University of Idaho
2008-2009 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA
Meeting #24

Tuesday, March 24, 2009, 3:30 p.m.
BRINK HALL FACULTY LOUNGE

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   - Minutes of the 2008-09 Faculty Council Meeting #23, March 10, 2009

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.

VI. Committee Reports.

   University Curriculum Committee:
   FC-09-072: UCC-09-094 – Discontinue M.S. in Veterinary Science
   FC-09-073: UCC-09-105 – Discontinue M.S. in Architecture (Denied by UCC)

   Faculty Affairs:
   FC-09-067: FSH 3050 – Position Description
   FC-09-068: FSH 3140 – Performance Expectations
   FC-09-069: FSH 3320 – Annual Evaluation
   FC-09-070: FSH 3420 – Faculty Salaries

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

   FC-09-071: FSH 1520 – University Constitution (Hill)
   (Initial discussion of multi-site participation at general faculty meetings)
   Faculty led discussion of the University’s strategic direction – PPP & beyond (4:30 p.m.)

X. Adjournment.

Professor Karen Guilfoyle, Chair 2008-2009, Faculty Council

Attachments: Minutes of 2008-2009 FC Meeting #23
FC-09-067 through FC-09-071 (distributed earlier)
FC-09-072 & 073
University of Idaho  
Faculty Council Meeting Minutes  
2008-09 Meeting #23 Tuesday March 10, 2009

Present: Baird, Baillargeon, Baker, (w/o vote), Crowley, Eveleth, Fairley, Fritz, Graden, Guilfoyle (chair), Hill (w/o vote), Huber, Limbaugh, Machlis, Makus, Mihelich, Miller, Murphy, Oman, Schmeckpeper, Stohner, Sullivan, Williams, Wilson. Liaisons: Budwig (Boise), Newcombe (Coeur d’Alene), Dakins (Idaho Falls). Absent: Battaglia, Johnson. Visitors/Guests: 10

A quorum being present, the chair opened the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

Minutes: It was moved and seconded (Miller/Murphy) to approve the minutes of the meeting of March 3, 2009 as distributed, approved.

Chair’s Report: Professor Guilfoyle’s welcome return was followed by her recognition and thanks to the council for the professional manner in which they handled the work at hand. Special recognition was given to Jack Miller for stepping up to the chairmanship during a very difficult time. She then announced the receipt of a thank you card to the FC for its donation to Operation Education in memory of President Daley-Laursen’s father. The chair had also received a resolution from the Idaho State Faculty Senate about state employee salaries which she read to council. The chair noted that there would be a student appeal to the Academic Hearing Board and the FC members who were nominated in the fall would be required to convene the Board.

Provost’s Report: The Provost noted that the United States Chief Justice, John Roberts would be a guest at our campus this Friday to deliver the Bellwood Lecture. He encouraged faculty to bring their students and friends to the lecture.

The Provost moved on to briefly discuss the federal stimulus package, noting that there were several pieces that might affect the university. The state will receive two separate allocations – general and education related. Disbursement of funds would be clearer following spring break.

PPP/NOI’s: It was noted that the President had indicated at a previous FC meeting that there would be no faculty or staff laid-off as a result of the closure of programs in the present PPP. [Commentary to this effect was recorded in the minutes of FC meetings of January 20 and 27, 2009]. It was moved (Miller/Eveleth) that FC offer an understanding to the SBOE that NOI’s have been approved based upon the President’s statement that no lay-offs will occur as a result of present program discontinuation. Approved.

It was noted that FC had received copies of the Department of Psychology and Communication Studies notes that were meant to accompany the NOI for discontinuance of the BS Communication Studies. UCC chair, Professor Dacey reported that UCC had moved to note their displeasure at not being provided with the department notes either. FC discourse considered that although the notes had not accompanied the NOI when it was discussed at FC last week, there was extensive discussion that included knowledge of the department vote.

FC-09-033 Drop MS Geological Engineering. This NOI was denied by UCC (1:9). Discussion ensued on the points made in a letter in opposition to the NOI from Professor Stan Miller. The dean of Engineering, Professor Blackketter circulated a memorandum outlining several aspects of the issues surrounding the development of this NOI. The intention was to develop an entirely new approach in building a new multi-disciplinary program that would retain training elements in Geological Engineering that would be
consolidated into a new package together with Environmental Engineering. The memorandum noted the positive interactions with the faculty involved in developing new strategies.

There was extensive discussion about the proposed new Masters program. It was expected that the new program could be formulated by the close of the spring semester. There was a real need for these graduates in the state, but the demand was small. Discussion explored the development of the new program and confirmed that it would proceed based on the elimination of the MS Geological Engineering. The effect of discontinuing one program with a lag to implementing a new program was discussed. The effect on student recruitment was explored. The intention was to make the transition seamless and thus it was expected that there would be no down-side effect on student recruitment. Swings in student numbers over recent years were discussed.

An amended motion was proposed to defer consideration of the NOI to such time as the accompanying merged program NOI was brought forward (Wilson/Oman).

Discussion: It was proposed that FC should be responding to the document in front of them at the meeting and not speculating about the possibility of another NOI coming forward at some time in the future. The question for the amendment to the main motion was called, 6 in favor, 13 against, motion defeated.

There being no further discussion of the main motion, the vote was proposed in support of the NOI’s, 4 for, 13 against. Thus FC disapproved the NOI.

**FC-09-065.** Consolidate MS Majors in CNR to a single major. UCC chair Dacey noted that the vote at UCC was 11 for and 0 against the NOI. Dean of the College of Natural Resources, Professor McLaughlin noted that this change was consistent with the future direction of the college and that the vote in the college was unanimously in favor of the NOI. There being no further discussion, the vote was proposed in support of the NOI’s, 17 for, 0 against. FC approved the NOI.

**FC-09-066.** Drop MAT Art Education. UCC chair Dacey noted that the UCC vote was 0 in favor and 11 against this NOI. The college vote was unanimously against the NOI. The dean of the College of Art and Architecture, Professor Hoversten noted that this was a good program but a lack of funds and faculty overload limited enrollment. The course was taken on-line by teachers looking for additional training and supporting career advancement. The degree was difficult for the college to resource and relatively faculty intensive. The HOD, Professor Woolston noted that faculty had agreed to take on teaching overload to continue to offer the program, although there would be no additional funding to support extra positions. Extensive discussion centered around the sustainability of a program that had to be supported by faculty overload. Additional comments suggested that the community needed to discuss the strategic place for MAT programs in the long-term plans for the university.

There being no further discussion, the vote was proposed in support of the NOI’s, 4 for, 13 against, 1 abstention.

**Adjournment:** It was moved and seconded (Crowley/Sullivan) to adjourn at 4:55 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Rodney A. Hill, Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Council
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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).

   The Animal & Veterinary Science Department is dis-continuing (dropping) its Master of Science in Veterinary Science graduate program.

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 M.S. – Vet Sci graduate program has enrolled a very low number of students (fewer than 1 per year) over the past 10 years.

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

   The AVS Department will continue to offer the M.S. – Animal Science and Ph.D. – Animal Physiology graduate programs

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.

   None offered.

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>CWI</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>1</td>
<td>1</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>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>None at M.S.</td>
<td>None at M.S. level</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).

Not applicable.

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</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>FY</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>
</tbody>
</table>

| **B. Source of Funds** |     |     |     |       |
| 1. Appropriated-       |     |     |     |       |
| reallocation           |     |     |     |       |
| 2. Appropriated – New  |     |     |     |       |
| 3. Federal             |     |     |     |       |
| 4. Other:              |     |     |     |       |
| **TOTAL:**             | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0     |

| **B. Nature of Funds** |     |     |     |       |
| 1. Recurring *         |     |     |     |       |
| 2. Non-recurring **    |     |     |     |       |
| **TOTAL:**             | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0     |

* 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.
Notice of Intent (NOI) Approval Tracking Form

Committee Chairs please append this document to the relevant NOI and send it forward to the next committee for review.

Committee: AVS Faculty

Program/Degree: MS Veterinary Science

Discussion:

Meeting was convened at 12:00 noon (Pacific) by Dr. Carl Hunt, originating in Ag104 and by videoconference to Caldwell, Idaho Falls, Salmon and Twin Falls.

In attendance: Amin Ahmadzedah, Jason Ahola, Dick Battaglia, Marie Bulgin, Mireille Chahine, Joe Dalton, Tracy Davis, Matt Doumit, Benton Glaze, Carl Hunt, John Hall, Mark McGuire, Gordon Murdoch, Roxanne Pillars, Matt Powell, Pedram Rezamand, Ron Richard, Chris Schneider, and Dirk Vanderwall.

Absent: Wayne Ayers & Jim England (both on weekly Tuesday field calls), Ron Hardy, Rod Hill, and Rick Norell.

Excerpt of the discussion of the NOI’s:

- Program Reprioritization. Two AVS degree programs have been identified by the committee for elimination. These are not cost-bearing programs, but have been used infrequently in the past so are proposed for elimination. The programs are:
  - MS in Veterinary Science – again, not cost-bearing, and probably a direction for AVS in the future. Prospective students who would enroll in the degree option include pre-vet students who are not accepted for vet school in their first attempt and also post-DVM’s who might want to pursue an advanced research degree and/or be considering a career move to academia or industry.
  - Vote of the faculty required today on NOI (Notice of Intent) for both degrees. Considerable discussion followed, including possibly a NOI to rename AVS degrees to “Animal and Veterinary Science” with the appropriate area of emphasis. There were several advantages cited for retaining the M.S. Vet Science degree with the two prevailing advantages being: 1) there is a need for this degree for career/professional positions – 100% of the graduates of this degree find employment, and 2) elimination of the degrees would not change the courses we are offering and consequently there would be no cost saving in eliminating either. The only advantage of the NOI’s that could be cited was appearance that CALS had made a good faith effort to streamline its degree offerings. A vote followed the discussion.

Vote: The vote to support the NOI eliminating the M.S Vet Science degree option failed 16 to 2

Revised 12/10/08
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Notice of Intent (NOI) Approval Tracking Form

Committee Chairs please append this document to the relevant NOI and send it forward to the next committee for review.

Committee: Academic Programs Advisory Committee, CALS

Program/Degree: M.S. Vet. Science

Discussion:
The committee reviewed the NOI Approval Tracking Form from the Animal and Veterinary Sciences faculty meeting, which clearly outlined the arguments against discontinuing this degree. The form also contained the departmental vote concerning this NOI – 1 in favor, 17 opposed. No further discussion occurred.

Vote: 2 in favor, 2 opposed, 2 abstained
Notice of Intent (NOI) Approval Tracking Form

Committee Chairs please append this document to the relevant NOI and send it forward to the next committee for review.

Committee: Graduate Council

Program/Degree: Master of Science in Veterinary Science

Discussion:

Ben Swan, Chair of CALS Academic Programs Advisory Committee, presented the NOI on behalf of the college. Dick Battaglia was present representing the department and Andrew Brewick was present representing the Dean’s Office.

In summary, the department vote was 2-16 to approve the NOI and the vote was 2-2-2 by CALS Academic Programs Advisory Committee.

Dick Battaglia addressed the Council. He explained that there are two MS degrees in dept. – MS in Animal Science and MS in Veterinary Science. Animal Science and Veterinary Science used to be two departments each with their own degree. When the departments merged, the separate degrees were retained. MS Vet Sci is a post DVM degree with few students. The difference between the degrees is what the committee makes it. The same faculty is involved in both degrees. The BS degrees are combined so this NOI request would be in line with that combination. However, Council was reminded that his request was initiated by the Dean’s Office and not the department.

Andrew said that any post DVM can still get the MS in An Sci and design the degree and the program will serve the student well. The elimination of this program is a strategic decision. There is not as high a need or demand for this program as there once was.

Why do DVMs come back? DVM is broad degree while MS is or PhD is an in depth program. It can also depend if the student wants to go into practice or academia.

How many are actually in the program? Does this elimination dilute the department? No, there is only one a year.

Vote: ___10__Yes
    ___3___No
Notice of Intent (NOI) Approval Tracking Form

Committee Chairs please append this document to the relevant NOI and send it forward to the next committee for review.

Committee: University Curriculum Committee  Date: 3/02/09

Absent: Nancy Krogh, Garrett Holbrook.
Others Present: Margrit Von Braun, John Foltz, Bill Woolston, Mark Hoversten, Dwaine Hubbard

Program/Degree: Discontinue Master of Science (M.S.) major in Veterinary Science

Discussion:

UCC-09-094 College of Agricultural and Life Sciences
The committee reviewed the proposed Notice of Intent (NOI) from the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences to discontinue the Master of Science (M.S.) major in Veterinary Science. Committee member Secrist questioned the departmental notes in the minutes from APAC and Graduate Council. Committee member Machleidt noted there were no minutes from the departmental curriculum committee meeting. Committee member Battaglia indicated that the departmental minutes were attached to the NOI from the department. Associate Dean Foltz indicated that the missing minutes and data may be an oversight from his office when he sent them forward. The argument to close M.S. in Veterinary Science program is very low enrollment in the program. Battaglia indicated that the department would like to keep the program on the grounds that it cost the university very little to retain it. The committee approved the motion to Defer the proposed NOI until the missing data can be provided.

Vote: No vote recorded.
Notice of Intent (NOI) Approval Tracking Form

Committee Chairs please append this document to the relevant NOI and send it forward to the next committee for review.

Committee: University Curriculum Committee  Date: 3/09/09


Absent: Mark Secrist, Garrett Holbrook.

Others Present: Diane Armpriest, Thea Lu, Charles Tibbals, Dwaine Hubbard

Program/Degree: Discontinue Master of Science (M.S.) major in Veterinary Science

Discussion:

UCC-09-094  College of Agricultural and Life Sciences
The committee returned to the deferred Notice of Intent (NOI) from the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences to discontinue the Master of Science (M.S.) with a major in Veterinary Science. Battaglia noted that the major isn’t essential to the survival of the department, but it really has next to no cost to the department and dropping this major will not cause any courses to be dropped. The committee noted the lack of courses offered under the subject rubric of Veterinary Science. Committee members Battaglia and Hill reviewed the graduation rates of the majors in the Department of Animal and Veterinary Science and explained why students would return to complete more advanced degrees. The committee Approved the proposed NOI 8 for and 2 against, and will forward the proposed NOI to Faculty Council for review.

Vote: Approved – 8 for and 2 against
IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
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MS Architecture Program
Page 1
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).

   The request is to be allowed to discontinue the MS Architecture degree. This program draws resources from other existing professional programs.

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 request to cancel this degree program is based on a number of factors including the following:

   **Summary:**

   Closure of this degree allows the department to focus its limited faculty resources on the accredited, seamless professional, graduate degree as well as the undergraduate BS Arch degree which are taught contiguously. Students receive both the BS Arch and M Arch at the same time. The Yardley Report suggested that the University of Idaho focus on degrees related to professional programs leading to state licensure.

   Currently, students in this non-professional MS Arch degree program recommended for closure are taught as an overload beyond normal teaching assignments.

   **Quality:** Graduates of the MS Arch program are generally of high quality and find jobs in teaching, research and in the public sector.

   **Duplication:** The program does not duplicate other programs or degrees at the university.

   **Centrality:** Architecture is listed in the mandate documents for the University of Idaho. It is central to the mission.

   **Demand:** Approximately two to three students are admitted per year out of about 10-12 applicants per year. There are approximately six students in the program and two newly admitted.

   **Resources:** The MS program is currently administered as an “overload” to normal teaching assignments. Although teaching loads in this department are very high, removal of this degree would not offset the benefits provided by MS students serving as teaching and research assistants.”.

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

   The Master of Architecture remains the accredited professional degree. Closure of MS Arch program does not affect accreditation.

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 does not apply. The University of Idaho offers the only accredited Architecture Program in the State of Idaho and the only MS Arch in the state of 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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWI</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>7</td>
<td>7</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>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</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).

This closure allows us to focus on our professionally accredited degree, the Master of Architecture which is central to the role of the University.

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.):

   Estimated Fiscal Impact  FY _______  FY _______  FY _______  Total _______

   **A. Expenditures**

      1. Personnel _______ _______ _______ _______
      2. Operating _______ _______ _______ _______
      3. Capital Outlay _______ _______ _______ _______
      4. Facilities _______ _______ _______ _______

      TOTAL: _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ 0 0 0 0

   **B. Source of Funds**

      1. Appropriated-reallocation _______ _______ _______ _______
      2. Appropriated – New _______ _______ _______ _______
      3. Federal _______ _______ _______ _______
      4. Other: _______ _______ _______ _______

      TOTAL: _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ 0 0 0 0

   **B. Nature of Funds**

      1. Recurring * _______ _______ _______ _______
      2. Non-recurring ** _______ _______ _______ _______

      TOTAL: _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ 0 0 0 0

* 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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**Committee:** Faculty Committee of the Whole
Department of Architecture and Interior Design.
2/4/2009

**Program/Degree:** MS. Architecture

**Discussion:**

Diane Armpriest began the discussion by providing an overview of the NOI Process. The recommended closure of the MS Architecture program was a result of the prioritization process that identified the MS Arch as one of the 41 programs to be closed. The NOI for each program was then developed at the college level. The NOI we are reviewing today was initiated by Dean Hoversten and sent to the department chair who reviewed it and added minor editorial changes before sending it to faculty for review and discussion. Today we need to discuss the elimination of the MS Architecture at the department meeting as a committee of the whole, revise the form as needed and send it, together with minutes of the meeting, to the college curriculum committee for discussion.

Anne said that we should state clearly that it was not the department who authored this document (NOI). The statement with our initial response to the dean should be attached to the NOI document as this outlines our position. The department believes that the benefits outweigh the costs but the administration is recommending this because of current and forecasted constraints.

Frank added that it is probably a political move and if not approved and may increase vulnerability of other department programs to future cuts.

The department preference is freezing the program rather than elimination because it would be easier to reactivate and we may want to expand it at a future date when the financial climate is healthier.

The MS Arch program does not increase the teaching/advising load for all faculty members; it affects only the major professors and committee members working with MS Arch students.

Question Yardley statement in NOI. There was no mention of the MS in Yardley, but the entire university was encouraged to support the professional programs.

The benefits outweigh the cost despite the fact that it contributes to an additional teaching/advising load.

We should acknowledge that the University of Idaho needs to make cuts.

The consensus was to recommend freezing the MS Arch program to create options in the future.

Include department’s cost benefit analysis with document.
Bruce said it is the only MS Arch program in the state.

We should be sensitive to the University’s recommendations.

End of discussion...........

At the meeting additional changes were also made directly on the NOI form by Diane in response to faculty comments, and she will circulate it to all faculty for review prior to submitting it to the College Curriculum Committee.

Vote:

The NOI, Addendum and minutes are forwarded with unanimous support to the CAA Curriculum Committee

9. Addendum

This NOI was not initiated by the faculty of the Department of Architecture and Interior Design, and the following statement presents the position of the Department relative to the proposed closure of the MS Architecture program.

The Department of Architecture and Interior Design acknowledge that the University of Idaho needs to make substantial budget cuts; however, the Department’s cost benefit analysis suggests that the benefits to the University of Idaho associated with retaining the MS Architecture program outweigh the minor costs associated with delivering the program. MS student and faculty research helps forward the University initiatives on sustainability, and we offer the only MS Arch program in the State of Idaho. In addition, student profiles typically fall into the categories of non-traditional and international, thus increasing diversity at the University of Idaho.

Again, understanding the current fiscal environment, we recommend that we freeze the program until additional resources are available, thus saving the additional time and money required to request reopening the program at a later date. A summary of the findings of our assessment of program strengths is attached.

10. Department of Architecture and Interior Design

“Sense of the Faculty” on Proposed Elimination of MS in Architecture
10/27/09

The faculty of the Department of Architecture and Interior Design discussed the proposal to eliminate the MS Architecture degree during our faculty meeting, Jan 21, 2009. As a point of clarification, there are currently six active students in the program, and 2 admitted to start in 2009. Faculty in Architecture, Interior Design and VTD participate directly in the program. The students choose our program because they are interested in university teaching, research or preparation for Ph.D. programs elsewhere.

In addition, it is important to point out that the topics pursued by most of our graduate students are in the area of sustainable design or virtual technology and design – areas that have already been identified as central to the strategic plan and focus areas of the University of Idaho.

We believe the advantages of maintaining the program outweigh the disadvantages.
• No funding is budgeted to support faculty teaching in the program, so it creates a positive cash flow for the University.
• The program is selective – admitting only 2-3 students (of approximately 10 applicants) annually. Students are admitted to the program only if a faculty member would like to work with them and help pursue their mutual research agendas. There are several examples of collaborative outcomes, including joint publications, symposia and grants.
• Some MS students serve as teaching assistants in Foundations, Architecture and VTD.
• The participation of MS students in graduate level courses enriches the experience of the professional M.Arch students who are also enrolled.
• MS students come from around the world and increase the diversity of our program.

We also noted several disadvantages to offering our current program.

• Working with MS students does increase the teaching loads of faculty who serve as major professors or on committees.
• Because the program is small, and students are often enrolled part-time, we have not established a strong MS Culture.
• There is no funding available to recruit students, and we only have very limited funding available to support the students.

The preference of the faculty is to continue the MSArch program. As an alternative approach, recognizing that the University is in a serious fiscal crisis, we would propose “freezing” the program rather than eliminating it. By taking that action, it would be easier to reactivate it at such time as resources become available.
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Committee: College of Art and Architecture Curriculum Committee
Jill Dacey (chair), Brian Sumption, Anne Marshall, Diane Armpriest, Shauna Corry, Elizabeth Graff.

Program/Degree: Discontinue the MS Architecture degree

Discussion:

It should be noted that this NOI was not initiated by the Department of Architecture and Interior Design, but by Mark Hoversten, Dean of the College of Art and Architecture.

Diane Armpriest and Anne Marshall presented in support of the MS Arch degree. The students teach and enhance research. The students have contributed to an increased research output and increase in diversity…most students are International students.

The department realizes the situation the University is in and that we are being requested to make cuts; however, they want to freeze the program rather than do away with it, in order to have the option of reinstating the program later.

There are no separate classes but the students do a thesis, so there is an extra cost. Elizabeth Graff asked what additional demands are placed on the department by having these students. Response was that it requires one-on-one with faculty members to design their program and then with the committee.

Most MS students don’t have a professional degree in architecture. The student may be from another discipline completely. Diane says that it takes about an hour a week for a year to mentor a student. May or may not contribute to the faculty members’ research. Only take the student if there is a faculty member who wants to take this person on, otherwise they are not admitted. The one hour is not off-loaded by teaching by the student.

There is concern that if we don’t do this that the degree will be eliminated without input. Mark added that if there are compelling reasons to keep a program, these will be listened to.

Vote: To support the NOI to discontinue the MS Architecture degree, not unanimously.

It was moved and seconded to reconsider the NOI to Discontinue the MS Architecture after the NOI to discontinue the MAT Art was discussed.

For consistency in how the NOI was presented and the vote taken, the committee determined that the question was not presented consistently with all NOIs being considered. After further clarification of the similarity to the MAT Art in terms of faculty time and positive aspects of the program, the College Curriculum Committee re-voted.

Vote: To NOT support the NOI to discontinue the MS Architecture degree, unanimously.
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Committee: Graduate Council

Program/Degree: Master of Science Architecture

Discussion:

Jill Dacey opened discussion. The AA curriculum committee voted to keep the program but not admit students rather than eliminate the MS in Architecture. This degree is the thesis program for the Architecture program. Only a few students are allowed into the program each year. The students participate with faculty and faculty research.

The department approved, under protest, to close it. College Curr Comm, voted for the NOI - College voted unanimously not to approve.

Discussion points are summarized. The dept savings would be felt at the faculty level, as faculty help students write theses. The thesis is in line with the faculty’s research. The students take the same courses as the March (non-thesis option) students. Students in this degree do not help create the threshold number for classes, as there are so few students. Another advantage to maintain a small program is to enhance scholarly productivity, as the University of Idaho strategic plan indicates.

Move to vote on the NOI to discontinue MS Arch
y=2, n=6, abstain=4

Vote: 2 In Favor

6 Opposed

4 Abstain
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Committee: University Curriculum Committee  Date: 3/09/09

Absent: Mark Secrist, Garrett Holbrook.
Others Present: Diane Armpriest, Thea Lu, Charles Tibbals, Dwaine Hubbard

Program/Degree: Discontinue the Master of Science (M.S.) major in Architecture

Discussion:

UCC-09-105 College of Art and Architecture
Committee chair Dacey introduced the proposed Notice of Intent (NOI) from the College of Art and Architecture to discontinue the Master of Science (M.S.) major in Architecture. Committee member Battaglia asked what where the differences between the B.S.Arch, M.S. in Architecture, and M.Arch programs. Dacey explained the differences between the programs. Diane Armpriest added that the MS. In Architecture does not necessarily require an architecture background, although it does require in interest in architecture. Committee member Machleidt asked if the M.S. in Architecture is the departments only research focused graduate program since the department does not offer a Ph.D. Dacey indicated that is correct. Committee member Marshall asked about the culture in Architecture and whether the University of Idaho would lose credibility by losing its only research focused graduate program in Architecture. Armpriest indicated that it is a matter of opinion. Armpriest noted that the M.S. in Architecture program served as a stepping stone for students who wish to go one to earn a Ph.D. Armproest explained that the department is very selective about who is admits to the program and only chooses applicants that the faculty are interested in working with. Machleidt asked what the strategic plan of the department is and if it includes expanding research in architecture. Committee member Eckwright noted that it is the University of Idaho’s responsibility to the State of Idaho to provide architecture instruction and training. Committee member asked what freezing a program meant as indicated by the college curriculum committee. The committee Denied the proposed NOI 0 for and 10 against, and will forward the proposed NOI to Faculty Council for review.

Vote: Denied – 0 for and 10 against