University of Idaho  
2007-2008  
FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA  

Meeting #6  

3:30 p.m.  
Tuesday, October 2, 2007  
Ag & Life Science 104; Boise 450C, CDA 112A; IF4 (TAB321b)  

Order of Business  

I. Call to Order.  

II. Minutes.  
   - Minutes of the 2007-08 Faculty Council Meeting #5, September 25, 2007  

III. Chair’s Report.  

IV. Provost’s Report.  

V. Other Announcements and Communications.  
   - FC-08-006: FSH 2700: Student Evaluation of Teaching (Jeanne Christiansen)  
   - UI Bonding (Tyrone Brooks, Jana Stotler)  

VI. Committee Reports.  
   University Curriculum Committee:  
   - FC-08-007: NOI: CNR (minor name change) Timber Harvesting to Forest Operations  
   - FC-08-008: Regulation B-13: Registration in Joint-Listed Courses  
   - FC-08-009: Regulation J-9-a: Academic minor credit change  

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 #4, September 18, 2007  
FC-08-006: FSH 2700 – Student Evaluation of Teaching  
Bond Update Powerpoint  
FC-08-007: NOI: CNR (minor name change) Timber Harvesting to Forest Operations  
FC-08-008: Regulation B-13  
FC-08-009: Regulation J-9-a
Present: Adams (w/o vote), Baker, Crowley (chair), Fritz, Guilfoyle, Haarsager, Hubbard, Keim-Campbell, McCaffrey, McCollough, Mihelich, Miller, Morra (w/o vote, sitting in for McDaniel), Munson, Odom, Rowland, Schmiege, Sullivan, Ch. Williams, Ci. Williams, Wilson. Liaisons: Newcomb (Coeur d’Alene).

Absent: McDaniel, Murphy [student members not yet appointed]: Liaisons: Crepeau, Stauffer

Observers: 3

A quorum being present, chair Crowley called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. in AgSci 104. It was moved and seconded (Haarsager, Odom) to approve the minutes of September 18th as distributed. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair’s Report: The chair reminded council members that John Grossenbacher would be presenting the annual McClure Lecture on science and the making of public policy this Thursday in the Hartung at 7:00 p.m. He also spoke about the upcoming presidential symposium, the first in what promises to be a very important series, on sustainability that would be offered next Monday and Tuesday. He urged all who could to attend both. He also noted that Tyrone Brooks, Senior Director of Administrative Operations & Capital Planning, had made a presentation to the President’s Cabinet concerning the bonding proposal for facilities and that he would be with council next week for a briefer presentation on the same subject. On a not unrelated topic, he noted that the Provost’s and President’s Offices were working on scheduling an all-university convocation on the topic of Sandpoint expansion. Finally he noted that Professor James Murphy, who unfortunately could not be here today, had just been elected as a representative from CLASS to Faculty Council.

Provost’s Report: The provost reinforced the chair’s invitation to attend next week’s sustainability symposium, reading off a very impressive list, including the governor, who would be making presentations at the symposium.

Discussion with the President: The president opened his remarks by thanking the council for its leadership and noted the power of the shared governance model which brought good ideas forward and improved almost all ideas by discussion. One idea that had come from Faculty Council was the notion that the president and provost should visit the various units of the university. They were making visits to all colleges and all centers. This morning he had the pleasure of visiting in the College of Science, including a visit to a 200-level Chemistry lab. He had thoroughly enjoyed the experience though noting that his presence had nonplussed at least one student in the lab. If any councilor had suggestions of things that the president and provost should put on their itinerary, he urged them to make them.
The president reported on the search for a vice president for research. He noted that the search had identified three candidates for on-campus interviews last spring. Those interviews had all gone well but, in each case, “life got in the way” of consummating a successful offer. So a new search is being launched this fall. One of the major tasks of the new vice president for research will be to be able to plug individual faculty members’ research into appropriate federal funding agencies. In the recent past we have been very successful in Washington, DC in large measure because of our political connections. But the political landscape has changed greatly. Congressional earmarks have been reduced and, in any case, the power of the Idaho delegation to win any earmarks has been greatly reduced by the reduction of Senator Craig’s influence. Both the state and the institution will take a hit from his loss of clout. In terms of research funds for the University of Idaho the loss may be in the range of $4 to $8 million, mainly in the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences and the College of Engineering.

Turning to the matter of enrollment, he noted that we needed to recognize how the state appropriation for higher education was distributed: it is based principally on enrollment. Ultimately institutions with growing enrollments will benefit at the expense of those whose enrollments are flat or declining. This year enrollments are up 4% at ISU, 3% at BSU, 6% at LCSC, but down a little less than 1% at UI. While bigger is not ipso facto better, we need to manage our enrollments in a way that is not naïve with respect to the allocation of state resources. Everyone is part of the process and we are making progress. We have been somewhat insulated from the effects of flat enrollments by the Foundation’s success in investing. The Foundations’ return had been 15.61% last year, considerably better than the return on his own personal investments.

In speaking of the Foundation he noted also that it had changed considerably in its structure over the past few years. It was considerably more corporate in its structure than before and more clearly focused on its two tasks: to manage the existing endowment and to open doors for the acquisition of new resources. The newly restructured fee assessment on gifts is much more transparent than the old and creates greater revenue for fund-raising. The university’s fund-raising infrastructure is being built, and a part of that infrastructure is the expectation that the deans will spend approximately half their time in fund-raising.

He noted that the Board of Regents/State Board of Education had experienced tremendous staff turnover in the recent past, and is developing a new relationship aligned with the state’s new governor. In this period the university must pay particular attention to the work of the board.

The president touched on the proposed bonding initiative for the university. He noted that we had been through a financial crisis 3-4 years ago that had reduced everyone to thinking about getting through the day or month. We had emerged to the point where we could think in terms of a multi-year horizon and we were now at the point where we needed to be thinking long-term—for the next generation or even the next century. These would be our “legacy projects,” e.g., Sandpoint and the Idaho Center for Livestock and Environmental Studies as well as significant investments in the Moscow campus. We have not been good about reinvesting in our infrastructure and it is part of our duty to be thinking about the university in 2020, 2050, etc.
In the ensuing discussion the president was asked about the board office’s relative inexperience and the board’s overall future relationship with the institutions and agencies it oversees. He suggested the outcome of the current deliberations will be a board more concerned with broad policies and leave the actual running of the institutions to their CEOs and judge those CEOs against the broader policy mandates of the board, or a board with strengthened capacity of its staff so it can properly oversee the wide range of responsibilities it is charged with. The second possibility would be the more expensive one, so he suspected they would opt for the first.

The board has made financial decisions at the K-12 level, only to find there is not enough money to carry them out. The issue of overspending on testing at the K-12 level had been rectified. The “Gear Up” grant program, designed to prepare K-12 students, from districts “without privilege” to be competitive at the secondary level is a federal program that demands matching money from the state. No provision had been made for any match. The board had now asked the various state higher education institutions to find ways of matching with in-kind resources. We were trying to find $300,000. Even if all the institutions can find those types of in-kind resources that they have pledged to find, there will still be a significant shortfall. A further request by the board to use university funds for the shortfall perhaps would raise a constitutional issue.

The other institutions can charge tuition. Are they more expensive? No, so far it only means that the total money they charge can be disbursed to any university need. We are constitutionally prohibited from charging tuition and so student fee money cannot go to the direct cost of instruction. There may come a time when we will have to lobby for a constitutional change or to challenge the prohibition in court. Either option will be expensive.

Who will the governor appoint to succeed Larry Craig? The president and council speculated on possible answers. If the governor appoints someone other than James Risch, Risch would probably still run in 2008 and probably win. If Risch is appointed, he could begin building seniority now, but he is 62 now and the seniority building is not going to pay off for a decade or more and thus he might well retire before any increased seniority became effective.

What about changes to the university’s health insurance program? The president replied that it was really stunning how great the cost of health care and thus insurance was. The new plan was designed to give employees flexibility of choice in how to spend their insurance money. Everyone would need to pay close attention to the choices offered so as to make appropriate choices for his or her situation.

**FC-08-002: FSH 1420 C-1: University Administration, General Counsel:** This proposal came as an FYI item concerning relatively minor redefinitions of general counsel’s description.

**FC-08-003: FSH 5100 J: General Research Policy, Indirect-Cost Assessments:** This was another FYI item concerning rather major revisions (by deletion of much of the previous specificity) of that part of the policy that dealt with the allocation of indirect costs. This revision sparked a lively debate on indirect costs. On the one hand there was the position, championed largely by the provost, that substantial portions of the indirect cost returns should be used centrally to be used to defray the infrastructure costs of research (heat, lights, deferred maintenance of research facilities, etc.), while on the other there was position, championed by
individual researchers, that that money should be channeled back to those who wrote the grants, as that was the only source of revenue for supporting certain graduate student costs, e.g., paying for their fees and health insurance, that at other institutions were covered centrally. On the whole our audited indirect-cost rate is something like 45%, our average indirect-cost return on grants is something like 10%; this leaves a $30 to $40 million dollar shortfall which is subsidized out of general university funds. The provost noted that it was a good, and necessary, debate and suggested that the council invite John Tracy, Interim Vice President of Research and/or Gene Merrell, Associate Vice President of Research, for an extended discussion.

**FC-08-004: FSH 1565, 3050, 3520, 3560, 3570: various policies dealing with tenure and promotion:** The faculty secretary explained these changes as an attempt (1) to create greater congruence between those sections of the *Handbook* that talk about tenure and those that talk about promotion (as each is amended separately over the years they tend to sound different even when no difference is intended), (2) to incorporate more generally changes made last spring about sign-offs of center administrators and interdisciplinary directors when appropriate, and (3) to attempt the Sisyphean task of keeping titles of positions current. There was no attempt to introduce any substantive change. After brief, positive discussion (Professor Haarsager allowed as how she had read through the proposal and found them much clearer and easier to read—a sentiment that gladdened the heart of the faculty secretary and his administrative assistant), it was moved and seconded (Fritz, Odom) to accept the proposed changes. The motion carried unanimously.

**FC-08-005: 3520 G-9: Faculty Tenure, Compassionate Extension:** The faculty secretary recalled the history of this proposal. It had been discussed and approved by Faculty Council, the university faculty, and the president three years ago. Since then it had been wandering in the wilderness of personalities, politics, micromanagement, and indecision at the board level. The board had finally approved, this last August, changes in board policy that would permit compassionate extension. The changes presented here, which came to Faculty Council as a seconded motion from Faculty Affairs, were being made to adjust our policy to the wording of the newly adopted board policy. After some discussion about whether the council could or should tell the provost its desires, in the form of a policy statement, even if those desires were not totally in accord with board policy, and just how much detail this policy or any other should contain, the motion to approve carried with one abstention.

**Adjournment:** The hour having grown late, it was moved and seconded (Odom, Wilson) to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 5:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Q. Adams,
Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Council
Memorandum

To: Faculty Council

From: Jeanne Christiansen
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

Re: Faculty Staff Handbook 2700

Date: September 27, 2007

Overview
FSH 2700, Student Evaluation of Teaching, was revised in July 2003. This revision occurred at the time of change both to the form and questions asked and from the use of paper to an online access for student evaluations of teaching. Section C was included in the policy to provide for review of the newly implemented form and system. Section C has not been implemented fully and outlines a time-specific procedure rather than policy.

Chronology of Events
• The university revised the student evaluation of teaching form and transitioned from paper to online access during the 2001-2002 academic year.
• FSH policy 2700 was revised effective July 2003 to include C-5 with direction to conduct a review of the online system after the fourth semester of use, spring 2004.
• The Teaching and Advising Committee reviewed the student evaluation of teaching process in fall 2007 and issued recommendations.

Recommendations
• Revise policy 2700 to remove part C (this is procedural rather than policy; the Teaching and Advising Committee charge includes review and recommendations related to student evaluations of teaching).
• Form a team to develop an implementation plan for the recommendations included in the report

I appreciate your consideration of this request.
STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

PREAMBLE: This section discusses the purposes of student evaluation of teaching and the procedures by which that evaluation is carried out. It first appeared in the 1979 Handbook and was amended in July, 1992, to reflect the removal of student evaluations to the Office of Academic Affairs. Following a period of testing in 2001, a paperless web-based evaluation system was given formal approval in 2002. This made the original Handbook section obsolete, and thus it was completely revised. For further information, contact the Provost’s Office (208-885-6448).

[rev. 7-01, 7-02]

CONTENTS:
A. Purpose
B. Policies and Procedures
C. Procedures for On-line Evaluations (Beginning Spring 2002 and Running for Four Consecutive Semesters)

A. PURPOSE. Student evaluation of teaching has two purposes. First, student evaluations assist individual instructors in improving their own teaching (“instructor,” as used in this section, refers to any teaching member of the faculty or staff). Second, they assist academic administrators in counseling instructors about their teaching and they are carefully weighed as a factor in judging the teaching component in tenure, promotion, and salary determinations. To achieve the first of these purposes instructors are urged to provide their students mechanisms for evaluation throughout the semester. To assist academic administrators in evaluation, the following policy and procedures have been adopted.

B. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.

B-1. All students will have the opportunity every full semester to evaluate each of their instructors. Thus student evaluation of teaching is required in all sections of all courses during Fall and Spring semesters.

B-2. The standard university form, as approved by the faculty, will be used by all instructors in all of their classes, except in the College of Law which will use an evaluative device which it has tailored to its needs.

B-3. The Office of Academic Affairs has the responsibility of oversight in the administration of the evaluations, except those in the College of Law.

B-4. The evaluation shall take place during the last three weeks of instruction in each of Fall and Spring semesters.

B-5. Instructors shall not see the evaluation results until after final grades have been submitted.

B-6. The Office of Academic Affairs shall see that a database of evaluation results for at least the last five academic years is maintained. These results shall be made available to colleges and academic units as needed, and the numerical summaries of an instructor’s evaluations shall be made available to students or other members of the university community upon request.

C. PROCEDURES FOR ON-LINE EVALUATIONS (Beginning Spring 2002 and Running for Four Consecutive Semesters). At the university faculty meeting held on May 8, 2001, on the recommendation of Faculty Council, adopted the following set of temporary evaluation procedures so as to test the feasibility of on-line evaluation of teaching.

C-1. Students will the evaluation by logging on to the Student Information System any time during last three weeks of instruction for the semester.
C-2. The following measures can be used to encourage student participation:

C-2-a. Instructors will be encouraged to remind their students to complete the on-line form, and discuss the importance of the evaluation process.

C-2-b. A reminder will be sent to students via email. (This email might even contain a hyperlink to the appropriate web address for the evaluations.)

C-2-c. A drawing will be conducted from among the names of students completing the evaluations of all courses in which they are enrolled. Five gift certificates of $100 at the University of Idaho Bookstore will be awarded in this drawing. The drawing will be advertised in the email reminder to students, and publicity might also be sought through the student newspaper.

C-2-d. A program may be undertaken to educate students on the importance of the teaching evaluation.

C-2-e. Instructors may, at their discretion, include in their course syllabus the requirement that students complete the evaluation as a requirement to receive a grade for the course. (The system should be set up so as to allow instructors to obtain a list of those students from their course who have completed the evaluation.)

C-3. Results of the evaluation will be reported by the following process:

C-3-a. Instructors will be able to view the student responses for their courses after final grades have been submitted. They would access these responses through the Employee Information System.

C-3-b. Unit administrators responsible for annual evaluations of instructors will be given permission to view the responses for all courses taught within the unit.

C-4. Additional Possibilities:

C-4-a. The system should allow some degree of customization of the evaluation form to fit the needs of instructors. (Implementation of such customization is contingent on Faculty Council recommending a suitable form.)

C-4-b. The system should be available for instructors to use earlier in the semester for a formative evaluation.

C-4-c. Such an early evaluation would be optional; only the semester-end evaluation would be mandatory.

C-4-d. Instructors wishing to use the early-semester evaluation would be able to customize several questions with essay responses.

C-4-e. Responses to the early semester evaluation would, as with the other evaluation, be available to instructors through the Employee Information System.

C-4-f. The system may be programmed to give improved student demographic data with the evaluation, such as breakdowns of results by class standing or GPA range.

C-5. Review. This on-line system for evaluations will be reviewed after its fourth consecutive semester of use. During this review it will be decided whether or not to make the on-line system permanent, or what if any adjustments should be made. (For instance, it may be determined that the random drawings for student incentive are no longer needed.)
This committee is charged with reviewing the On-Line Evaluation system every three years. These observations and recommendations constitute our report.

In the opinion of this committee, it appears that the on-line evaluation system has several sometimes conflicting purposes:

◊ To provide feedback from students to individual faculty members so that the faculty member might improve his or her teaching. This constitutes the formative function of the evaluation system.

◊ To provide data for department administrators, to assist them in annual evaluations of faculty. This constitutes a summative function of the system.

◊ To provide data that can be used in tenure and promotion decisions. This is also a summative function of this system.

◊ To carry out all these functions as efficiently as possible, without excessive inconvenience to students and waste of paper or other resources.

The committee feels that partially because of these conflicting purposes, the current on-line evaluation system is falling short of what should be the university’s goal in this area: to create a culture across the university that encourages thoughtful evaluation in order that faculty may be evaluated fairly in a manner that uses student opinion appropriately.

The current system suffers from the following problems:

◊ Students often do not treat these evaluations seriously. The response rate is lower than it should be. However, the committee has learned that the overall response rate, while low, is actually fairly similar to what the response rate was in the days of paper evaluations. According to a report prepared by Ray Wallace and Leonard Johnson in 2003, the “paper” response rate in spring of 2002 was only 57.2%. Switching to on-line evaluations the following semester actually increased the response rate—but only by 3.2% for fall 2002 and 0.7% for spring 2003.

Nevertheless, the response rate is still lower than we would like. Students sometimes appear to be offering their evaluations in a hurried and haphazard manner, which may very well be caused by the informal setting in which they fill out the evaluations. Occasionally, students appear to be doing these evaluations in groups. Unfortunately, the answers that students give in these settings can have serious negative effects on the faculty member involved.

◊ There is a fundamental lack of enthusiasm among faculty for the current evaluation system. On the one hand, these data are overemphasized in evaluating performance of faculty members, instead of employing other measures (class visits, for example). At the same time, the evaluations are underutilized: faculty are not investing the time necessary to customize their evaluations in a way that is appropriate to the specific course.

◊ There is a perception that the tenure and promotion process over relies on the statistical data from these evaluations instead of looking at other possible evidence of a faculty member’s teaching, such as the thoughtful review of syllabi by senior faculty in the same field, class visits by department administrators, descriptions from the faculty member about his or her own teaching, and so forth. In other words, the on-line evaluations are not incorporated into any kind of comprehensive system of faculty development.

The faculty of the university, rather than the administration, is ultimately responsible for determining the standards by which courses are evaluated. This means that the committee can only make recommendations that will affect the environment in which these evaluations take place, such as the sort of tools that will be available for such evaluations.

With this consideration in mind, the committee offers the following recommendations:

◊ That the on-line evaluation system be retained with some modifications because of its efficiency.

◊ That the university make an effort to incorporate these evaluations into a comprehensive faculty development program. Recommendations:

• The university could begin an effort to create a comprehensive faculty development program.
along the lines recommended by Nancy Wannamaker and Ding Johnson, as a result of a two-day seminar they attended this past March under the auspices of the Center for Educational Development and Assessment.

• The university could distinguish between two functions of student evaluations: (1) formative, designed to give feedback to the faculty member toward self-improvement and (2) summative, designed to provide data for personnel decisions.

• The option of formative evaluations could be provided to faculty so that they could conduct their own midterm evaluations. The results from these evaluations would be made available only to the faculty member and his or her mentor.

• All of these steps would be toward seeing student evaluations as part of a larger system of faculty development. The results from student evaluations cannot by themselves determine the quality of a faculty member’s teaching; administrators and tenure and promotion committees need to include additional measures. (Wannamaker and Johnson point out some other possibilities: peer assessment of course content or syllabus design, structured interviews to assess student learning, class visits, and so forth.)

◊ That steps be taken to make students take the process more seriously:

• That the hours at which students are permitted to fill out an evaluation be restricted to the daytime hours. (The committee was concerned that students occasionally fill out evaluations in groups late at night in what appears to be a raucous atmosphere.)

• That students be allowed the option to electronically sign their evaluations in order that they might carry more weight.

• That the university engage in efforts to educate students about the purpose of the the evaluations and their use in how faculty members design their teaching and in how they are evaluated. In general it should be the goal of the university to create a culture of thoughtful evaluation.

• That the practice of counting blank evaluations as evidence that a student participated be discontinued.

• That the university solicit student opinion on other possible incentives might encourage more student participation.

◊ That steps be taken to encourage more participation by faculty:

• That faculty be allowed the option of designing their own open-ended question. This would be particularly useful for the formative evaluations.

• That department administrators use a variety of methods to assess teaching and encourage their faculty to evaluate their own teaching.

◊ That the evaluations not be used for any other purpose besides assessing the faculty member’s performance and as a means of improving the faculty member’s teaching. The committee does not feel that the on-line student evaluations should be used to assess general learning outcomes, for example. There already is student opinion data from other types of surveys. Most important, the on-line student evaluations need to retained their primary purpose of improving the faculty member’s teaching. Any changes made to the evaluations beyond this would decrease their effectiveness in this area.

• We carefully considered whether it was possible to assess learning outcomes with the on-line student evaluations. The university learning outcomes apply to programs, nto individual courses.

• It may be possible to totally revise the on-line evaluation system so that the evaluations have a completely different purpose, but we see this as a separate set of issues.

• The danger is that a hybrid system will not satisfy anyone.
Bond Financing Update
September 25, 2007
Keys to Successful Bond Financings

• Must have a prioritized list of projects tied to the strategic plan with a long term view – 10 years at least.
• Must be able to talk about projects on a strategic outcomes basis.
• Must know what our programs, research, and student mix will look like over the long term horizon.
• Must have the President and VP of Finance lead the rating agency presentation(s).
• Must understand our financial ratios relative to financings.
Needs and Opportunities

ESCO Project:
UI’s technical audit to identify potential energy savings resulted in a need to finance those projects.

Refunding of Existing Bonds:
Market conditions presented an opportunity to achieve substantial savings on existing debt.
Planning Process

1. Development of a 30 Financing Proforma:
   • Modeling of Repayment Capacity
   • Conservative Student Enrollment Assumptions
   • Identification of Revenue Sources

2. Review of Financing Methods:
   • Bank Loans
   • Lease Purchase/Certificates of Participation
   • Bonds

3. Assessment of Financing Needs

4. Assembling the Team
Bond Team

Consultants:
• Lee White, George K. Baum & Co - Investment Banker
• Richard Skinner, Skinner Fawcett – Bond Counsel
• Blake Wade, Ballard Spahr – Bond Counsel

UI Team Members:
• Tyrone Brooks, Admin. Operations – Financing Strategies
• Jana Stotler, Strategic Budget & Controller – Financing Strategies
• Kent Nelson, General Counsel – Legal Counsel
• Ron Town, Business Srvcs & Accounting Srvcs – Debt Accounting
• Theresa James, General Accounting – Debt Accounting
• Trina Mahoney, Budget Office – Capital Budgeting
How We Progressed

February ‘07
• Presentation on financing potential to meet UI’s needs to VP of Finance & Admin.
• Beginning review of potential projects for bonding

March ’07
• Presentation to President on potential of bond financing

April ’07
• Presentation to Board of Regents on future financing plans

June ’07
• Bond team assembled & began pre-issuance work

August ’07
• Capital projects for bond financing approved by President
• Rating agency presentation at UI
• Bond Series 2007 materials assembled

September ‘07
• Agenda item submitted for Issuance of Series 2007 Bonds to Board of Regents for October meeting.
Financing Philosophy

Development of long-range financing strategies to assist UI’s campus renewal and strategic plan.

30 Year Strategy

Strategic and prudent use of bonds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Fiscal Years</th>
<th>Potential “New Money” Bonds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2008 - 2016</td>
<td>$114 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>2017 - 2025</td>
<td>$ 70 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>2026 - 2035</td>
<td>$100 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>2036 - 2040</td>
<td>$ 50 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase I Details

Estimated Timeline and Amounts:
• Bond Refunding: $65 M – October 2007
• ESCO Project: $35 M – October 2007
• Series 2008: $34 M – December 2008
• Series 2010: $45 M – December 2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Par Amount</th>
<th>Deposit to Escrow or Project Fund</th>
<th>Average Nominal Savings as a % of Refunded Par</th>
<th>Cash NPV Savings</th>
<th>Average NPV Savings as a % of Refunded Par</th>
<th>All In Cost</th>
<th>Average Net Annual Debt Service¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Series 2007</td>
<td>$94,605,000</td>
<td>$97,600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,271,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2007B, New Money Issue</td>
<td>$33,450,000</td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,107,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2007A, Total Refunding Program</td>
<td>$61,155,000</td>
<td>$62,600,000</td>
<td>21.846%</td>
<td>$6,478,591</td>
<td>10.765%</td>
<td>4.025%</td>
<td>$3,125,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 1999 Refunding</td>
<td>$16,180,000</td>
<td>$16,571,790</td>
<td>10.223%</td>
<td>$1,083,445</td>
<td>6.715%</td>
<td>4.058%</td>
<td>$1,366,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 1999A Refunding</td>
<td>$1,180,000</td>
<td>$1,204,740</td>
<td>9.396%</td>
<td>$72,323</td>
<td>6.155%</td>
<td>4.058%</td>
<td>$99,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 1999B Refunding</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$5,117,960</td>
<td>12.092%</td>
<td>$403,049</td>
<td>8.110%</td>
<td>4.058%</td>
<td>$422,567</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Credit Rating Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Date</th>
<th>Total Debt</th>
<th>FTE Enrollment</th>
<th>Expendable Resources</th>
<th>Expendable Resources to Debt</th>
<th>Expendable Resources to Operations</th>
<th>Reliance on State Funding</th>
<th>Operating Margin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Idaho - Current</strong></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$127,010,000</td>
<td>11,110</td>
<td>$114,283,079</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UI - Pro-Forma $100 M</strong></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$227,010,000</td>
<td>11,110</td>
<td>$114,283,079</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moody's Median - A1</strong></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$141,620,000</td>
<td>18,132</td>
<td>$141,620,000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Peer Comps - A1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Date</th>
<th>Total Debt</th>
<th>FTE Enrollment</th>
<th>Expendable Resources</th>
<th>Expendable Resources to Debt</th>
<th>Expendable Resources to Operations</th>
<th>Reliance on State Funding</th>
<th>Operating Margin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Alaska</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$123,000,000</td>
<td>17,454</td>
<td>$172,200,000</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois University</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$286,000,000</td>
<td>28,777</td>
<td>$143,000,000</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball State</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$142,000,000</td>
<td>16,533</td>
<td>$355,000,000</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$187,200,000</td>
<td>22,036</td>
<td>$149,760,000</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana State</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$130,200,000</td>
<td>16,774</td>
<td>$104,160,000</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Dakota</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$110,000,000</td>
<td>11,405</td>
<td>$110,000,000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$391,000,000</td>
<td>19,683</td>
<td>$273,700,000</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Washington</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>11,713</td>
<td>$7,200,000</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC Charlotte</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$174,900,000</td>
<td>18,855</td>
<td>$139,920,000</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Vermont</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$401,300,000</td>
<td>10,580</td>
<td>$361,170,000</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What the Rating Agencies Said

Moody’s

• A1 Rating with Stable Outlook
• “...outlook for UI reflects its fundamental market and operational strengths despite its high leverage and modest enrollment declines. Stabilization of enrollment and continued balanced operational performance are important to maintaining a stable credit profile as the University adds additional debt in coming years.”
• “What could change the rating – UP...dramatic increase in financial resources...stabilization of enrollment levels and continued debt service coverage would improve the University’s credit strength.”
• “What could change the rating – DOWN Continued enrollment declines; deterioration of balance sheet...greater borrowing than currently anticipated.”
What the Rating Agencies Said, Con’t

Standard & Poor’s

• A+ Rating with Stable Outlook
• “…outlook anticipates stabilized demand and improved fundraising. It also reflects continued state financial support...further efforts to achieve balanced financial operations...future debt will be matched with additional financial resources.”
Moving Forward

• Continue implementation of strategic plan
• Exhibit consistent and strategic enrollment growth
• Prudent operational performance and resource stewardship
• Allocation of funds specifically to the top strategic priorities
• Stable growth in resources with an emphasis on academic operations, research enterprise, and donor giving
Questions?
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 Natural Resources
Name of Department(s) or Area(s): Department of Forest Products

Indicate if this Notice of Intent (NOI) is for an Academic or Professional Technical Program
Academic X Professional - Technical

A New, Expanded, Cooperative, Contract, or Off-Campus Instructional Program or Administrative/Research Unit (circle one) leading to:
Change name of the Timber Harvesting minor to Forest Operations

(Degree or Certificate)

Proposed Starting Date: Summer 2008

For New Programs:
Program (i.e., degree) Title & CIP 2000 X Program Component (major/minor/option/emphasis)

For Other Activity:
Off-Campus Activity/Resident Center
Instructional/Research Unit
Addition/Expansion
Discontinuance/consolidation
Contract Program
Other

Dean’s signature on file 8/28/07
College Dean (Institution) Date
Michael Whiteman, Associate Dean CNR 8/27/07
Chief Fiscal Officer (Institution) Date

Chief Academic Officer (Institution) Date

President Date

SBOE/OSBE Approval Date

Revised 8/9/06
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).

   We would like to change the name of our minor “Timber Harvesting” to “Forest Operations.”

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.).

   There are no modifications to this program other than the change in the name of our Timber Harvesting minor to a minor in Forest Operations. The name Forest Operations better reflects the focus on management operations that occur in the forest besides timber harvesting.

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

   There will be no change to the quality of our program. The new name better reflects the content of the program and does not impact our accreditation requirements.

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.

   This is a name change only. There are no similar programs that exist in Idaho.

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>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</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>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</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).

This curriculum is consistent with the University of Idaho mission to: formulate its academic plan and generate programs with primary emphasis on agriculture, natural resources, metallurgy, engineering, architecture, law, foreign languages, teacher preparation and international programs related to the foregoing. It also directly aligns with the University Strategic Theme of Stewarding the Environment - sustaining Idaho’s natural resources that contribute to our quality of life and natural resources-based industries. The environmental, social and economic benefits provided by Idaho’s forests are enhanced when activities carried out to accomplish management objectives are conducted in sustainable ways that are sensitive to both ecological needs and economic considerations.

Forestry is an important sector of the state’s economy and to the viability of small local communities spread throughout Idaho. Gross sales in Idaho wood and paper products were $1.65 billion in 2002, directly employing 17,430 people. This is nearly half of the 2003 projection for Idaho agricultural product gross sales ($4 billion).

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.):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Fiscal Impact</th>
<th>FY 08</th>
<th>FY 09</th>
<th>FY 10</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Source of Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Appropriated-reallocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appropriated – New</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Nature of Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Recurring *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Non-recurring **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</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.
TO: University Curriculum Committee
FROM: Office of the Registrar
RE: Proposed Addition of Regulation B-13 [Effective: Summer 2008]
DATE: March 09, 2007

B-13. Registration in Joint-Listed Courses. A student who enrolls in a joint-listed course may only earn credit at the level the student initially completes the course. A student who enrolls in the same joint-listed course at a different level will receive zero credit on his or her transcript.

TO: University Curriculum Committee
FROM: Office of the Registrar
RE: Change Regulation J-9-a [Effective: Summer 2008]
DATE: April 20, 2007

J-9-a. An academic minor is a prescribed course of study consisting of 18-19 or more credits which supplements an undergraduate major at the University of Idaho. For descriptions of minor curricula, see the programs of the degree-granting units in Part 5. In the following paragraphs of J-9, "minor" denotes "academic minor," which is to be distinguished from "teaching minor"; for information on the latter, see the Department of Curriculum and Instruction section of Part 5.

Rationale: The Idaho State Board of Education stipulates that an Academic Minor comprises between 15 and 25 percent of the total degree requirements. The minimum number of credits for a degree of the UI is 128. 15 percent of 128 credits works out to 19.2 credits.