University of Idaho
2009-2010
FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #15

Tuesday, December 8, 2009, 3:30 p.m.
BRINK HALL FACULTY LOUNGE

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2009-10 Faculty Senate Meeting #14, December 1, 2009

III. Consent Agenda:
   • FSH:
     FS-10-023: FSH 3320 – Annual Evaluations
   • UCC:
     FS-10-024: UCC-10-019 – CLASS – Discontinue Minor in Greek
     FS-10-025: UCC-10-020 – CLASS – Discontinue BA Latin
     FS-10-026: UCC-10-021 – CLASS – Discontinue Minor in Latin
     FS-10-027: UCC-10-022 – CLASS – Discontinue BA Classical Studies

IV. Chair’s Report.

V. Provost’s Report.

VI. Other Announcements and Communications.

VII. Committee Reports.

VIII. Special Orders.

IX. Unfinished Business and General Orders.
   • Efficiency Cost Reduction Policy Memo
     1. Department consolidation & department chair issues
     2. Travel freeze
     3. Open/vacant/staff lines
   • FS-10-021: NOI Regulation M

X. New Business.

XI. Adjournment.

Professor Jack Miller, Chair 2009-2010, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2009-2010 FS Meeting #14, December 1, 2009
Consent Agenda with documents
Present: Baillargeon, Baird, Baker (w/o vote), Barlow, Battaglia, Eveleth, Fritz, Geist, Graden, Guilfoyle, Hill (w/o vote), Holbrook, Limbaugh, Mihelich, Miller (chair), Padaghm-Albrecht, Stearns, Joyce, Williams, Wilson. Off-Campus Senators: Budwig (Boise), Dakins (Idaho Falls), Newcombe (Coeur d’Alene). 8 guests.

Absent: Edwards, Huber, Marshall, Murphy, Stark.

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

Minutes: It was moved (Battaglia, Eveleth) to accept the minutes of meeting #13 of the Faculty Senate. Approved.

Chair’s Report: The Chair noted that he would be in attendance at the up-coming SBOE meeting to challenge the proposed policy changes (salary reductions etc. previously contained in financial exigency policy). Any suggestions for redrafting the policy would be welcome. The Chair welcomed Professor Paul Joyce who is joining as a senator to replace Professor Sullivan (College of Science) now on sabbatical leave.

Provost’s Report: Unfortunately, the Provost was not present during the usual time for the report – a very rare circumstance - and the meeting moved on to other business.

Dr. Steve Neiheisel – Enrollment Management Report: Dr. Neiheisel spoke to a PowerPoint presentation (as distributed). “Increasing enrollments” was identified as one of three areas for revenue enhancement beginning in 2008. The Enrollment Management effort had been restructured since Dr. Neiheisel’s arrival in early 2008. Institutional structures include: a Review and Advisory Board that meets three times each year and a Strategic Planning Workgroup that meets regularly.

In his inauguration speech, President Nellis announced a target for the year 2020 of 16,000 student FTEs. This would be equivalent to an approximate headcount just over 18,000. This would require an average annual increase of 4% to 5% in student numbers.

Nine growth opportunities and strategic priorities have been identified. The most developed planning efforts and areas of focus for fall 2010 are in categories of transfer students, retention and yield (proportion of students enrolling to total students admitted). There was potential to grow transfers by 50% and other potential in international student recruitment. UI now had articulation agreements with 11 community colleges in Idaho, Washington and California. The California community college system had identified that there would be up to 250,000 California students who would not find placement in California in AY11 due to caps on enrollment there. Initiatives to increase retention included identifying students “at risk” early each semester and providing them with additional support. The live-on campus for freshmen in AY11 was another retention-focused initiative.

Questions.
Growing student numbers would also require that we grow faculty numbers to support teaching. How will this be coordinated?
Mr. Neiheisel agreed that this would need to occur. The responsibility for coordination would be jointly and broadly taken by administration.

*How will summer enrollment growth opportunities be realized?*

The Provost noted that summer courses can provide the opportunity to respond to student need by offering additional sections of “bottleneck” courses that might otherwise delay student progression through their program. There needs to be a process to first identify areas of student demand. In addition, optimizing structures for example – summer courses in six or eight week blocks, coordinating such that there is little or no overlap. There were many such logistics issues to coordinate. He added that the summer also provided an ideal time to offer courses that were innovative in content or pedagogies.

Dr. Neiheisel added that summer also provided opportunities to offer dual credit courses to junior and senior high school students and to attract them to full engagement as Vandals.

The senate chair enquired about another role that Dr. Neiheisel was filling – coordinating a university technology advisory group in which there was no faculty representation. Dr. Neiheisel replied that there were three separate workgroups being formed to address the very large issue of technology adoption: These were in the areas of academics, a group chaired by Dean Baird, the area of technology infrastructure chaired by Tony Opheim, and an administrative group chaired by Nancy Krogh. Each of these chairs would be seeking faculty to participate in these groups.

**FS-10-018, FS-10-019, FS-10-020** NOIs closures of Parma, Sandpoint and Teton R & E Centers. Dean Hammel was in attendance to provide contextual information and to answer questions.

Dean Hammel described the fiscal situation: A budget reduction of 11.5% ($3.2M) meant that the scope of services had to be reduced. The choices were to reduce facilities or to lay off personnel. After review by a task force the three sites were identified. The objective was to retain as much of the research capability as possible without losing faculty. In the case of the Parma closure, faculty would be relocated to nearby Caldwell.

Discussion centered on the Parma station closure. An injection of industry funding support was essential to overcome the need to close the facility. The deadline was December 31 when funds were exhausted but the issue is to be discussed at the December SBOE meeting. This needed to occur to put the potential closures in place for December 31. If sufficient industry support was realized, closure could be overcome. The question of one-time savings versus longer-term fixes through negotiation of support from industry was discussed at length. Dean Hammel pointed out that negotiations were on-going with industry; the preferred option being to find funds for on-going support rather than one-time funds. Faculty had contributed about 20% of the funds needed for one-time support through June 30, 2010 sourced from Y account funds. There were very few alternatives to facility closure available. An alternative such as closure of specific programs and laying off faculty and staff was the least desirable alternative.

A guest, Mr. Gier suggested that Parma faculty had agreed to work a four-day work week as an interim measure. Dean Hammel responded that state funds would not be returning and a four day work-week will not address the long-term need. This was not a fair solution to impose on faculty and work conditions need to be equitable across the entire college and the university.
Mr. Gier went on to ask if Parma tenured faculty moved to Caldwell without technicians and infrastructure; how could they maintain their productivity? The Dean responded that the move needed to happen and achieving ideal outcomes was under consideration and not yet determined.

The Provost offered additional context to the present fiscal situation noting that on top of the 11.5% cut, the college had also faced the 6% rescission in state funding, making a total of a 17.5% cut in funding in 2009. There was a substantial re-set in the level of support for higher education in Idaho. The Provost was buoyed by the industry support that has come forward and commended Dean Hammel for his work with industry and the UI community for finding workable solutions to very difficult issues.

There being no further discussion, it was moved that the senate adopt the three NOIs for proposed closure of Parma, Sandpoint and Tetonia (Miller, Battaglia). Eighteen in favor. Approved.

The chair noted that next week senate would complete the discussion of the Provost’s efficiency memo. Senators who wished to submit draft resolutions should do so in writing in advance for distribution to the senate prior to the next meeting. Next week would be the last meeting of the fall semester.

**FS-10-022**: NOI New undergraduate minor in Conservation Sciences. Senator and Chair of UCC Professor Battaglia noted that there were no other similar programs offered in the state and that the structure of the minor packaged it into existing courses. Thus, there were no substantial new costs. There being no further discussion, the question was called. Approved unanimously.

**FS-10-021**: NOI Regulation M. There was extensive discussion about the wording and meaning of “university expects instructors to be reasonable in providing ....” students the opportunity to make up work in the event of their absence from class, due to various circumstances. The hour being late, it was moved to table the item (Geist, Limbaugh). Approved.

**Adjournment**: It was moved (Wilson, Williams) to adjourn at 5:04 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Rodney A. Hill, Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Senate.
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ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS AND SALARY DETERMINATION
OF FACULTY MEMBERS

PREAMBLE: This section contains those policies and their attendant procedures for those periodic reviews of
performance that affect faculty members and academic administrators. Policies concerning performance evaluation
were part of the original 1979 Handbook, but were completely rewritten in July 2002 and further refined in 2003. In
July 2007 Form 1 underwent substantial revisions to address enforcement and accountability issues in the UI
promotion and tenure process as well as align the form with the Strategic Action Plan. In January 2008 Form 1 was
again revised to include a Disclosure of Conflicts statement to comply with FSH 6240. In 2009 this section was
again revised to reflect recent changes to the faculty position description and evaluation forms to better integrate
faculty interdisciplinary activities. Further information may be obtained from the Provost’s Office (208-885-6448. [ed.
7-03, rev. 7-07, 1-08, 7-09]

CONTENTS:

A. Annual Performance Evaluation and Salary Determination for Faculty Members
B. Performance Below Expectations of Non-tenured Faculty Members
C. Performance Below Expectations of Tenured Faculty Members
D. Performance Evaluation of Academic Administrators
E. Sequence of Evaluation of Faculty Members and Administrators.

A. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND SALARY DETERMINATION FOR FACULTY MEMBERS.

A-1. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION. Annual evaluation of the performance of each member of the faculty is,
primarily, the responsibility of the faculty member and her/his unit administrator. The provost is responsible for
preparing supplementary instructions each year, including the schedule for completion of the successive steps. The
form to be used, “Annual Performance Evaluation Form 1: Evaluation of Faculty,” is appended to this section.
Personnel on international assignment see FSH 3380 C. [rev. 7-03, 7-09]

b. Performance levels in for each criterion evaluated are described as follows:

i. Exceptional Performance (5) is extraordinary performance well beyond that required relative to the
position description.

ii. Above Expectations (4) represents performance which is better than expected relative to the
position description.

iii. Meets Expectations (3) is the performance expected of a faculty member relative to the position
description.

iv. Below Expectations (2) denotes performance that is less than expected of a faculty member relative
to the position description and means improvement is necessary. A rating of below expectations in one or
more criteria triggers procedures outlined in 3320 B or C. [rev. 7-09]

v. Unacceptable Performance (1) is performance that is not acceptable relative to the position
description and/or is inconsistent with the conditions for continued employment with the institution.
Failure to meet these standards in any of the following ways will result in a rating of unacceptable
performance: [rev. 7-09]

a) received a “1” rating the previous period but did not make the improvements required;
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b) consistently violated one or more of the institution’s standards for meeting the expectations of the position; or

c) violated one or more standards of conduct as specified in the Faculty/Staff Handbook.

c. Annual Report of Efforts and Accomplishments by Faculty Member. Each faculty member shall provide his or her unit administrator with the following materials for use in the annual performance evaluation:

1. Current Curriculum Vitae
2. UI Faculty Position Description for Annual Performance Review
3. Written detailed summary report of faculty activity for the period of the annual performance review that compares accomplishments to expectations in the Position Description for the period under review.
4. Other materials deemed necessary to document efforts and accomplishments for the period under review.

Add. 7-01

The performance of each faculty member during the review period covered by the evaluation is judged on the basis of the position description(s) in effect during that period. In the case of a faculty member holding joint appointments and/or involved in interdisciplinary activities, as described in the position description, in two or more academic or administrative units, it is the responsibility of the administrator in the faculty member’s primary academic discipline to solicit and consider relevant information on job performance from other administrators with responsibility for the faculty member’s work. [See also 3080 E-3.]

Rev. 7-09

Ratings are determined by comparing the faculty member’s performance to the position description. The results of the student evaluation of teaching are carefully weighed and used as a factor in this evaluation. For each area of responsibility, the unit administrator shall describe the basis for her/his evaluation in assessing the faculty member’s performance. The ratings and narrative are entered as indicated on the form. The annual evaluation score for a faculty member in Form 1 relates to the faculty member’s performance evaluation relative to his/her position description. The overall unit average is provided to the faculty member upon request so that each faculty member can gauge his/her performance relative to other faculty members within the unit. After the unit administrator has completed ratings and narratives for all faculty for the review period, he or she shall provide the following items to each reviewed individual as they become available:

1. a copy of the individual’s annual evaluation form and narrative
2. if requested, comparative information to help assess performance evaluation and numerical ratings, including, but not limited to:
   a) Frequency distribution for overall ratings for the unit
   b) Frequency distribution for overall ratings for the college

Add. 7-01, 7-03

d. Evaluation of Faculty by Unit Administrators. Unit administrators evaluate their faculty members. The performance of each faculty member during the review period covered by the evaluation is judged on the basis of the position description(s) in effect during that period. In the case of a faculty member holding joint appointments and/or involved in interdisciplinary activities, as described in the position description, in two or more academic or administrative units, it is the responsibility of the administrator in the faculty member’s primary academic discipline to solicit and consider relevant information on job performance from other administrators with responsibility for the faculty member’s work. [See also 3080 E-3.]

Rev. 7-09

Ratings are determined by comparing the faculty member’s performance to the position description. The results of the student evaluation of teaching are carefully weighed and used as a factor in this evaluation. For each area of responsibility, the unit administrator shall describe the basis for her/his evaluation in assessing the faculty member’s performance. The ratings and narrative are entered as indicated on the form. The annual evaluation score for a faculty member in Form 1 relates to the faculty member’s performance evaluation relative to his/her position description. The overall unit average is provided to the faculty member upon request so that each faculty member can gauge his/her performance relative to other faculty members within the unit. After the unit administrator has completed ratings and narratives for all faculty for the review period, he or she shall provide the following items to each reviewed individual as they become available:

1. a copy of the individual’s annual evaluation form and narrative
2. if requested, comparative information to help assess performance evaluation and numerical ratings, including, but not limited to:
   a) Frequency distribution for overall ratings for the unit
   b) Frequency distribution for overall ratings for the college

Add. 7-01

e. Self-Evaluation and Conference. Each faculty member is given an opportunity to use the evaluation form (FSH 3320 Form 1) to make an evaluation of his or her own performance. The unit administrator shall provide each faculty member with the opportunity to meet to discuss the unit administrator’s evaluation. (Suitable alternate arrangements are made for off-campus personnel.) The purpose of this meeting is to review and discuss the administrator’s evaluation and the self-evaluation, if any. The unit administrator explains his or her ratings and narrative providing a formative assessment on progress towards tenure, promotion, and/or continued satisfactory performance related to the faculty member’s performance during the year and any revisions in professional goals and objectives for the coming year. The faculty member and the unit administrator work to identify strategies to help the individual faculty member improve performance. The ratings may be modified as a result of the discussion. At the conclusion of the review process, each faculty member shall sign the evaluation form indicating that she/he has had the opportunity to read the evaluation report and to discuss it with the unit administrator. If the faculty member disagrees with the contents of the
review, the faculty member he/she shall be permitted to append a report to the unit administrator’s evaluation, detailing the nature of the dissent. A copy of the administrator’s final evaluation is given to the faculty member. [ren. and rev. 7-01, rev. 7-09]

f. College-Level Action. Copies of the performance evaluation materials forwarded by the unit administrator to the appropriate dean(s), for evaluation at the college(s) level, shall include: [rev. 7-09]

- a narrative evaluation on progress towards tenure, promotion, and/or continued satisfactory performance,
- any evaluative comments provided by interdisciplinary/center administrators or from those administrators of faculty holding joint appointments, and
- the evaluation form,

If the unit fails to attach the narrative evaluation and evaluative comments, are not attached, the college will return the materials to the department/unit by the college. [add. 7-09]

If the faculty member files a dissent, is filed by the faculty member, the unit it shall be provided a copy to the dean. The dean shall arrange a meeting with the unit administrator and the faculty member to attempt to resolve the relevant issues. The dean enters an evaluation in the space provided on the evaluation form. A copy of that form is given to the faculty member and the original is forwarded to the Provost’s Office for permanent filing [see FSH 1470 and APM 65.02]. A copy of the evaluation form is retained in the college office. If the dean concurs with the overall evaluation and rating of the faculty member by the unit administrator, no additional signature is required from the faculty member. [rev. 7-09]

If there are any differences in any rating between the unit administrator and college dean, the dean shall attach a narrative stating the reasons for these differences, and a second and subsequent signature by the faculty member, acknowledging receipt of the dean’s evaluation and rating, is required. The college shall forward the original evaluation form and narrative to the Provost’s Office for permanent filing. If the college fails to attach the narrative, is not attached the provost will return the form to the college. A copy of the evaluation form is retained in the college office. If the faculty member disagrees with the Dean’s evaluation and the disagreement cannot be resolved at the college level, either party may choose to refer the matter to the University Ombuds (FSH 3820). If the matter remains unresolved at the college level, the Provost shall be notified of the disagreement. [ren. and rev. 7-01, rev. 12-06, 7-09]

A-2. SALARY DETERMINATION. This process is carried out at the departmental and higher levels of academic administration. [see FSH 3420.] [rev. 7-09]

B. PERFORMANCE BELOW EXPECTATIONS OF NON-TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS

B-1. If the unit administrator determines that a non-tenured faculty member is performing below expectations, the unit administrator should consider the variety of possible causes, other than inadequate effort on the faculty member’s part, that might be responsible for the change in performance. [see FSH 3190] [ed. 7-09]

It is not the unit administrator’s role to diagnose the cause of the problem but to suggest sources of appropriate professional help and to encourage the employee to seek such help [http://www.hr.uidaho.edu/default.aspx?pid=70192]. Faculty members and unit administrators may obtain referral information and advice from the University Ombuds and Human Resources. [ed. 12-06, 7-09]

B-2. FIRST ANNUAL OCCURRENCE.

a. In the event that a tenured non-tenured faculty member receives an annual evaluation concluding that he or she has performed below expectations (2 or lower) within one or more areas of responsibility, the unit administrator will, at the same time he or she delivers the performance evaluation,
within sixty days of the evaluation, offer to meet with the faculty member to identify the reasons for evaluating the performance as below expectations.* [rev. 7-09] At this meeting, (1) The faculty member and the unit administrator will review the current Position Description and examine strategies that would permit the faculty member to improve his or her performance. [rev. 7-09]

b. In the event that a non-tenured faculty member receives an annual evaluation concluding that the faculty member has performed below expectations (2 or below) in the overall score, the unit administrator will, at the same time he or she delivers the performance evaluation, offer to meet with the faculty member to identify the reasons for evaluating the performance as below expectations.* [add. 7-09] At this meeting, (1) The unit administrator will appoint a mentoring committee by selecting three individuals from a list of five faculty members nominated by the faculty member, or if the faculty member makes no nominations, will appoint three faculty members of her/his choosing. The mentoring committee’s purpose is to help the faculty member improve performance. The members of the committee need not be drawn from the same unit as the faculty member. The faculty member or unit administrator may request that the University Ombuds attend meetings of the mentoring committee and faculty member. [ed. 12-06, rev. 7-09]

c. In the event that a faculty member receives an overall score of 1, the provost may determine that further review of a faculty member’s performance is required. This review will be conducted in accordance with the procedures prescribed in 3320 C-2B-4. [ren. and ed. 7-09]

*These steps will be taken within sixty days of the annual evaluation.

B-3. TWO CONSECUTIVE ANNUAL ASSESSMENTS OF BELOW EXPECTATIONS. In the event of two consecutive annual evaluations concluding that the non-tenured faculty member has performed below expectations overall or within one or more areas of responsibility (2 or lower) the unit administrator will, at the same time he or she delivers the performance evaluation within sixty days of the evaluation, arrange a meeting of the faculty member, the unit administrator and, in the unit administrator’s discretion, the Dean of the College. The faculty member or the unit administrator may request that the University Ombuds attend the meeting. [ed. 12-06]

The intent of the meeting is to review:

a. the current position description and revise it if necessary to address the issues identified during the discussion. [ed. 7-09]

b. the strategies implemented in the previous year and to identify why the strategies did not result in the faculty member meeting expectations. The parties should re-examine strategies that would permit the faculty member to improve his or her performance. [ed. 7-09]

*These steps will be taken within sixty days of the annual evaluation.

C. PERFORMANCE BELOW EXPECTATIONS OF TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS (See also FSH 3190)

C-1. ANNUAL ASSESSMENT OF BELOW EXPECTATIONS. In the event a tenured faculty member receives an annual evaluation of below expectations, the procedures described in B-1 through B-3 above will apply. In the event of an overall score of 1, the provost may determine that further review of the faculty member’s performance is required. This review will be conducted in accordance with the procedures prescribed in 3320 C-2. [rev. and ed. 7-09]

C-2B-4. THREE CONSECUTIVE ANNUAL EVALUATION ASSESSMENTS OF BELOW EXPECTATIONS. In the event of three consecutive annual evaluations below expectations overall or within one
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or more areas of responsibility, or a pattern of below expectations evaluations over five years (a summary score of 2 or lower), the Dean shall initiate a formal peer review. [rev. 7-09]

a. Composition of the Review Committee. The Review Committee will consist of six (6) members, appointed as follows:

(1) The Faculty member will submit to the unit administrator a list of the names of three faculty members from within the unit and three tenured faculty members from outside of the unit. The unit administrator will submit a similar list to the faculty member. From the list given to the faculty member, he/she will select one person from inside of the unit and one from outside the unit. From the list given to the unit administrator, he/she will select one person from inside of the unit and one from outside the unit.

(2) The committee members will select as chair another faculty member from within the unit.

(3) The Ombuds or his/her designee shall be an ex-officio member of the committee. [ed. 12-06]

b. Timing of the Review. The review and recommendation(s) will be completed within sixty days of the annual evaluation.

c. The Review. The purpose of the review is to assess the level of performance of the faculty member and the unit administrator’s evaluation of that performance. To that end, the committee shall assess the reasonableness of the previous evaluations and the appropriateness of the development plans, as well as any material submitted by the faculty member and the unit.

The faculty member and chair will provide the following materials to the committee:

• Updated Curriculum Vitae of the faculty member
• Position Descriptions for the past four years
• Annual evaluation materials submitted by the faculty member for the past three years
• Annual Evaluations of the faculty member by the unit head and the Dean for the past three years
• Student and peer evaluations (if any) of teaching for the past four years
• A self-evaluation of teaching
• A self-assessment summary of what the faculty member has learned and achieved during the past four (4) years, including contributions to the department, university, state, nation, and field (about 2 pages).

The faculty member may submit any additional information he or she desires, and the committee may request additional materials as it deems necessary.

d. Responses to Committee Report. The faculty member, chair, and dean will receive the report and will have fifteen days from the report’s date to submit written responses to the review committee. The review committee will send the report and all responses to the provost.

e. Provost. The Provost will be responsible for determining the appropriate resolution, which may include: [rev. 7-09]

1) continuing the status quo;
2) mentoring to address area(s) of concern;
3) termination for cause;
4) consideration of other recommended resolution(s).

DC. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS. [See FSH 1420 E-6] [ed. 7-09]

[Note: If the below from 1420 is approved to be included here and removed from 1420, reference in 3520 G-6 needs to refer to here 3320 D not 1420 E-6.]
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DC-1. EVALUATION BY FACULTY MEMBERS. Opportunity is provided for an annual performance evaluation of college deans, assistant and associate deans, and administrators of academic departments and other intracollege units by the faculty members of the respective units. The provost sends each faculty member an appropriate number of copies of the form, “Annual Faculty Evaluation of Academic Administrators” [form 2B], [rev. 7-99, ed. 6-09] appended to this section] to be used for evaluation of the departmental unit or center intracollege unit administrator, one to be used for evaluation of the dean, and one to be used for evaluation of each assistant or associate dean in the college.

[Note: “Non-underlined red” text below was moved from 1420 E-6 to address the Provost's desire to add a periodic review of administrators to 3320. It was then edited - underline text is new, struck out is current language from 1420 being deleted, and “non-underline red” text is original language from 1420. All black text is original policy language previously in this section of 3320.]

DC-2. EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENTAL OR INTRACOLLEGE UNIT AND CENTER ADMINISTRATORS AND ASSISTANT AND ASSOCIATE DEANS. The review and evaluation of unit administrators, and assistant and associate deans, require consideration of their responsibilities as faculty members and as unit administrators as defined by percentage allocations in the Annual Position Description. All unit administrators are entitled to a review and evaluation of their performance in conjunction with their responsibilities as faculty members. Further, all unit administrators are entitled to a review of their performance in conjunction with their responsibilities as unit administrators. (Forms to be used in the evaluation of administrators are found in 3320, Form 2A and Form 2B, [rev. 7-99, ed. 3-07])

1. Evaluation as a Faculty Member.

a. Annual Evaluation. The annual evaluation of an unit administrator’s performance as a faculty member shall be conducted by the dean of the college in accordance with the provisions of FSH 3320 A above.

b. Third Year Review. If the unit administrator is untenured, there shall be a third-year review in accordance with the procedures outlined in FSH 3520 H-3.

c. Five Year Review. If the unit administrator is tenured, he or she shall have his or her performance as a faculty member evaluated in accordance with the provisions of FSH 3320 C.

2. Evaluation as an Unit Administrator.

a. Annual Evaluation. The dean shall conduct an the annual evaluation of each administrator’s performance shall be conducted by the dean of the college in accordance with his or her achievement of the responsibilities specified in FSH 1420 E-1 and above as documented in the Annual Position Description. The dean and administrator will negotiate the administrator’s Annual Position Description for the unit administrator will be negotiated with the dean on the basis of the unit’s department or division needs, and be made available to the faculty for annual evaluation purposes. The unit administrator will present his or her annual goals for the unit at the beginning of the review year and report on his/her effectiveness in meeting last year’s goals. Annual goals should be based on the unit action plan, needs of the unit department and discussion with the dean. The dean will make a conscientious effort to solicit input from unit faculty through evaluation form 2B. The dean will then provide feedback to faculty who have responded as needed...[rev. 7-99, ed. 6-09]

Unit faculty must send completed copies of the form 2B directly to the dean. The dean furnishes the administrator a summary of the faculty evaluations in such a way that the confidentiality of individual evaluations is preserved. The dean may arrange a conference with the administrator to discuss the evaluation summary. After these steps have been completed, the dean shall destroy the individual faculty members’ evaluations are destroyed by the dean and shall file the written summary is filed in the dean’s office. The dean then submits a summary of conclusions and recommendations resulting from the review
DC-3. EVALUATIONS OF DEANS. Completed copies of the evaluation form are sent directly to the provost. The provost furnishes each dean a summary of the evaluations in such a way that the confidentiality of individual evaluations is preserved and confers with the dean about the evaluation. After these steps have been completed, individual faculty members’ evaluations are destroyed by the provost and the written summary is filed in the Office of Academic Affairs.

a. Annual Evaluation. The provost shall conduct an annual evaluation of each dean's performance shall be conducted by the provost in accordance with his or her the dean’s achievement of the responsibilities specified in FSH 1420 D-2E and as documented in the Annual Position Description. The provost and dean shall negotiate the Annual Position Description for the dean/administrator with the provost on the basis of the college/unit needs, and make file available to the faculty for annual evaluation purposes. The dean/administrator will present his or her annual goals for the college/unit at the beginning of the review year and report on his or her effectiveness in meeting last year’s goals. These Annual goals should be based on the college/unit action plan, needs of the college/unit and discussion with the provost/dean. The provost/dean will make a conscientious effort to solicit input from unit-college faculty through evaluation form 2B.

College faculty must will send completed copies of form 2B present directly to the dean/provost. The provost will summarize the faculty responses and share that summary with the dean. In preparing and conveying that summary, the provost has the responsibility to ensure that faculty comments are confidential. This includes, but is not limited to, avoiding the use of any phrases that can identify the faculty member making the comments. The dean furnishes the dean/administrator a summary of the faculty evaluations in such a way that the confidentiality of individual evaluations is preserved. The provost/dean may arrange a conference with the dean/administrator to discuss the summary evaluation. After these steps have been completed, the provost shall destroy individual faculty members’ evaluations are destroyed by the provost/dean and file the written summary is filed in the Office of Academic Affairs/dean’s office. The provost must then submit A summary of conclusions and recommendations resulting from the review are submitted by the dean/provost who, in turn, makes his or her review and forwards recommendations to the president. The provost/dean will then provide feedback to faculty who have submitted form 2B, as appropriate

DC-4. PERIODIC REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATORS. Each unit administrator is formally reviewed at least six months before the end of each appointment term, or, if there is not a fixed appointment term, at least every five years. The periodic review will be conducted in accordance with the mechanisms of formal review as described in approved bylaws of the individual colleges, which must provide for the following FSH 7-99. The Provost appoints an ad hoc review committee to include faculty, department chairs, and experienced administrators of other units. The periodic review will be conducted at the request of the Provost and Executive Vice President and in accordance with the mechanisms of formal review, which must provide for the following:

14. Opportunity for the dean, center administrator, or unit administrator to prepare a report/ or portfolio summarizing his or her administrative achievements for the preceding period, including annual reviews; for consideration by those individuals conducting the review. [rev. and ren. 7-99]

24. Opportunity for all faculty and staff of the college/unit to participate in the review.

A review committee that, in addition to departmental membership, includes at least one UI faculty member from outside the department. [add 7-99]
3. Solicitation of input by the committee from appropriate constituencies of the department, college, or unit. Confidentiality of all individual evaluations will be ensured. [add. 7-99]

45. Preparation by the review committee of a written report summarizing the findings and recommendations of the review, which will be forwarded to the Provost and the dean/unit administrator. [ed. and ren. 7-99]

56. The provost/dean will submit the written report along with any additional comments and recommendations to the Provost/provost and provide appropriate feedback to the administrator/faculty and staff. [rev. and ren. 7-99]

c. Additional Review. The provost or college dean may initiate a review at any time he or she judges determines such a review is needed. The dean shall submit to the provost a summary of conclusions and recommendations resulting from this additional review. If the review is conducted by the provost, he or she shall submit a summary of conclusions and recommendations are submitted by the dean to the provost and likewise the provost to the president.

Likewise, the faculty of a particular unit may also initiate, by majority vote, such a review of the unit administrator. The tenured faculty of a college may also initiate, by majority vote, such a review of the college dean.

ED. SEQUENCE OF EVALUATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS AND ADMINISTRATORS. The provost prepares the schedule for completion of steps in the performance evaluation and salary determination process each year. The schedule will ensure that faculty members’ evaluations of departmental, unit, or intracollege, unit, or center administrators and assistant and associate deans are in the hands of have been received by the dean before the administrators’ recommendations on salary, promotion, and tenure are made known to the faculty and, similarly, that faculty members’ evaluations of deans are in the hands of have been received by the provost before the deans’ recommendations on salary, promotion, and tenure are made known to the faculty. Conversely, likewise, the summaries of faculty evaluations of unit, departmental, or intracollege, unit, or center administrators, assistant and associate deans, and deans will be communicated to the persons evaluated after their recommendations on faculty salary, promotion, and tenure have been transmitted to the provost.
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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 Greek Minor needs to be discontinued since there is no longer any instruction in the Greek language. It will be partly replaced by a revised Classical Studies minor.

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.).

   N/A

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

   N/A

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.

   No similar programs exist within 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>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>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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</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).

The Greek minor is being eliminated to make way for a new restructured Classics minor which will better serve student demand. This is consistent with the mission of the University of Idaho to emphasize areas of liberal arts and social sciences.

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.):

This change requires no new resources.

<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Source of Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Appropriated-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</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.
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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 Foreign Language, Latin option BA, along with the Latin minor, Greek minor and Foreign Language Classical Studies option BA are being eliminated to make way for a new, restructured Classics minor which will better serve student demand.

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.).

   N/A

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

   N/A

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.

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>25</td>
<td>25</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>0</td>
<td>0</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>3</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>Minor</td>
<td>Latin Language &amp; Literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Latin</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>BA and minor</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 Foreign Language Latin option BA is being eliminated to make way for a new restructured Classics minor which will better serve student demand. This is consistent with the mission of the University of Idaho to emphasize areas of liberal arts and social sciences.

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.):

This change requires no new resources.

<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>A. Expenditures</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</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>TOTAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Source of Funds</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Appropriated-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>TOTAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Nature of Funds</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</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>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</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.
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 Letters, Arts and Social Sciences
Name of Department(s) or Area(s): Departments of History/Foreign Languages

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:
Minor in Latin

(Degree or Certificate)

Proposed Starting Date: Fall 2010

For New Programs: For Other Activity:

Program (i.e., degree) Title & CIP 2000

☐ Program Component (minor/ emphasis)
☐ Off-Campus Activity/Resident Center
☐ Instructional/Research Unit
☐ Addition/Expansion
X Discontinuance/consolidation
☐ Contract Program
☐ Other

Dean’s signature on file 9/28/09
College Dean (Institution) Date
VP Research & Graduate Studies Date

Chief Fiscal Officer (Institution) Date
State Administrator, SDPTE Date

Chief Academic Officer (Institution) Date
Chief Academic Officer, OSBE Date
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 Latin minor, along with the current Foreign Language Latin option BA, Greek minor and Classical Studies BA, are being eliminated to make way for a new restructured Classics minor which will better serve student demand.

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.).

N/A

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

N/A

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.

N/A

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>
</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>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>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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 Latin minor is being eliminated to make way for a new restructured Classics minor which will better serve student demand. This is consistent with the mission of the University of Idaho to emphasize areas of liberal arts and social sciences.

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

Yes ☒ 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.):

**This change requires no new resources.**

<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| **B. Nature of Funds**  |          |          |          |             |
| 1. Recurring *          |          |          |          |             |
| 2. Non-recurring **     |          |          |          |             |
| **TOTAL:**              | N/A      | N/A      | N/A      | N/A         |

* 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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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 Foreign Language Classical Studies option BA is being eliminated along with the Foreign Language Latin BA option and the Latin and Greek minors, to make way for a reorganized Classics minor which will better serve student demand.

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.).

N/A

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

N/A

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.

N/A

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>
</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>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).

The Foreign Language in Classical Studies option BA is being eliminated to make way for a new restructured Classic minor which will better serve student demand. This is consistent with the mission of the University of Idaho to emphasize areas of liberal arts and social sciences.

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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Source of Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Appropriated-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</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.

This change requires no new resources.