University of Idaho
2009-2010
FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #17

Tuesday, January 26, 2010, 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 #16, January 19, 2010

III. Consent Agenda:

IV. Chair’s Report.

V. Provost’s Report.

VI. Other Announcements and Communications.

VII. Committee Reports.
   • UCC:
     FS-10-032: UCC-10-057 – Re-Organization of CNR (McLaughlin)

VIII. Special Orders.
   • Confirmation of sabbatical leaves for 2011-12

IX. Unfinished Business and General Orders.
   • Efficiency Cost Reduction Policy Memo
     1. Travel freeze
     2. Open/vacant faculty/staff lines
   • FS-10-021rev: NOI Regulation M

X. New Business.
   • Budget Reduction and Allocation Strategies (Keith Ickes) 4:00 p.m.

XI. Adjournment.

Professor Jack Miller, Chair 2009-2010, Faculty Senate
University of Idaho
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
2009-10 Meeting #16
Tuesday January 19, 2010

Present: Baillargeon, Baird, Christiansen for Baker (w/o vote – prior to 4:30), Baker (w/o vote - arrival 4:30), Barlow, Battaglia, Edwards, Eveleth, Fritz, Graden, Guilfoyle, Hill (w/o vote), Holbrook, Joyce, Limbaugh, Marshall, Mihelich, Miller (chair), Murphy, Padagh-Albrecht, Stark, Anderson for Stearns (w/o vote), Williams, Wilson. Center-Campus Senators: Budwig (Boise), Dakins (Idaho Falls). 7 guests.

Absent: Geist, Huber. Center-Campus Senators: Newcombe (Coeur d’Alene).

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

Minutes: It was moved (Murphy, Barlow) to accept the minutes of meeting #15 of the Faculty Senate. Approved.

Chair’s Report: The Chair reminded the senate that the General Faculty Meeting will be held this Thursday beginning at 2:00 p.m. in the Student Union Building Ballroom. The room is well-equipped to handle electronic connection to the other sites across the state. Amongst the policy changes coming forward are those approved by senate with respect to tenure and promotion. He urged faculty to attend. In addition, later today, President Nellis would be addressing the senate meeting. He is traveling back from Coeur d’Alene. When he arrives, the item before the meeting will be deferred to a later meeting. The President wished to discuss important budget issues.

The Chair noted that faculty leadership had been involved in discussions with the President, Provost and Budget Director regarding further state rescissions and that there was a possibility that furloughs would be implemented. The Chair indicated that the President wished to discuss all options and is seeking input from the faculty and broader UI community.

The Chair went on to speak to the rationale behind furloughs and suggested that the real effect of furloughs would only be made visible to the SBOE and the legislature if furloughs were ‘real’ and this meant to some level, including cancellation of classes.

The Chair then addressed the recent proposed changes to SBOE policy (salary reductions etc. previously contained in financial exigency policy) and reminded the senate that faculty are encouraged to send input to the SBOE directly to the contact person, Matt Freeman at matt.freeman@osbe.idaho.gov

Provost’s Report: The Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs, Jeanne Christiansen was representing the Provost who was traveling with the President. The initiative to improve first year student retention was showing benefits with a reduction in the number of first year students on probation in the fall. A program directed to assist first year students at risk had attracted 87/200 eligible students. There was also another new student support program underway that focused assistance on students who were from a low income background. Enrollment for spring was similar to last year and there is a strong need to grow enrollment numbers.

FS-10-008 - FSH 1565 Faculty Ranks and Responsibilities. A question arose about whether changes to policy FSH 1565 had been approved at meeting #12. There was some ambiguity in the minutes about the nature of the changes approved. Changes included:
• referring to Faculty Affairs the reversing of the terms affiliate and adjunct faculty to comply with their broader use across higher education,
• retention of proposed ‘struck-out’ language in sections D 7. F and I, and
• acceptance of all other changes as presented.

It was agreed that FSH 1565 had been approved as noted with the above changes.

President’s Diversity Council Senate Member. Senator Anne Marshall was nominated for this role (Miller/Fritz). There were no other nominations. Senator Marshall accepted and was approved unanimously.

Delegate replacement at Twin Falls for General Faculty Meeting. Both the delegate and alternate were unavailable for the upcoming General Faculty Meeting. The Twin Falls site had previously nominated Dr. Mireille Chahine in a group of proposed delegates. It was moved (Miller/Williams) to accept the nomination of Dr. Chahine as a delegate for the Twin Falls site. Approved.

FS-10-028: Discontinue BS Special Education. Withdrawn for review by Graduate Council.

FS-10-029: Regulation J-3-d. Approved.

FS-10-030: Environmental Science new option. This change would standardize course offerings at Idaho Falls and officially show the offering in the catalog enabling smoother handling of administrative issues at Idaho Falls. Approved.

FS-10-031: Graduate Admissions change. GPA entry raised from 2.8 to 3.0 and TOEFL entry requirement raised. These changes were consistent with entry requirements across the north-west region universities.

There was a concern about how this might affect non-traditional student entry to a graduate program. It was noted that non-traditional students could be admitted provisionally and performance in the graduate course would provide evidence of their ability to succeed.

Graduate School Dean von Braun pointed out that the proposed change had been widely circulated to the graduate faculty and they had provided broad support.

There being no further discussion, the question was called. Approved.

FS-10-009: FSH 3560 – Promotion. The revised policy had been returned to senate. The language around “presumption in favor of …..” lower level committee support by the University Promotions Review Committee [see Meeting #12] had been removed. There were several other minor editorial changes. Approved.

Efficiency Memo – Open Faculty Lines. The Chair, spoke to the previous senate discussion of the issue of the salary line reverting to central administration when a vacancy arose. He moved that this item deferred from Meeting #15 be opened for discussion (Miller/Murphy). Approved. He went on to present his view that if positions were allocated to the Provost, that the Provost had an incentive to hold the lines open as a way to raise revenue for issues important to central administration. The chair favored the model in which the salary savings should remain with the unit from which the vacancy arose until the position was awarded elsewhere and then passed to the unit to which the position was awarded.
A senator had e-mailed faculty constituents to get feedback following meeting #15. The sentiment within her college was that open lines (funds) should remain in each college until a decision had been made about the position’s future. Another view was that if the position remained within the college/unit it increases transparency of governance because it keeps the line visible to faculty in the college rather than moved to a line where there is a sense that no one knows of its fate. Another view was that the college or unit could also use these funds to support interim appointments to teach. Yet another view was that captured and reallocated positions may have the effect of pitting college against college.

Senator, Dean Baird pointed out that strategic allocation and debate on open positions had been conducted in Provost Council retreats in the last few summers. This process was collegial, strategic and productive. The concern that there was something adversarial in the process was most likely misplaced.

Senator Murphy was requested to provide the view of the University Budget Advisory Committee on the use of salary savings. The recommendation was that the first 25% of an open salary line should be captured into a strategic reserve fund, especially important in times of state rescissions such as the present.

Further discussion was deferred as previously agreed as President Nellis, Provost Baker and Budget Director Ickes joined the meeting.

President Nellis noted that the governor had recommended a further rescission, amounting to $1.8 million in the spring. Total cuts to state allocations going into this period were already at $20 million. The governor had not previously recaptured funds from K-12 education. Some legislators in the lower house were still intent on protecting K-12 although the state senate was supportive of the governor’s proposal.

This further rescission left the UI administration with very few options following the earlier cut-backs. Thus, the possibility of furloughs was now before the UI community. The President wished to outline some possible scenarios and sought feedback. One approach was a tiered proposal in which one hour of furlough would accrue for every increment of $2,500 salary. Thus, the lowest paid employees would face four hours furlough and the highest paid would face six full days of furlough.

The President went on to note that this rescission would become a permanent cut in FY11 plus there would be a further hold-back of $3.2 million. He then turned to increasing revenues. Possible mechanisms include increasing enrollment, strategic use of scholarships and fee increases. Next year fees at WSU would be equivalent to approximately double the fees at UI. President Nellis noted that he was sensitive to the lower per capita income of Idaho residents. In the current environment there were few other options for UI to increase non-state-source revenues. Research expenditures (awards) had increased in value; 2008-09 was $89 million, up from $82 million in the previous year and current proposals were very much higher than in previous years. These funds would filter through additional resources. Given the present difficulties posed by the additional state rescission, President Nellis wanted to share ideas about how to deal with the state budget cuts and seek recommendations from the senate, the faculty and the broader UI community.

The Chair revisited his suggestion of tying furloughs to some level of class cancellation to provide visibility to the legislature and the Idaho community that the cuts were causing serious consequences at UI. However, this needs to be considered in some balance of protecting students from the impact of furloughs.
What would the magnitude of a furlough be for a person with a salary of $50,000?
Budget Director Ickes responded approximately $400.

What are the alternatives to furloughs?
President Nellis responded that the university had a very small strategic reserve. It would not be wise to deplete it any further. Another alternative may be to consider lay-offs.

One senator suggested that increased fees would still mean that a quality UI education was still affordable for many Idaho parents.

Student representatives noted that during the past several years ASUI had always supported proposed fee increases, but often these were not approved by the SBOE.

President Nellis noted that he believed the tone of thought within the SBOE may have changed in the face of the present fiscal difficulties and it may now be possible to negotiate increases to bring fees to a level that could be sustainable.

The Secretary of the Faculty noted that reluctance of the SBOE to approve requested fee increases had been a major difficulty for UI in continuing to achieve excellence. It is a strategic imperative that SBOE policy provides greater flexibility to the university in setting fees. Given the large disparity between UI fees and our peer institutions, the Secretary urged the faculty to strongly support the UI administration in sending the message to the SBOE that the need for fee increases towards at least a semblance of peer parity was urgent.

Another senator complimented President Nellis on his active role in representing the university across the state and nation.

What would be the impact of a 10% increase in fees?
President Nellis replied that this would raise approximately $5 million in revenue.

Is there a perception in the legislature that professors are a pampered group?
The President noted that some legislators believe that there is still ‘fat’ to be cut from the higher education budget even in the face of the fact that UI faculty are amongst the lowest paid of land-grant institutions.

As the hour was late, the Chair thanked the President, Provost and Budget Director for seeking senate input.

Adjournment: It was moved (Marshall/Murphy) to adjourn at 5:04 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Rodney A. Hill, Faculty Secretary and
Secretary to Faculty Senate
DATE: January 15, 2010

TO: Jack Miller and Dan Eveleth
Faculty Senate

FROM: Doug Baker
Provost and Executive Vice President

SUBJECT: Items for Faculty Senate

The following members of the faculty have been recommended for sabbatical leave for 2010-2011:

Herbert L. Hess  Electrical and Computer Engineering  Academic Year 2010-11
Carol Padgham-Albrecht  Lionel Hampton School of Music  Fall Semester 2010
Kerri Vierling  Fish and Wildlife Resources  Academic Year 2010-11
Lee Vierling  Rangeland Ecology and Management  Academic Year 2010-11
Donald Tyler  Sociology, Anthropology and Justice Studies  Fall Semester 2010

This is a request for approval by Faculty Senate.

cc: Rod Hill
Notice of Intent

To initiate a New, Expanded, Cooperative, Discontinued, program component or Off-Campus Instructional Program or Instructional/Research Unit

Institution Submitting Proposal: University of Idaho

Name of College, School, or Division: College of Natural Resources

Name of Department(s) or Area(s): Departments of Forest Resources, Fish and Wildlife Resources, Rangeland Ecology and Management, Forest Products, and Conservation Social Sciences

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

Academic X Professional - Technical

This is a New, Expanded, Cooperative, Contract, or Off-Campus Instructional Program, or Administrative/Research Unit (circle one) leading to:

A reorganization of the college that reduces the number of academic departments from five to three. The reorganization includes tenure reassignment, departmental name changes, and realignment of undergraduate academic programs with the resulting academic units. It also initiates two university level time-bound processes to explore the development of two self-sustaining research and outreach programs. Goals are to increase synergy within and across units, reduce costs of administration, and realign, where appropriate, undergraduate academic programming to reduce duplication and more effectively employ faculty resources in teaching, research, and outreach associated with natural resource sciences and management.

(Degree or Certificate)

Proposed Starting Date: January 1, 2010

For New Programs:

For Other Activity:

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

☐ Program Component (major/minor/option/emphasis)

☐ Off-Campus Activity/Resident Center

☐ Instructional/Research Unit

☐ Addition/Expansion

☐ Discontinuance/consolidation

☐ Contract Program

X Other
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Dean (Institution)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Research &amp; Graduate Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Fiscal Officer (Institution)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Administrator, SDPTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Academic Officer (Institution)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Academic Officer, OSBE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBOE/OSBE Approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dean’s signature on file 1/6/2010
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).

Part 1 – Change in Organizational Structure: Consolidation of five existing academic departments into three. The five existing departments will be reorganized/consolidated into three: (1) Department of Conservation Social Sciences; (2) Department of Forest Ecology and Biogeosciences, and (3) Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources. The new organizational structure consolidates two closely allied departments (Forest Resources and Rangeland Ecology and Management) and the Forest Products Department is discontinued as an administrative unit. CNR faculty and the eight undergraduate programs will be consolidated into the three resulting administrative units or associated with a center or institute either inside or outside of CNR.

Part 2 – Faculty tenure reassignment will be aligned with the assignment of academic programs to the resulting departmental units. This reassignment creates three academic departmental units with nine or more tenure track faculty in each. It also enhances the interdisciplinary nature of each group and creates an increased potential for joint appointments across CNR units.

Part 3 – Seven of the eight existing undergraduate academic degree programs (ecology and conservation biology, fire ecology and management, fishery resources, forest resources, rangeland ecology and management, resource recreation and tourism, wildlife resources) will be assigned to the three new academic departments. The remaining unassigned academic program in Forest Products, including its two options, is being redesigned and by August 1, 2010 will be assigned to an academic department, center or institute either inside or outside of CNR. The redesign focus is the area of bio-products/materials, especially those using woody biomass.

Part 4 – The forest operations option in the Forest Products undergraduate degree program is being consolidated into the existing Society of American Foresters accredited Forest Resources academic program.

Part 5 – The College has an opportunity in conjunction with units across campus to better service stakeholders by developing new self-sustaining research and outreach programs in the areas of Sustainable Rangelands and Bio-products/materials. Interested faculty inside and outside the college along with stakeholders will be brought together in two separate Task Forces to explore the viability of creating such units (program, center, institute or other collaborative). Each Task Force would have until August 1, 2010 to refine and develop its ideas as to how these potential opportunities might function and be organized. It is envisioned that the outcomes of these Task Forces would be implemented using the NOI process or whatever university and/or non-university process(es) necessary.

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.)

This effort was motivated by changes in university-level guidance on department size and an emphasis on consolidating and increasing our efficiency while retaining and/or enhancing academic program quality. The university and college strategic plans also influenced the planning and decisions used in this process.

The proposed change in organizational structure will consolidate two departments and integrate activities of two under-sized departments (three and six tenure-track, faculty members) into the
remaining three departments. After consolidation, all remaining departments will meet the institutional guideline of at least nine full time, tenure track faculty per department. The reorganization also increases the interdisciplinary diversity within the remaining three departments. We see opportunities associated with this change and we expect an increased demand for green, natural resource based jobs such as:

- Restoration ecology
- Watershed management
- Biological assessment
- Fisheries and aquaculture
- Fire science and management
- Conservation leadership and planning
- Bio-based products

This emerging demand includes Idaho, the region and the world. Emerging areas expected to grow include: fisheries, sustainable development, fire management, and the interface of humans and ecosystems in the intermountain West. Continuing to improve our organization and redesign our natural resource education delivery enhances our college’s potential to provide organizations like Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Idaho Department of Lands, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, the U.S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Idaho Department of Water Resources, Idaho cities and counties, private enterprises, non-governmental organizations such as The Nature Conservancy and others who hire professionals capable of addressing real-world natural resource and environmental problems. In Idaho and the region these include forest and rangeland management, endangered species conservation, watershed restoration, carbon accounting, fish and wildlife population monitoring, bio-product development, and the impacts of land use change on Idaho’s growth and development. These are significant issues in the state of Idaho. Continuing to educate graduates with the ability to create solutions to real-world problems is critical to maintaining Idaho’s quality of life.

Employment opportunities for our graduates are likely to increase due to our ability to better meet the requirements of natural resource program accrediting organizations through increased synergy, larger and more diverse departmental facilities and repositioning our academic programs.

In particular, the proposed re-design of the forest harvesting and operations minor and career track will be better positioned to receive recognition by the Society of American Foresters as part of our already SAF accredited Forest Resources degree program. This will increase the credentials of graduates in this area as well as enhance the likelihood to attract internships with the private, public, and non-profit natural resource sectors. Ultimately our goal is to continue to produce a high quality and diverse natural resource workforce that can anticipate and respond to a broad range of natural resource challenges.

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

Academic Program quality will be maintained by working to retain presently accredited undergraduate academic programs covered in this NOI. In the case of forest operations, we believe SAF accreditation as a part of the Forest Resources degree will be an enhancement. As a result, the University of Idaho will remain competitive with other regional and national institutions of higher education. Maintaining accreditation credentials also allows us to continue to obtain competitive research support, and produce graduate and undergraduate students with required competencies necessary to qualify for state and federal rosters. It ensures we will retain a highly visible presence within the ecology and associated applied natural resource professions in forestry, range, wildlife, fisheries, fire, conservation biology and conservation social sciences.
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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.

Within the state, these academic program areas are unique to the University of Idaho. In the region, natural resource programs exist in Washington, Oregon, Utah, Nevada, Montana and Wyoming. However, the quality and diversity of Idaho’s natural resource programs continue to stand out in the region. This is in part due to our focus on continued improvement and constant dedication to re-design and upgrade our academic programming.

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>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWI</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our expectation is that reorganization may initially lead to a slight drop in enrollment in selected programs, which will rebound as our repositioned and revitalized academic degree programs become more attractive to potential students.
### 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>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWI</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Natural resource sciences and professional education in a range of areas including: fisheries and aquaculture, wildlife, range, forestry, forest products, conservation biology, resource recreation and tourism, terrestrial and aquatic ecology, forest hydrology and related water resources, conservation education, protected area management, conservation social sciences, restoration ecology, geo-spatial sciences and fire science.</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Fire Ecology and Management; Bachelor of Science in Fishery Resources with emphases in management and aquaculture; Bachelor of Science in Forest Products with options in forest products business management, forest operations, and wood construction and design; Bachelor of Science in Forest Resources; Bachelor of Science in Ecology and Conservation Biology with options in natural resources ecology and conservation biology; Bachelor of Science in Rangeland Ecology and Management; Bachelor of Science in Resource Recreation and Tourism; and Bachelor of Science in Wildlife Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Natural Resources or specialties listed above</td>
<td>Natural Resources with thesis or project focused on a defined discipline or interdisciplinary specialty within natural resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MNR PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Masters in Natural Resources</td>
<td>Professional Masters in Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources or specialty areas listed above</td>
<td>Natural Resources with dissertation focused on a defined discipline or interdisciplinary specialty within natural resources</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).

As the state’s land grant university, the University of Idaho has been assigned the statewide mission of developing professionals and scientists to sustain natural resources. This proposal retains and strengthens this focus and better positions our programs to develop future generations of natural resource professionals. It also creates an opportunity for focused groups of stakeholders in the bio-materials and rangeland areas to work with others to develop research and outreach programs that ultimately will better address their needs.

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

   Yes ___  No  X ___

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

This effort meets University of Idaho central administration’s guidance on department size and addresses budgetary concerns presently faced by the University. In addition, the University and college strategic plans were used to develop the logic behind this proposal.
8. **Resources--Faculty/Staff/Space Needs/Capital Outlay.** (Use additional sheets if necessary.):

**Impacts shown below are estimated savings not costs.** Savings in personnel are a result of eliminating two department head administrative stipends and summer salaries and by reducing/reorganizing departmental and college administrative staffing. Savings in operating expenses represent reductions in phone service and basic office supplies. These savings will be used to meet state holdbacks, for faculty salaries and in the realignment of administrative services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Fiscal Impact</th>
<th>FY 10</th>
<th>FY 11</th>
<th>FY 12</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>156,365</td>
<td>211,496</td>
<td>211,496</td>
<td>$570,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Operating</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Capital Outlay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>$156,865</td>
<td>$212,496</td>
<td>$212,496</td>
<td>$572,857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| **B. Nature of Funds**  |        |        |        |         |
| 1. Recurring *          | $156,865| $212,496| $212,496| $572,857|
| 2. Non-recurring **     | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0       |
| **TOTAL:**              | $156,865| $212,496| $212,496| $572,857|

* 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.
M-1. **Attendance.** Instructors will make clear at the beginning of each course the extent to which grades depend on attendance and in-class participation. Students are responsible for attending class. Students are accountable for communicating with the instructor and making up missed work in the event of any absence. Instructors should provide reasonable opportunity for students to make up work when the student’s absence results from: (a) participation in official university activities and programs, (b) personal illness, (c) family illness and care or d) other compelling circumstances.