Management or PTTE 434  Quality Assurance Organization and Management (3 cr)
Chem 101  Introduction to Chemistry I or Chem 111  Principles of Chemistry I (4 cr)
Engl 317  Technical Writing (3 cr)
Engr 105  Engineering Graphics (2 cr)
Math 143  Pre-calculus Algebra and Analytic Geometry or Math 160  Survey of Calculus or Math 170  Analytical Geometry and Calculus I (3-4 cr)
Phys 100  Fundamentals of Physics or Chem 112  Principles of Chemistry II (4 cr)
Phys 111, 112  General Physics I-II or Phys 211, 212  Engineering Physics I-II (8 cr)
Psyc 101  Introduction to Psychology (3 cr)

**Suggested Electives:**

- PTTE 130  Introduction to Electricity and Basic Electronics (3 cr)
- PTTE 267  Computer Aided Drafting/Design (3 cr)
- PTTE 333  Computer-Industrial Electronics (3 cr)
- PTTE 467  Teaching and Learning Computer Aided Drafting/Design (3 cr)
- PTTE 415  Microcomputer Applications (3 cr)
- PTTE 428  Computer Integrated Systems Teaching and Learning Computer Operating Systems for Technology (3 cr)
- PTTE 450  Occupational Safety/Industrial Safety (3 cr)
- PTTE 460  Desktop Publishing (3 cr)
- PTTE 470  Technical Competence and/or PTTE 490 Adv Technical Competence and/or approved technical electives (32 cr)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTTE 475</td>
<td>LAN Technology</td>
<td>3 cr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTTE 481</td>
<td>Computer Integrated Manufacturing</td>
<td>3 cr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Numerical Control Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stat 251</td>
<td>Statistical Methods or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>301 Probability and Statistics</td>
<td>3 cr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Specialization Block, see dept for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>course options</td>
<td>16 cr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electives to total</td>
<td>134-128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>credits for the degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>