University of Idaho
2009-2010
FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #24

3:30 p.m.
Tuesday, March 23, 2010
BRINK HALL FACULTY LOUNGE

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.

- Minutes of the 2009-10 Faculty Senate Meeting #23, March 9, 2010

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.

- FS-10-039rev: FSH 5200: Human Participant Research (Inge)

VI. Committee Reports.

Faculty Affairs:
- FS-10-023: FSH 3320 – Annual Evaluations (Locke)
- FS-10-023b: FSH 1420 – University Administration

UCC:
- FS-10-040: NOI: Art & Architecture – Reconfiguration (Hoverston)

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Dan Eveleth, Vice Chair 2009-2010, Faculty Senate

Attachments:
- FS 2009-10 Minutes #23
- FS-10-023
- FS-10-039rev
- FS-10-040

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

Minutes: It was moved (Miller/Eveleth) to accept the minutes of meeting #22 of the Faculty Senate. Approved.

Chair’s Report: The Chair noted that a replacement senator was needed for the University Budget and Finance Committee due to the resignation of Professor Murphy from the committee. The term would be until the beginning of the fall 2010 semester. Volunteers were sought and should self-nominate by the next senate meeting.

The Chair reminded senators that the process of election of new senators needs to be in full-swing soon as elections must be completed by April 15. Senators within colleges should coordinate the election processes. They may seek the assistance of college staff.

Provost’s Report: The state budget allocation for FY11 was almost locked in and held no surprises. It appears that we will face a total reduction of 7.6% going into next year. In addition stimulus funds will not be available resulting in a further reduction. Thus, it is important that the UI community works on improving other revenues via increased student recruitment and retention and ways to improve efficiency.

Questions:
Is it possible for the Provost to provide a summary of events that could be available to the broader UI community that showed the progression to the point that has required implementation of furloughs?
The Provost was enthusiastic in his response and suggested a brief power-point presentation that showed the events that led to the present situation and projections for how we plan to move forward in the next few years.

Would it be possible to circulate the presentation to senators?
Yes. An important point is that we have endured a difficult fiscal period and we have managed the process.

Will there be another furlough in the fall of 2010?
It is not possible at present to predict the situation in the fall.

Have furloughs been implemented at other Idaho campuses?
The Provost was not aware of furloughs at other campuses.

When will we know if the SBOE has granted the requested fee increases?
The SBOE will meet and make their decision on April 5. The Provost added that tuition for WSU students will be $9,200 per year, whereas UI fees are now $4,900 plus any additions approved. Thus, our fee revenue is much lower than at WSU.

Are fees/tuition at ISU and BSU similar to UI?
Yes almost identical. In many other states the land-grant institutions being the flag-ships in the state are permitted to charge tuition differential to other regional universities.
The Provost went on to address the issue of general education reform at UI. It has been ten years since the present general education structure had been implemented. In the interim there have been many changes including implementation of a strategic action plan that was now in its fourth year. In reviewing the general education curriculum, we have the opportunity to address the ways we integrate general education into our majors. A memo has been circulated to the community. The review will be led by Deans Kathy Aiken and Scott Wood and Vice-Provosts Jeanne Christiansen and Bruce Pitman. The broader UI community will be invited to participate in the review process.

**FS-10-023, 023b – FSH 3320 and FSH 1420:** The Chair noted that these items were not for vote until the meeting of March 23 and because changes to policies around annual evaluations were likely to be contentious, senators should circulate the changes and seek input from faculty constituents. He noted that the changes should be considered together as the review of administrators was being removed from 1420 and largely placed into 3320 Section D.

It was requested that the Chair of Faculty Affairs Committee be invited to senate for the next meeting (March 23) for further discussion and vote on this item.

The Chair noted that language around tenured faculty-initiated additional review of a dean or unit administrator had been added in 3320 D-4 c.

The Provost responded that the language in this section was vague, and requested that the Associate Counsel, Mr. Graham be allowed to speak. The Chair agreed and Mr. Graham outlined his perspective. He argued that a faculty-initiated additional review of an administrator needed to have the agreement of the provost, as it would be the provost who would conduct such a review.

Professor Crowley asked the Chair for approval to speak. Agreed. Professor Crowley was a member of FAC during the drafting of this policy change. He noted that the intention was that a mechanism was needed for the tenured faculty to be able to signal to the Provost that review of an administrator was needed. There was little structure in the draft addressing process as this should be at the discretion of the Provost.

The Chair reminded senate that this item was for initial discussion and it would return at the next meeting. He moved on to address the next issue.

**FS-10-040 - NOI Art and Architecture reconfiguration (for discussion):** The Chair noted that this item would be before UCC and Graduate Council this week and it was being addressed concurrently for discussion but would come up for vote at Senate following input from these other groups.

The Chair introduced Dean Hoversten to speak to the college reconfiguration. Dean Hoversten distributed detailed notes to accompany the NOI. The NOI would reconfigure the college such that there were no departments. There were no curricular changes and no degree changes. The changes have been driven by two main factors: 1) the profession is changing rapidly and 2) the need to respond to efficiency requirements and restructure small departments. In addition, was a need to implement professional fees equitably across all programs in the college. At present, professional fees were not charged in one program. He noted that the reconfiguration had been a lengthy process beginning with workshops in 2008. There had been extensive dialog with faculty and staff. Many of the issues that were discussed revolved around the process of faculty governance in the new structure and accreditation. All of the degrees in the college are accredited. The NOI puts the faculty governance structure in place.

There is only a small cost saving in the restructure (≈ $27 thousand), but revenue generation through professional fees will be enhanced by $230 thousand. The new structure will allow flexibility and serves the cross-disciplinary nature of the programs. Industry is very supportive of the changes.
Through the process an anonymous straw poll of faculty and staff received support of 80% of college employees, with only two not participating in the poll.

**With no departments, how are department chair roles filled?**
There is a salary component in the NOI for administrators. Tasks such as faculty performance evaluation, student advising and class scheduling in the summer will be done by coordinators.

**What are student views on the reconfiguration?**
Student leadership response had been relatively neutral. The dean noted an issue with some difficulty in getting communications effectively distributed to students. A senator noted that student advising would present a great opportunity to convey information to the broader student body. In addition, it was very important to make those connections early in the process. Dean Hoversten noted that college leadership was meeting with student leadership every other week.

**Are the art program students who now do not pay receiving any benefits?**
Yes. In addition, the professional fee will replace former lab and course fees. The professional fee also has the advantage that it can be used across a broader range of purposes. The fee is not insignificant at $492 per semester.

The Chair noted that this was a preliminary discussion and the item would return at the March 23 meeting. He thanked Dean Hoversten for providing information and discussion and moved to the next item.

**FS-10-033 - Partner Accommodation:** The Chair noted that Associate Counsel, Mr. Graham had provided some recent changes to the policy that had been drafted by Faculty Affairs Committee, and moved to amend the policy as proposed by Mr. Graham (Miller/Edwards). The Chair invited Mr. Graham to join the senate discussion.

**Do the changes proposed by Mr. Graham bring the policy into compliance with present Idaho law?**
Mr. Graham did not purport to speak for the Idaho courts. But, the term “Dual Career” accommodation replacing “Partner” accommodation advanced the university’s intent to proceed lawfully. He went on to note that the City of Moscow had sought to extend health benefits to unmarried couples. A state senator had questioned this and the attorney general wrote an opinion to the state senator saying that extending health care benefits to unmarried couples, the City was recognizing a domestic legal union other than marriage and therefore in violation of the state constitution.

He went on to note that the purpose of the policy was to improve the universities competitiveness in attracting high quality faculty. Implementation of such a policy would be beneficial.

The issue of fairness to present staff employees was addressed at length. Staff Affairs had been asked to comment on the policy. The discussion at senate today had been delayed for one month to allow for staff input. Staff representative senator Baillargeon noted that the Staff Affairs Committee had reviewed the proposed policy changes and would not support the proposal in its present form. Mr. Mark Miller of Staff Affairs was invited to speak. His preference was to return the proposal so that it could be reviewed in collaboration with Staff Affairs [Note that FAC had submitted the policy to Staff Affairs Committee for input and a month had been allowed for that purpose. No alternative policy proposal had come forward.] The view of another senator was that UI consisted of a whole community of faculty, staff and students and it was important for the senate to consider each of these groups in deliberations. An alternative view suggested that it was unlikely that a policy that satisfied all groups could be crafted. The question of fairness to whom was raised. In one scenario, a partner could get assistance from HR and this was not available to another person from the outside community. Thus, there was no disadvantage to staff in this sense. In C-1 where there would be an existing vacancy, the question is whether it is fair to allow someone who is in a dual career...
accommodation situation into a UI-only search. This policy is saying that the partner would only be considered in that pool.

The discussion moved to the intellectual support of the UI community for the diversity issue embedded in the policy change. This issue also received extensive discussion. It was pointed out that the university was an intellectual leader in the state and it was important that the university supported a position on the issue.

Another point was that UI suffered from a lack of competitive salaries and this may be an even more important issue than the matter before the senate.

The Chair noted that the policy seeks to provide transparency and create a process that is observable and accountable. It was an additional incentive to attract quality faculty that was even more important in a smaller community such as Moscow when competing against universities in larger population settings. In the Chair’s view a policy that creates transparency for accommodations that already do happen is more beneficial to staff. Yet another view was that in the present fiscal situation, given staff lay-offs and furloughs it was questioned whether this was a time to be considering this policy.

It was moved (Edwards/Eveleth) to include a secondary amendment to the policy (underlined). In “C-1. Existing Vacancy. Initially, the university may attempt to find accommodation in existing vacancies, including jobs listed as “open only to current UI employees.” However, the candidate’s qualifications, as determined by the search committee, must be competitive with other applicants in the pool.”

And in addition the following change:

“C. Process. Human Resources shall assign a staff member who will be responsible for providing reasonable assistance to a staff or faculty member’s partner, including partners of those prospective staff or faculty who have received a position offer, in finding local employment. This person shall maintain an information base and support network pertaining to local employers, both on and off campus and will actively coordinate with other educational institutions in the area. This person will contact and offer service to all new hires, will be available at the time of interview, and will be available to existing employees.”

There being no further discussion the question was called on the primary amendment presented by Associate Counsel Mr. Graham. 19 in favor, 1 opposed. Approved.

The question was called on the secondary amendment as noted above to C and C-1. Approved unanimously.

The question on the main motion to adopt the Dual-Career Accommodation policy was called. 13 in favor, 3 against. Approved.

Adjournment: It was moved (Fritz/Eveleth) to adjourn at 5:08 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Rodney A. Hill, Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Senate
To be added to FSH 5200, under section B-1. 1. a., recently approved at Senate (3/2/10) to address concerns voiced.

Definition of research - systematic investigation including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge. This includes qualitative research methods such as constructivist, participatory and action research that may not be considered generalizable. It also includes other methodologies that may not be considered generalizable but have the intent of adding to a body of knowledge.

Note: Certain activities by policy do not fall under the definition of research and are not subject to IRB review and approval. For example projects carried out as part of coursework with the sole intent of teaching students research skills may be covered under the Course-Related Research Practica policy. Projects carried out as part of a University Quality Improvement or Quality Assurance project may be covered under the policy for such activities.
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UI FACULTY-STAFF HANDBOOK
CHAPTER THREE:
EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION CONCERNING FACULTY AND STAFF

3320

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS AND SALARY DETERMINATION
OF FACULTY MEMBERS
AND
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS

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]

a. Forms Distributed. Supplies of the form to be used in the evaluation process are procured by deans and unit administrators. The immediate administrative officer is responsible for ensuring that each faculty member receives the proper form together with a copy of the supplementary instructions. [rev. 7-01]

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 this type 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;
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 [rev. 7-09]
(4) Other materials deemed necessary to document efforts and accomplishments for the period under review. [add. 7-01]

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 faculty members 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.]

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: [rev. 7-03, 7-09]

(1) a copy of the individual’s annual evaluation form and narrative [rev. 7-09]
(2) if requested, comparative information to help assess performance evaluation and numerical ratings, including, but not limited to: [rev. 7-09]
   (a) Frequency distribution for overall ratings for the unit
   (b) Frequency distribution for overall ratings for the college [rev. 7-97, ren. and rev. 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 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, the college will return the materials to the department. [add. 7-09]

If the faculty member files a dissent, 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. 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 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 or 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, within sixty days of the 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. [ren. 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
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 is 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 and center 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 a 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 annual evaluation of unit administrator’s annual 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 form 2B are sent directly to the dean. The dean furnishes the administrator evaluated a summary of the faculty evaluations in such a way that the confidentiality of individual evaluations is preserved. The dean may arrange a conferences 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 in the dean’s office. The dean then submits as a summary of conclusions and recommendations resulting from the review
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DC-3. EVALUATIONS OF DEANS. Completed copies of the evaluation form are sent directly to the provost. The provost furnishes each dean evaluated 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 performance specified in FSH 1420 D-2E and as documented in the Annual Position Description. The provost and dean will negotiate the Annual Position Description for the dean administrator will be negotiated with the provost on the basis of the college/ unit needs; the complete file is 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. Those Annual goals should be based on the college/unit action plan, needs of the college/unit and discussion with the provost. The provost will send a conscientious effort to solicit input from unit college faculty through evaluation form 2B.

College faculty must will send completed copies of form 2B directly to the dean. 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. 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 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 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 will then provide feedback to faculty who have responded-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 college, 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-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.

3. A review committee that, in addition to departmental membership, includes at least one UI faculty member from outside the department. [add. 7-99]
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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, or college dean will submit the written report along with any additional comments and recommendations to the provost, dean, or college dean, and provide appropriate feedback to the administrator/faculty and staff. [rev. and ren. 7-99]

e. Additional Review. The provost and/or college dean may initiate a review at any time he or she judges or 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 the 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-center administrators and assistant and associate deans are in the hands of the provost 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 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-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.

(Forms on next five pages)
UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION

PREAMBLE: This section describes the major administrative officers of the university down to the level of the provost and vice presidents and, further, the academic administration down to the level of the head of a school, division, or department. A fuller display of the university’s administration is to be found, in graphic form, in 1440. This section is original to the 1979 edition of the Handbook. It has been updated frequently since that time as titles and administrative organization have evolved. Notable substantive additions include that of the ombuds (C-4) in July 1992, material concerning the presidential veto (A-1-c) in July 1995, and substantial revisions to the subsections dealing with the selection and tenure of departmental administrators (E) in July 1998. Section E was substantially revised again in July 1999. Major revisions in subsections A, B, and C also appeared in July 1999 and again in July 2006 to reflect reorganizations of the senior administration. Further information on the university’s administrative structure is available from the President’s Office (208-885-6365), the Office of the Faculty Secretary (208-885-6151), or from the offices of the provost and executive vice president, vice presidents, or deans. [rev. 7-98, 7-99, ed. 7-00, rev. 7-06]

CONTENTS:

A. The President and Provost and Executive Vice President
B. Vice Presidents and Vice Provosts
C. Other Officers Reporting Directly to the President
D. College Deans
E. Administrators of Schools, Divisions, and Departments

A. THE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT. The president is the chief executive officer of the university. The provost and executive vice president supports and assists the president in providing leadership to and coordination of the activities of the central administration and the executive functions of the university. [rev. 7-99, 7-06]

A-1. The President.

a. The president is appointed by the regents and serves at their pleasure. The president is the chief executive officer of the university and functions as the representative of and an adviser to the regents and as the general agent through whom representations to them by UI personnel and students are regularly made. [See also 1900.] The Idaho Constitution, statutes and university policies declare the president a member and the president of the university faculty and also as the president of the other faculties referred to in 1520 I-4 and II [See 1520 I-2.] and a professor of a branch of learning in which UI regularly offers instruction.

b. The president exercises the power and authority delegated by the regents by issuing and enforcing such executive orders and invoking such measures as are reasonable and necessary for the performance of the functions and the discharge of the responsibilities and duties appurtenant to the presidency. The president exercises such rights, prerogatives, and responsibilities as normally accrue to the president and chief executive officer of an institution of higher education and discharging such other responsibilities and performing such other duties as may be assigned by the regents or required by law. The president may delegate his authority to other officers of the university as necessary. The president serves as a member ex officio of all councils, committees, boards, or similar bodies necessary to the operation of UI, regardless of how these bodies may have been established or appointed. [See 1620 B-3 and B-8.]

c. The president receives recommendations from the faculty on policy issues.

1. When the faculty, whether in a meeting or via a general policy report, approves an item which requires the president’s action, the president will approve or disapprove it within sixty days of the faculty’s action. The
president will provide written notification of his or her action to Faculty Council via the faculty secretary. Any item not approved by the president within this time will be deemed to be disapproved. [rev. 7-06]

2. When an item has not been approved by the president:

   a. The Faculty Council may reconsider; and/or

   b. A referendum may be held on the item. Such referenda will be held on the petition to the Faculty Secretary signed by fifty members of the university faculty and submitted within sixty days of the first full semester after the item has been disapproved. Such referenda will be by written ballot and conducted by the Faculty Secretary’s Office. Upon two-thirds vote of the total voting membership of the university faculty, the item will be presented by the president to the regents for their consideration.

A-2. The Provost and Executive Vice President.

   a. The Provost and Executive Vice President [hereinafter “the provost”] serves as the chief academic officer of the UI, is a member of the president’s cabinet, and serves as the chief executive officer of the University of Idaho when the president is unavailable. The provost has the major responsibility for the promotion of academic freedom and tenure. The provost is the president’s representative to the Faculty Council and works closely with the vice president for finance and administration, Faculty Council and deans in budget planning, fiscal accountability, general policy development and human resources. Acting for the president and within delegated authority and responsibility, the provost develops and requires compliance with such administrative directives and instructions as are reasonable and necessary for the discharge of assigned responsibilities and duties. [rev. 7-06]

   b. The provost is directly responsible for the general direction of the academic programs, endeavors, and instructional services in the several colleges, schools, departments, and other academic units on the Moscow campus and to the UI’s academic efforts throughout the state. To this end, the provost coordinates the activities of the vice presidents and other members of the senior administration to support the mission of the university. The college deans report to and work closely with the provost in these responsibilities. Among the specific duties of the provost are: general direction of curricular planning, student recruitment and retention; general direction of academic support programs and services; fostering academic excellence in UI departments and divisions; appointment, training, and review of academic administrators; oversight of the faculty personnel system and the faculty development program; general direction of UI’s research and outreach efforts; and coordination among the faculty, administration, and staff.

   c. The provost also provides leadership to the dean of library services, the center deans in Boise, Coeur d’Alene, and Idaho Falls, the WWAMI medical education program, and institutional research and assessment. [add. 7-06]

B. THE VICE PRESIDENTS AND VICE PROVOSTS [See 1440, Administrative Organization] [sec. B rev. 7-99, 7-06]

B-1. Vice President for Finance and Administration.

   a. The vice president for finance and administration also serves as treasurer for the regents and performs the functions of UI bursar, as specified in the Idaho Code. The vice president works to determine UI’s requirements for funds, obtain such funds, and ensure their effective and proper use. The vice president develops and prepares operating and capital budgets and operating plans in concert with academic and staff departments. The vice president is the institutional officer designated by law and by the regents to execute contracts or agreements that, if made, would commit UI to any obligation to provide services or facilities, expend funds, or convey property. Acting for the president and within delegated authority and responsibility, the vice president develops and requires compliance with such administrative directives and instructions as are reasonable and necessary for the discharge of assigned responsibilities and duties. The vice president for finance and administration is a member
of the president’s cabinet. The vice president regularly reports to the regents through the president; even so, as provided by board policy, the vice president is authorized to report to the regents through the executive director of the Office of the State Board of Education when such direct reporting is requested by the regents or the president. [rev. 7-06, ed. 5-08]

b. The vice president oversees the division of finance and administration whose mission is to provide leadership in an environment which promotes distributed and integrated management, productivity, transparency, and accountability in implementing the university’s mission and goals while ensuring stewardship of the institution’s human, financial, information technology, and facility resources. The division includes all functional areas in administrative affairs, auxiliary services, business and accounting services, capital planning and budget, facilities services, financial services, and human resources. The Idaho Constitution provides the regents of the university autonomy in its activities regarding the procurement of goods, acquiring and managing real estate holdings, capital construction and personnel management. [rev. 7-06]

**B-2. Vice President for University Advancement.** The vice president for university advancement is responsible for developing and maintaining institutional programs for alumni relations, public relations and development, and also serves as executive director of the UI Foundation. The vice president is specifically responsible for the effective functioning of university communications and marketing, alumni relations, and the development offices including those at extended regional campuses, and specific program fundraising efforts. These departments are coordinated to support and enhance the university’s missions of teaching, scholarly activity and outreach. Among specific duties are to: formulate and recommend policies relating to the development, public relations, and volunteer activities of the university; formulate a strategic plan for the organization and progression of long-range development programs; design and implement strategies for a comprehensive public relations program; and promote fundraising activities. The vice president works closely with the Alumni Association and the Vandal Booster Board in association with their executive directors. The vice president serves as a member of the president’s cabinet. The vice president is expected to supervise, lead, and manage the advancement area and to participate in formulating strategic plans, directions, and policies for the institution as a whole. Acting for the president and within delegated authority and responsibility, this vice president develops and requires compliance with such administrative directives and instructions as are reasonable and necessary for the discharge of assigned responsibilities and duties. [ed. 7-06]

**B-3. Vice President for Research.** The vice president for research is responsible for the research program of the university and the university’s several research institutes as well as the Idaho Geological Survey, and is responsible for coordinating with the Idaho Research Foundation. The vice president provides vision and leadership to the research institutes and the procurement of external research support. The vice president is expected to lead, and manage the research program as well as to participate in formulating strategic plans, directions, and policies for the institution as a whole. Acting for the president and the provost and within delegated authority and responsibility, the vice president develops and requires compliance with such administrative directives and instructions as are reasonable and necessary for the discharge of assigned responsibilities and duties. The vice president is a member of the president’s cabinet. [rev. 7-06]

**B-4. Associate Vice President for Northern Idaho.** The associate vice president for Northern Idaho identifies innovative higher education programs to meet the higher education needs of the Coeur d’Alene, Post Falls, and Sandpoint regions. [add. 7-06]

**B-5. Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Dean of Students.** The vice provost for student affairs and dean of students is responsible for setting the tone for the quality of student life on campus, leadership in student development, and the general direction and oversight of student services. The vice provost leads UI’s statewide efforts pertaining to student life, including residence living, student counseling, multicultural affairs, student benefits, health and wellness, child care, campus recreation, and the dean of students’ office. The vice provost also works closely with student government and intercollegiate athletics. The vice provost serves as a member of the presidents cabinet, and is expected to supervise, lead, and manage student affairs and to participate in formulating strategic plans, directions, and policies for the institution as a whole. Acting for the president and the provost and within delegated authority and responsibility, this vice provost develops and requires compliance with such administrative directives and instructions as are reasonable and necessary for the discharge of assigned responsibilities and duties.
B-6. Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Enrollment Management. The vice provost for academic affairs and enrollment management is responsible for the following academic support areas: admissions and financial aid, new student services, tutoring and academic assistance, the Center for Academic Advising, the College Assistance Migrant Program, career and professional planning, Core, honors program, international programs office, independent study, summer programs and concurrent enrollment, registrar’s office, officer education programs, and the Center for Teaching Excellence, which includes general education, student retention, and faculty development. The vice provost is responsible for delegated responsibilities from the provost in general academic areas. The vice provost promotes articulation with other colleges and universities based on academic policies, and participates in formulating strategic plans, directions, and policies for the institution as a whole. Acting for the provost and within delegated authority and responsibility, the vice provost develops and requires compliance with such administrative directives and instructions as are reasonable and necessary for the discharge of assigned responsibilities and duties. [rev. 7-06]

C. OTHER OFFICERS REPORTING DIRECTLY TO THE PRESIDENT. [sec. C rev. 7-99, 7-06]

C-1. General Counsel. The university’s general counsel is solely responsible for all legal matters pertaining to UI, including retaining outside legal counsel. The general counsel represents the university, including advising the president and all members of the central administration, and others designated by the president or other administrators. The general counsel is an ex officio member of the president’s cabinet. [ed. 7-06, rev. 5-07]

C-2. Affirmative Action Officer. The affirmative action officer oversees the functioning of UI’s equal employment opportunity and affirmative action programs and advises the president on the full range of employment and educational practices concerning these matters within UI. [See also 1640.10, 3060, and 6010 (ed. 7-97).]

C-3. Director of Athletics. The director of athletics supervises the intercollegiate athletic programs and ensures that they support UI’s educational objectives and comply with the regulations of the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the athletic conferences with which UI is affiliated. [See also 4320 and 4325.] The director is a member of the president’s cabinet. [ed. 7-06]

C-4. Ombuds. The ombuds provides a voluntary, informal mechanism to facilitate communications between individuals in dispute, to help clarify issues involved, and to suggest avenues for dispute resolution. [See also 3820.] [ed. 7-06]

C-5. Special Assistant to the President for Governmental Relations. The special assistant to the president for governmental relations is responsible for assisting members of the central administration in all matters involving the university’s relationship with congressional and legislative entities and elected officials at the state and federal levels. Located in Boise, the special assistant is a member of the president’s cabinet. [ed. 7-06]

C-6. Internal Audit. The Department of Auditing Services, reporting directly to the president, is an independent appraisal activity established within the university as a service to university management and the Board of Regents [See Governing Policies and Procedures Manual of the State Board of Education, Section V.H,4]. The department seeks to improve the management of the university’s resources and assets and provide the university’s management staff and the Board of Regents with an evaluation of the institution’s and various organizational unit’s operational functions. The scope of the audit function encompasses the examination and evaluation of the adequacy and effectiveness of the institution’s system of management controls as well as the quality of performance in carrying out assigned responsibilities. [add. 7-06]
D. COLLEGE DEANS.

D-1. APPOINTMENT.

a. Each college is administered by a dean who is appointed by the regents on recommendation of the president. Such recommendation is formulated through procedures that (a) solicit the advice and include the active participation of faculty members and students of the college and (b) are consistent with the bylaws of the college faculty. [See 1520 IV-7 (ed. 7-97).]

b. When a vacancy in the position of dean occurs, the provost convenes a search committee to advise in the selection of a new dean. The provost determines the size of the committee, including the number of members from outside UI, and appoints the members. The provost also names a person to chair the committee. To ensure adequate representation and participation of the college faculty in the search and selection process [see 1520 I-4-A], the following will be observed: (a) faculty members from the college concerned comprise at least 50 percent of the membership; and (b) these faculty representatives are selected by the provost from a pool of faculty members presented to him or her through procedures established in the college bylaws that provide for the representation of the major academic disciplines in the college. The pool must contain at least half again the number of members needed from the college for the committee. Additionally, search procedures must provide some means for the entire college faculty to participate in the interviewing of finalists and for individual faculty members to forward their comments and recommendations directly to the president. The search committee forwards its recommendation to the provost who, in turn, forwards a recommendation to the president who is responsible for making a final recommendation to the regents. [ed. 7-97, 7-00, rev. 7-06]

c. The college dean serves in his or her administrative position at the pleasure of the provost, and the regents receive annual recommendations from the president concerning the dean’s status. [rev. 7-06]

d. The college dean may be granted tenure in an academic discipline in accordance with regular UI procedures for tenure, but may not be granted tenure as an administrator. [See 3520 F-4.]

D-2. RESPONSIBILITIES.

a. The various colleges differ widely in size and organization. Consequently, this statement of responsibilities is intended to be general enough to allow for different procedures and different degrees of delegation of authority and responsibility within the colleges. These matters are dealt with specifically in the bylaws of the individual colleges. The principal variation lies in the responsibilities placed in the hands of administrators of intracollege academic units.

b. The college dean is the chair of the college faculty in the development of policies and priorities governing the academic program of the college. The dean is responsible both for the exercise of leadership in these matters and for the development of the leadership roles of other faculty members in the college decision-making process. The academic program of the college is directly affected by program planning, definitions of goals and priorities, instructional methods and standards, student advising, research policies, allocation of resources, and the development of professional standards peculiar to the branches of learning for which the college is responsible. The academic program of the college includes undergraduate and graduate instruction, research and creative activity, and extension services.

c. The college dean is the chief executive officer of the college in the implementation of policies defined by the college or university faculty and approved by appropriate authority. As such, it is the dean’s responsibility to:

1. Foster academic excellence in the college and each of its units.

2. Operate a system of academic advising and counseling for students [see 4310].
3. Present to the Faculty Council or its committees matters that have been proposed by the college faculty and require approval by the Faculty Council.

4. Present to the Provost Council or to other bodies problems of policy implementation that need university-wide attention, including the implementation of interdisciplinary programs. [ed. 7-06]

5. Develop budget proposals.

6. Control expenditures from approved budgets. [ed. 7-97]

7. Develop recommendations concerning appointments, promotions, tenure, salaries, layoffs, and terminations of college personnel.

8. Assign duties to the faculty. [See also E-1 below and 3240.]

9. Define job responsibilities, assign duties, and supervise the activities of nonfaculty personnel.

10. Maintain contacts with the professions for which the college prepares graduates.

11. Supervise the use, maintenance, and security of property entrusted to the college (responsibility for security is shared with Facilities Management and Campus Security). [See 6140.]

12. Allocate space assigned to the college within limitations imposed by the Space Governance Group (see APM 40.10). [ed. 7-06, 6-09]

d. College deans, individually and as members of the Provost Council, advise the president on such university-wide matters as: (a) admission, registration, advising, counseling, retention, and dismissal of students, (b) personnel policies, (c) institutional goals, (d) budgetary priorities, (e) university relations, and (f) day-to-day problems of institutional operation that require the attention of the president’s executive staff. [ed. 7-06]

e. The dean is encouraged to organize his or her activities so as to provide time for personal involvement in teaching, research, or equivalent professional endeavors.

E. ADMINISTRATORS OF SCHOOLS, DIVISIONS, AND DEPARTMENTS. [All save E-1, E-4b, and E-4c were revised or added 7-98; E-1, E-4, and E-6 were revised 7-99.]

E-1. RESPONSIBILITIES. The administrator of a school, division, or department (i.e., the first organizational unit below the college level) is responsible for interpreting university and college objectives and policies for the faculty of the unit and, through leadership, ensuring faculty participation in formulating and carrying out the unit’s policies within the framework of the objectives and policies of the college and university. The role may be defined more specifically by the bylaws of each college, but it is understood that the general responsibility for leadership includes: assisting higher administration in the assignment [3240 A] and in the evaluation [3320 and 3340] of the services of each member of the unit’s faculty and staff; promoting effective leadership of personnel and management of departmental resources; providing leadership in the development and implementation of unit plans; providing for open communication with faculty and staff; fostering excellence in teaching, scholarship and outreach for faculty, students, and staff in the department; effectively representing all constituents of the department; and continuing personal professional development in areas of leadership. [rev. 7-99]

E-2. TITLE.

a. The title of the administrator of a school or division (i.e., a division that is the first organizational unit below the college level) is “director.”
b. The title of a departmental administrator may be either “department chair” or “department head,” as determined by the bylaws of the individual colleges.

E-3. RANK AND TENURE. [ed. 7-00]

a. Administrators of schools, divisions, or departments must hold an academic rank in a discipline.

b. Tenure, in the academic rank only, may be granted under the usual procedures; tenure is not granted in the administrative capacity. [See 3520 F-4.]

E-4. SELECTION OF PERMANENT ADMINISTRATOR.

a. The responsibility for recommending unit administrators shall be shared between the voting faculty members (as defined by Article II, Section, 1 of the UI Constitution) of the unit and the dean of the unit’s college.

b. Administrators of schools, divisions, or departments are reviewed periodically as initiated by the dean. Each 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 review will include the mechanisms of formal review as described in the approved bylaws of the individual colleges and be consistent with the procedures of E-6. The dean submits the review material and recommendations to the provost, who in turn makes a recommendation to the president regarding renewal or nonrenewal. [rev. 7-99, ed. 7-00]

c. The college dean has the responsibility to initiate an earlier review at any time he or she judges such a review is needed. Likewise, the faculty of the particular unit may initiate, by majority vote, an earlier review. A summary of conclusions and recommendations resulting from the review are submitted to the dean to the provost who, in turn, makes his or her review and forwards recommendations to the president.

d. When a vacancy occurs, it is the responsibility of the college dean to assemble a search committee. The search committee should represent a balance of interests including diversity, unit disciplines and specializations, and faculty rank. Appointment to the search committee shall be in accordance with the bylaws of the unit and/or the unit’s college, provided that the search committee shall be comprised as follows:

1. At least two-thirds of the members shall be voting faculty members of the unit who were nominated by the faculty.

2. At least one member shall be a UI faculty member from outside the college selected from three persons nominated by the faculty. (A role of this outside member is to assure compliance with the process for selecting administrators).

3. In consultation with the faculty of the unit, the dean will select the overall committee to represent a balance of interests including diversity, disciplines/specialization, and rank.

e. As provided by the bylaws of either the unit or the college, the search committee may include student members, alumni, representatives of the unit’s constituents, and/or other UI faculty from outside the unit.

f. Faculty members of the unit who are candidates for the administrative position may not serve on the search committee nor participate in any faculty voting regarding the position.

g. Once the search committee has been formed, the dean of the college will select the chair after consultation with the committee.

h. In accordance with the provisions of the bylaws of the unit and/or college and with the recruitment policies
and procedures of the UI, the search committee shall, in consultation with college and university administration:

1. Develop a position description.

2. Determine whether an external or internal search shall be conducted. (An external or internal search is determined by circumstances unique to each vacancy; e.g. availability of funds, departmental needs, departmental and/or college policy, and shall be resolved in accordance with college or unit policies and procedures.)

i. The responsibilities of the search committee shall be to:

   1. Solicit a pool of candidates to be considered for the position;

   2. Evaluate applicants, from the pool of candidates, in accordance with criteria specified in the position description; and

   3. Recommend finalists for further consideration by the unit’s faculty and administration.

j. All voting faculty members of the unit shall have the opportunity to participate in interviewing finalists for the position.

k. After the unit’s voting faculty members have completed interviewing the finalists, the chair of the search committee shall obtain, by secret ballot, the preferences of the unit’s voting faculty for the administrative position.

l. The chair of the search committee shall forward the name(s) of one or more candidates acceptable to the majority of the unit’s voting faculty and a report documenting the search process to the dean. The dean will then meet with the unit faculty members or the search committee to discuss the proposed candidates.

m. If, after subsequent rounds of voting, no candidate obtains a majority of votes of the unit’s faculty members, the chair of the search committee shall poll the voting faculty members for an appropriate course of action.

n. If the unit’s voting faculty is unable to determine a course of action for selecting a unit administrator, the matter shall be referred to the dean.

o. If the individual(s) selected by the voting faculty members are acceptable to the dean, the dean shall forward the recommendation to the provost.

p. If the dean and a majority of the unit’s faculty cannot agree on a candidate who will accept the administrative leadership, the dean prepares a written summary of the relevant issues, including the results of the faculty vote, for the provost. Faculty members are encouraged to forward their written comments to the provost. The provost shall make a reasonable attempt to achieve congruence between the dean and the majority of the faculty; and in any event, makes a recommendation to the president regarding an appointment or an alternate course of action.

q. In the case of a recommendation to appoint an individual not currently on the faculty, the dean must also receive the recommendation of at least the majority of the full professors (and where appropriate, of the associates) in the academic department for the academic faculty appointment and rank.

E-5. APPOINTMENT OF AN ACTING (OR TEMPORARY) ADMINISTRATOR. When a vacancy occurs, the college dean shall assemble and consult with the voting faculty members of the unit and recommend to the provost and president a member of the unit’s faculty, acceptable to both the dean and a majority of the unit’s faculty, to serve as its acting administrator until a permanent administrator is selected.
E-6. REVIEW AND EVALUATION. See FSH 3320 D-2. The review and evaluation of unit administrators 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 a 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.

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 a Unit Administrator.

a. Annual Evaluation. The annual evaluation of unit administrators’ 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 above as documented in the Annual Position Description. The Annual Position Description for the unit administrator will be negotiated with the dean on the basis of the 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 effectiveness in meeting last year’s goals. These should be based on the unit action plan, needs of the 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]

b. Periodic Review. 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 [rev. 7-99]:

1. Opportunity for all faculty and staff of the unit to participate in the review.

2. 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. Confidentiality of all individual evaluations will be ensured. [add. 7-99]

4. Opportunity for the unit administrator to prepare a report or portfolio summarizing his or her administrative achievements for the preceding period for consideration by those individuals conducting the review. [rev. and ren. 7-00]

5. Preparation of a written report summarizing the findings and recommendations of the review, which will be forwarded to the dean and the unit administrator. [ed. and ren. 7-00]

6. The dean will submit the written report along with any additional comments and recommendations to the provost and provide appropriate feedback to the faculty and staff. [rev. and ren. 7-00]
c. Additional Review. The college dean may initiate a review at any time he or she judges such a review is needed.

Likewise, the faculty of the particular unit may initiate, by majority vote, such a review.

A summary of conclusions and recommendations resulting from the review are submitted by the dean to the provost who, in turn, makes his or her review and forwards recommendations to the president.

[See 1440 for chart of administrative organization.]
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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 intention of the NOI is to reconfigure current departmental units into one unit within the College, a unit that would encompasses all current programs and degrees. There is no intent to modify programs with this NOI. Currently the College of Art & Architecture has an organizational structure of three departments and one program that is administered through the Dean’s Office. Departments are: the Department of Architecture & Interior Design, Department of Art & Design, Department of Landscape Architecture and the Virtual Technology and Design Program. This also meets Provost Doug Baker’s Mandate to streamline administrative structures.

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.).

- Reduced state funding requires us to establish larger academic units, develop more efficient management structures, and find new revenue streams.
- Reactivation of the college in October, 2005 was based on the premise of integrated design in a common studio culture. The College of Art and Architecture's Strategic Plan – Create, Collaborate, Lead – articulated these concepts in a bold series of vision statements and strategies.
- A one-unit structure reflects a continuing commitment to the vision of an integrated college in which the integrity and strength of each discipline contributes to and reinforces our educational goals while reducing or eliminating unnecessary silos between disciplines.
- Our graduates are entering professions that are increasingly integrated and rapidly changing. We need to increase our ability to provide flexible and integrated education to prepare them for that world.

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

Accreditation:
- Maintaining accreditation in each discipline is a top priority of the college. Our CAA Teaching and Learning Mission states the following: “Provide accredited degree programs with extraordinarily effective teaching in dynamic learning environments, instilling in graduates the knowledge, skills, values and passion required for success as tomorrow’s professionals and leaders.” Discussions with all accreditation boards indicate that the reconfiguration proposed should not adversely affect accreditation as long as accreditation criteria are met. The college will work closely with accreditation boards throughout the implementation process to resolve any questions or concerns.

---

Professional societies and constituencies:
Members of the College's Advisory Council, professional practitioners and other private sector constituencies support this change. They believe this change represents a significant trend in practice and industry.

Faculty members and academic programs are members of professional societies, and reconfiguration will not impact those relationships.

State Licensing Boards:
- This organizational structure change will not affect the ability of our graduates to become licensed in their professions.
- The College will work closely with licensing boards throughout the implementation process to respond to any unresolved issues.

Students:
- This change provides a dynamic opportunity for our students to be part of an integrated college of art, architecture, graphic design, interior design, landscape architecture, and virtual technology and design. Students will have better access to more flexible and innovative learning opportunities and experiences.
- This model corresponds to innovative private and public practice. As a result, students will find more relevance for their degree in their profession of choice which will prepare them to enter the integrated workforce.
- This underscores our current commitment to trans-disciplinary learning for all students through the “College- wide Foundations Program.” This prepares them for the interdisciplinary world in which they will work and achieves efficiencies in our teaching.
- Student contributions will continue to be part of the process of formulating the vision of the new unit.

Faculty:
The new College by-laws will be developed so that:
- Faculty in each discipline will maintain control of curricula and instruction.
- Faculty will continue to be represented on college and university committees and participate in other faculty opportunities.
- Faculty in each discipline will participate in selecting unit leadership and college committee representation.
- Program coordinators, (formerly identified as department chairs in the current FSH) will be responsible for administrative duties including accreditation, course assignments, position descriptions, annual performance evaluations, promotion and tenure, budget management, per Faculty Staff Handbook 1420 e-1.
- In compliance with the Faculty Staff Handbook, a part time position will be established (identified as a Department Chair in FSH) to perform those tasks, not covered by the program coordinators identified above. (Relates to .50 FTE position on budget explanation.)

Process:
- February, 2009: Faculty and staff were involved in workshops that resulted in goals for the reconfiguration of the College. Chief among them was the need to retain existing faculty numbers to continue to teach classes. Concerns and desires were expressed and specific courses of action were tested. These workshops continued in March, 2009. Between workshops, chairs tested options that might be brought forward to the faculty as possible solutions.
- August, 2009: Department chairs developed a number of options including a list of advantages and disadvantages for faculty consideration.
- September, 2009: Eleven options were tested and prioritized again in a joint workshop of faculty and Advisory Council members.
• September – November, 2009: Department chairs worked to further test preferred options with their departments.
• December, 2009: A College workshop identified faculty and staff concerns.
• January, 2010: In response to the December workshop, a Blackboard website was established to encourage informal communication. Four dialogue sessions were held to allow smaller groups to discuss options. An in-depth dialogue identified strengths and weaknesses of all options. A straw poll indicated that 80% of faculty and staff supported the one-unit option.
• February, 2010: Student leaders continue to be informed of organizational changes as the process unfolds.

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: The College of Art and Architecture offers the only integrated college of art, architecture, graphic design, interior design, landscape architecture, and virtual technology and design in the State of Idaho. These programs are segmented into different colleges in regional universities. This proposal strengthens our unique niche in art and design education.

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>Fall, 2006</td>
<td>Art:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art: Art:</td>
<td>Ugrads:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>603</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad: Grad:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Archite</td>
<td>Pre-Arch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Fall, 2009</td>
<td>Fall, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ugrads: 95</td>
<td>Ugrads: 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc: 2</td>
<td>Assoc: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad: 11</td>
<td>Grad: 9</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>Fall, 2009</td>
<td>Fall, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>911</td>
<td>938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees offered by school/college or program(s) within disciplinary area under review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>Ugrad</td>
<td>BA History of Art &amp; Visual Culture</td>
<td>Areas offered are art metals, ceramics, drawing and painting, graphic design, history of art and visual culture, illustration, photography, printmaking and sculpture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA Visual Art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc. Degree Pre Architecture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>MFA Visual Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA Art Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>Ugrad</td>
<td>BA Art</td>
<td>The studio areas offered for concentration are drawing, painting, printmaking, papermaking, sculpture, weaving, ceramics and jewelry/metalts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>BFA Art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Associate of Arts Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MFA Art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td>Ugrad</td>
<td>Bachelor of Interior Design, Bachelor of Science, Architecture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor of Science, Architecture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Fine Arts, Bachelor of Science in Art Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor of Science Landscape Architecture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Virtual Technology and Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>Master of Architecture, Master of Science in Architecture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Fine Arts, Master of Arts in Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Landscape Architecture</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). Topic: Centrality to Land Grant Mission and SBOE Directives:

Centrality to Land Grant Mission and SBOE Directives:

- Enacted in 1862, the Morrill Act created a process for every state to establish a college dedicated to the agricultural and mechanical arts. Later Legislation (the Morrill Act of 1890) expanded the disciplines that universities could address in their programming and curricula as land grant institutions.
- In reply to the Morrill Act and the establishment of the University of Idaho as a land grant University, the Idaho State Board of Education (ISBOE) has provided policy that directs the University of Idaho to formulate its academic plan and generate programs with primary emphasis on agriculture, natural resources, and metallurgy, engineering, architecture, law,
foreign languages, teacher preparation and international programs related to the foregoing.

University of Idaho Strategic Action Plan

- The Vision, Values and Directions portion of the University of Idaho Strategic Action Plan 2005 – 2010 speaks directly to our mission in the State of Idaho. “Through collaboration across strong academic disciplines, and through the creation of public, private and community partnerships, we will undertake bold initiatives to promote science, technology and their applications..

- Our reconfiguration directly addresses the University of Idaho Strategic Action Plan, Scholarly and Creative Activity Goal, under Objective A: “Establish administrative structures, policies, procedures and incentives for faculty, departments, centers/institutes and colleges to participate in interdisciplinary programs.” This initial decision will begin a process that will support a transition that integrates our individually strong professional programs.

College of Art & Architecture Strategic Plan:

- We teach the integrated concepts of art, design and technology with a focus on cultural and environmental stewardship.

- Unleash the power of design and creativity in every aspect of our teaching, research, service and administration, boldly using the tools of our professions to overtly impact how we teach, learn and operate as a College.

- The University Of Idaho, College of Art & Architecture is the school of choice for transdisciplinary, community influenced education. We teach the integrated concepts of art, design and technology with a focus on cultural and environmental stewardship. We effectively prepare students for successful careers and service in our allied fields, and beyond.

- Assume a leadership role in the implementation of the University’s Strategic Plan and Strategic Initiatives, seeking out opportunities and funding for interdisciplinary collaboration, expanding classes, which attract students from other colleges, and making classes provided by other colleges an integral part of our students’ learning.

- Proactively assess the current and forecasted needs of the professional markets to ensure that our programs are providing students with the required knowledge and skills to maintain a competitive advantage in their desired fields.

Re-establishment of the College of Art & Architecture by SBOE, October, 2005

- In the document: Overview of the Process to Reestablish the College (Instruction, Research, and Student Affairs, April 20-21, 2006 SBOE), the group charged with re-establishment of the College recommended that the issue at hand for the CAA “was to impart a sense of an integrated and collaborative college umbrella of offerings that brought the college programs into a cohesive whole and reached out to the university community with some suggested ideas.”

- The intention of the re-establishment was to close the discussion on past decisions and enter into an era of new beginnings and renewal and establish the groundwork for distinctive top-tier programs that are well positioned to serve the needs of the 21st Century in teaching and learning, scholarly creativity and engagement through outreach.

- The board also stated that the professional fee will be increased to accommodate the increased costs, and to provide equity among students in the college. The board stated, “All on-going costs for restoring the college administration will come from existing resources within Art and Architecture base budgets, existing carryover and reserve funds in Art and Architecture, and from additional professional fees. The professional fee will be increased to accommodate the increased costs.”
6. Is the proposed program in the 8-year Plan? Indicate below.

N/A: Organization structural change, not programmatic

Yes _____  No _____

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

N/A: Organization structural change, not programmatic.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Fiscal Impact</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</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>.5 FTE (includes Fringe) (Unit/Dept Head)¹</td>
<td>55,200</td>
<td>56,900</td>
<td>58,600</td>
<td>170,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Operating²</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>20,000</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>65,200</td>
<td>61,900</td>
<td>63,600</td>
<td>190,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **B. Source of Funds**  |         |         |         |       |
| 1. Appropriated-        |         |         |         |       |
| reallocation            |         |         |         |       |
| 2. Appropriated – New   |         |         |         |       |
| 3. Federal              |         |         |         |       |
| 4. Other:               |         |         |         |       |
| **Student Professional** |         |         |         |       |
| Fees³                   | 127,700 | 183,300 | 230,300 | 541,300 |
| **TOTAL:**              |         |         |         |       |

| **B. Nature of Funds**  |         |         |         |       |
| 1. Recurring *          | 127,700 | 183,300 | 230,300 | 541,300 |
| 2. Non-recurring **     |         |         |         |       |
| **TOTAL: (NET)**        | 62,500  | 121,400 | 166,700 | 350,600 |
* 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.

Footnotes:
1. Savings will be appreciated when current department chairs positions are transformed into Program Coordinators. Once responsibilities are described we will have a clearer definition of amount. Savings not shown, but exists; unknown at this time.

2. Operational Expense categories such as non-capital expenses for technology and office expenses.

3. Student Professional fee revenue is dependent upon extending the fee to all students in the College. For budget consistency, a constant enrollment is considered. (At present students in the Department of Art & Design do not pay the professional fees.)

A formal request for an all inclusive Professional Fee in the College to SBOE is currently in process. The following is a condensed rationale quoted from that request:
- Provides phased in equity for all students in the College of Art & Architecture;
- Provides funding for the higher cost of education provided through the studio model; and
- Recognizes the professional nature of our programs and professional accreditation
College of Art and Architecture
Notes accompanying NOI for university committee use
Mark Hoversten, Dean
March 8, 2010

Scope of reconfiguration:
• Integrates the administrative structure into one unit
• Degrees, curricula, programmatic offerings remain the same

Rational for the reconfiguration:

“We teach the integrated concepts of art, design and technology with a focus on cultural and environmental stewardship.”
CAA Vision Statement 2006

“Unleash the power of design and creativity in every aspect of our teaching, research, service and administration, boldly using the tools of our professions to overtly impact how we teach, learn and operate as a College.”
CAA Strategy #1 2006

• Reactivation of the college in 2005 was based on the premise of integrated design in a common studio culture. The CAA Strategic Plan - Create, Collaborate, Lead - articulated these concepts in a bold series of vision statements and strategies. The proposed reorganization of the College reflects a continuing commitment to that vision of an integrated college of art and design in which each discipline contributes to and reinforces the educational goals of the other disciplines.
• An integrated college will prepare our students to enter professional environments that are increasing integrated from the inception of every project and, in many cases, even before the project has been defined. It will give them a competitive edge in this marketplace and position them to be leaders in rapidly changing art and design professions.
• By removing departmental silos, the reconfiguration responds to our aspirational goals to create visionary work, attempt to bridge scales, focus on primary values and concerns about people, environment and sustainability, and engage new paradigms to address synergies for cutting edge research, outreach, and instruction, and culture/climate.
• Reconfiguration also puts the college in a stronger position to extend professional fees to all students in the college as was the original intention when the college was re-activated in 2005. The potential revenue that will be phased in over three years will equal $230,000 per year at the time of full phase-in.
• Reduced state funding requires us to establish larger academic units, develop more efficient management structures, and find new revenue streams.
March, 2010

Process:

- December 16, 2008
  - Review of budget holdbacks, reallocations, and college deficit.
  - Decision to hold “chairs + one” meetings to identify potential budget cut options, identify new sources of revenue, and consider different models of delivering the CAA education.

- February 27, 2009: Faculty and staff were involved in workshops that resulted in goals for the reconfiguration of the College. Chief among them was the need to retain existing faculty numbers to continue to teach classes. Other issues discussed included:
  - Engaging in a cooperative effort to solve the budget crises while maintaining the core of the college, our mission and vision.
  - Concerns and desires were expressed and specific courses of action were tested.

- These workshops continued on March 11 and 12, 2009. Items discussed were:
  - Strengthening overall College offerings with the help of positions from Architecture Program (ongoing)
  - Streamlining Foundations (ongoing)
  - Creating a Professional Degree in Landscape Architecture (complete)
  - Cap Salaries for TA’s (complete)

- Between workshops, chairs tested options that might be brought forward to the faculty as possible solutions. This list included:
  - a) Horizontal cuts
  - b) Eliminate junior faculty
  - c) Eliminate a program
  - d) Merge programs
  - e) Reorganize structure; change departmental structure; hire to respond to new requirements
  - f) Merge colleges
  - g) Furloughs

- August 18 and 19, 2009: Department chairs presented six options including a list of advantages and disadvantages of each for faculty consideration.
  - Faculty reiterated the need to retain all faculty positions.
  - Faculty asked for a method to prioritize options to:
    - Address the financial gap and propel the college to address a radically changing world,
    - Support the core vision and missions of the University and College of Art & Architecture,
    - Apply decisions to meet time frames requirements.
• September 25, 2009: The six options plus five more that were brought forward by faculty members were tested and prioritized in a joint workshop of faculty and Advisory Council members. The top three options were:
  • Two departments:
    • Architecture and Interior Design - Art and Design, Landscape Architecture, Virtual Technology and Design
  • One unit/eliminate traditional departments
  • Three departments:
    • Architecture and Interior Design – Virtual Technology and Design and Art and Design – Landscape Architecture and Bioregional Planning (bioregional planning is not part of the college so this option was not viable)

• September – November, 2009: Department chairs worked to further test preferred options with their departments. They ultimately recommended a one unit structure.

• Student meetings were held on February 11, March 25, April 1, August 23, and October 30, 2009. They resumed on January 20, February 3, and March 3, 2010. These meetings were held to keep students informed of the process and gather input regarding their concerns and desires as well as respond to rumors they might have heard.

• December 17, 2009: A College workshop identified faculty and staff concerns – primarily relating to faculty governance and accreditation.
  • In response to the December workshop, a Blackboard website was established to encourage informal communication. Faculty members were asked to submit additional options or to suggest resolutions to the concerns.
  • Several ideas for maintaining faculty governance within a one unit option were placed on the Blackboard site.
  • No new options were submitted.

• January, 2010: Four 1 ½ hour dialogue sessions were held to allow smaller groups to discuss options. A straw poll indicated that 80% of faculty and staff supported the one-unit option.
  • Two additional options were brought forward from the list considered on September 25. One of these was not from the top three prioritized at that time, but was considered anyway.
  • An in-depth dialogue identified strengths and weaknesses of all options.

• January 25 – 27: Straw poll of all faculty and staff.
  • The straw poll was conducted using an anonymous, written ballot. Ballots were counted by two staff people (not faculty members or administrators) in the room and ballots are currently stored in a steel cabinet. It was called a straw poll because staff members were included. Staff members were included because a) reconfiguration involves them on a daily basis and their input was needed, and b) there are no direct curricula, programmatic, or degree changes involved in this reconfiguration decision.
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- 80% (28 of 35) of respondents supported the reconfiguration. Two people did not submit ballots.

- February, 2010:
  - Four 1 ½ hour faculty dialogue meetings were held to craft this NOI.

- March 4, 2010:
  - College by-laws committee approved the NOI and submitted it to the dean.
  - The dean submitted the NOI to the provost.

Financial Considerations:

- Cost savings are not the primary purpose of reconfiguring the college. However, in general, the financial considerations related to the NOI and reconfiguration is important.

- Whether or not the college reconfiguration takes place, starting July 1, 2010, chairs will be assigned 9 month contracts. This will result in approximately $27,000 savings, part of which will be used to hire chairs for part of the summer to assure continuity in advising and course offerings.

- This reconfiguration strongly positions the college to realize its request, first made in 2005 at the SBOE meeting that re-activated the college, to extend professional fees to all students in the college. At this time Art and Design students don’t pay professional fees and, therefore, don’t fully participate in the expenses of the college as other students do. A new request is being submitted to the SBOE separately at this time. It would a) provide equity among students in the college to pay for the high cost of studio-based education, b) generate needed additional revenue, and c) meet the state requirements.

- These professional fees would be phased in over three years and would ultimately generate approximately $230,000 per year. Professional fees can be covered by student financial aid. They also can be used in a greater variety of ways than lab and Course fees.

- Finally, reconfiguration will streamline certain financial management processes by reducing the number of duplicated accounts in the college. Over summer, 2010, the budgets will be reviewed to determine the extent to which this is possible. Not all duplicated accounts can be consolidated because of accreditation and the need to maintain identity in some cases.

Curricular, degree, and program Changes:

- There are no curricular, degree changes, or program changes identified in this NOI. However, we hope the integrated structure results in ongoing curricular improvements following faculty deliberations and decisions. We see this proposed structure as an opportunity to afford that cooperation and collaboration.
For example, there have been discussions about an integrative core for the college having a foundation, vertical, and capstone courses identified and integrated into the curricula. We also see this structure encouraging an integrative lecture series, coordinated studio project reviews that take better advantage of the unique mix of disciplines in the college (few universities house this mix of disciplines in one college), and topical field trips. These approaches reduce redundancies and create more compelling types of courses that look at nestling scales and scopes and emphasize interconnected, rather than fragmented areas of expertise.

The integrated college reinforces the vision of the Idaho Urban Research Design Center (IURDC) in Boise where we focus on urban design issues that are, by nature, interdisciplinary and integrated. The reconfigured structure makes it easier to deliver a range of courses integrating all disciplines in the college.

Decision Points:

- Spring, 2010: NOI approval through college and university faculty governance and SBOE. Professional fee application through SBOE approval. Continue to work with and listen to students throughout process. Contact accreditation and licensing boards, alumni, advisory council.

- Summer, 2010: Review of budgets. Continue communication to constituents groups.

- Fall, 2010: Review by-laws including faculty governance, committee structure, definition of chair/coordinator positions, position descriptions, performance evaluations, tenure and promotion processes and criteria, etc. Determine phase-in schedule in greater detail.

- 2010/2011 academic year: use existing by-laws and function similar to existing until revised by-laws are approved and phase-in can begin. Begin examination of integrated curricula. Integrate lecture series and end of semester student reviews.

- Detailed integration schedule to be determined in fall, 2010.

Unfinished Business:

- The NOI is written so that faculty governance processes will continue after NOI approval. The college anticipates a gradual implementation with the initial year (next academic year) operating in a very similar fashion to the current structure. During that year, details about leadership titles and distribution of responsibilities will be defined and implemented as the faculty governance process proceeds.
There is a need to refine the titles and tasks of leadership and develop routing paths for faculty governance in accordance with the FSH and revised college by-laws. These details have not been included in the NOI because it was thought they would distract the SBOE from the main focus of reconfiguration and because it was thought faculty governance issues are better addressed within the university rather than at the SBOE.

For example, it has been suggested to ‘promote’ chairs so that tasks such as enrollment management, coordination of college committees, assessment and other tasks normally assigned to associate deans might be distributed among the ‘coordinator’ positions (or whatever title eventually emerges).

Another suggestion that shows up in the NOI budget: buy-out part of an existing chair position’s time so that tasks of implementing the NOI and certain other tasks not yet defined in the ‘coordinator’ position can be accomplished during the next year as faculty governance and structure are further refined. It will be essential to coordinate the titles and duties of college leadership with the FSH.

Although these issues are still in the suggestion stage, they indicate the level of dialogue within the college. The college has found effective ways to engage all members in governance including a mixture of facilitated workshops, blackboard discussion sites, dialogue meetings, votes/straw polls, and deliberations of appropriate college committees.