University of Idaho
2009-2010
FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #25

3:30 p.m.
Tuesday, March 30, 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
    • Minutes of the 2009-10 Faculty Senate Meeting #24, March 23, 2010

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.

VI. Committee Reports.

   UCC:
   • FS-10-021rev: UCC-10-005v2 – Proposed Changes to Regulation M
   • FS-10-041: NOI: HPERD – Title Change – MS in Recreation to MS in Movement and Leisure Sciences (Browder)

VII. Special Orders.
    • Parking Fee Changes

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Jack Miller, Chair 2009-2010, Faculty Senate

Attachments:
FS 2009-10 Minutes #24
FS-10-021rev
FS-10-041

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
University of Idaho  
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
2009-10 Meeting #24  
Tuesday March 23, 2010


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

Minutes: Due to there being some points of clarification requiring input from absent senators, it was moved to postpone approval of the minutes until meeting #25 (Marshall /Fritz). Approved.

Chair’s Report: As the Chair was traveling, the Vice-Chair, Professor Eveleth chaired the meeting. He noted, following up on the Dual Careers policy proposal approved at meeting #23, that there was ongoing dialog between faculty leadership and staff affairs leadership to better understand the concerns that staff may have about the policy proposal. This discussion would inform the process leading up to discussion of the policy at the next General Faculty Meeting. In addition, Faculty Affairs and Staff Affairs Committees were working on the dependent benefits/student fees policy that would be coming to senate later in the semester. He reminded senators that the process of election of new senators needs to be in full-swing as elections must be completed by April 15. Senators within colleges should coordinate the election processes. The University Budget and Finance Committee (UBFC) a faculty senate appointed committee, needed a new member 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. An issue for the future may be discussion of the role of UBFC interfacing with the University Budget Advisory Committee (UBAC). The UBFC may also be charged with working on development of policy language consistent with the new furlough policy implemented by the SBOE.

Provost’s Report: The Provost clarified that the UBAC had been disbanded. However, it would be a useful exercise for the UBFC to interface with the newly appointed Executive Director of Planning and Budget, Keith Ickes to explore activities in the up-coming year. The required policy on furlough would be drafted by General Counsel, Kent Nelson. The Provost noted that today’s power outage, was due to a problem outside of the university. Power had been restored, but there were some on-going issues including some lag in the steam plant coming back to full production and a back-log in the university e-mail system that was expected to clear by late this evening. He referred to an emergency text system that could be routed to cell-phones. He will bring information to senate that will allow senators to sign-up for the emergency text service. It will be a useful emergency response measure to have senators enrolled on this service.

Turning to the budget, the Provost noted that it was now confirmed that the 6% and 1.5% state holdbacks in FY10 would become permanent in FY11. This together with a significant reduction of the federal stimulus funds would effectively mean that the university would be facing a 12-13% budget reduction for FY11. How we deal with this issue will largely depend upon revenues. Increased enrollment and proposed fee increases would interface with the state rescission. Presently, enrollment applications are up 4% and the indicated student attendance at Vandal Friday this week showed an increase of 400 compared to last year. Vandal Friday is a great event. The Provost had been visiting
other schools in the previous few weeks. His visits reinforced that UI is being very effective in outreach to prospective students and their parents. Vandal Friday is a great example of the passion that the university exhibits for its quality programs and quality advising of students. Vandal Friday will also have some more organized back-up sessions for students who miss the main event. Three additional organized student visiting days were scheduled and these could be referenced on the university website at www.uidaho.edu.

The Provost went on to address the furlough process. Many people had submitted requested furlough days. He invited General Counsel, Kent Nelson to comment on the furlough appeals process. Mr. Nelson noted that 13 appeals had been received in the appeal window. The Furlough Appeals Hearing Committee would meet this Friday and soon after notices would be sent out to the appellants. Some of the appeals were more in the vein of questions requiring clarification. He noted that the committee would consider the appeals and make recommendations to the President who would make the final decisions.

Questions: A faculty member in an extension role had noted that faculty who had 100% extension appointments (McIntire-Stennis funds) would not be facing any furlough, whereas faculty at the same office who were for example, 80% extension, 20% teaching were facing the full furlough allocation. The request was to consider how a proportionate furlough allocation might be implemented as an alternative to the present policy. Mr. Nelson indicated that the furlough allocations were tied to faculty contracts. The Provost encouraged the senator to have his colleague contact furlough@uidaho.edu so that his/her specific case could be addressed directly on the FAQ page. The Provost added that he would follow up with the Executive Director of Planning and Budget about the more general question of this type of case

**FS-10-039-rev - FSH 5200 Human Participant Research:** The Vice-Chair noted that a variation had been suggested on the previously proposed language to include consideration of studies in which qualitative research was conducted. It was proposed to change the present language under B-1. 1. A to:

> 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.

Following a brief discussion, it was moved (Guilfoyle/Marshall) to adopt the revision as noted. Approved unanimously.

**FS-10-023, 023b – FSH 3320 and FSH 1420:** These items were now for consideration following the opportunity for senators to reflect with their constituencies since meeting #23. The Vice-Chair invited the Chair of Faculty Affairs Committee, Professor Locke to speak to the proposed policy changes.
Professor Locke noted that the changes were mostly in the context of information presentation. There were no changes in procedures with the exception of changes to sections pertaining to review of administrators. There had been some feedback to the FAC that during previous administrator review processes, confidentiality of faculty comments had not been honored. Thus, FAC proposed to emphasize the confidentiality language. The Vice-Chair added that in addition to the proposal before the senate he suggested the following minor change in the first sentence of the second paragraph of D-4 c.:

The faculty of the unit may also initiate, by majority vote, a formal review (as outlined above) of the unit administrator.

And in the second sentence of the second paragraph of D-4 c.:

The tenured faculty of a college may also initiate, by majority vote, a formal review (as outlined above) of the college dean.

It was moved (Eveleth/Battaglia) to adopt the amendment. Approved, unanimously. There being no further discussion, the question of the main motion was called. Approved, unanimously.

**FS-10-040 - NOI - Art and Architecture reconfiguration:** The Vice-Chair asked senator Battaglia, Chair of UCC to comment upon the discussion of the NOI at the committee’s recent meeting. Professor Battaglia noted that the full UCC membership was present and following a comprehensive discussion, the NOI had been approved with one opposed.

The Vice-Chair requested comments from senate. It was noted that the eight page fact sheet that had been provided by Dean Hoversten was very helpful in understanding the process. This was a good model for future similar restructuring proposals.

Dean Hoversten was invited to join to answer questions from the senate.

_How do the changes affect Art students who are not currently charged professional fees?_  
In all of the other degree programs in the college, students are charged professional fees. With changing demands of the profession in training students, greater interdisciplinary training is required. The advantage of charging professional fees is that these can be leveraged against the student loan scheme whereas other studio and usage fees cannot. This also brings a non-discriminating charge to all students in the college.

_There do not appear to be any cost-savings in the new structure. Is the rationale to encourage closer working relationships of the faculty?_  
There are five major drivers underlying the changes, as outlined in the fact sheet. Three core drivers are:

1) The changes will position graduates such that they will have a competitive edge in a rapidly changing field and job market.  
2) The changes foster a culture having greater flexibility in scheduling teaching and encouraging cross-listing of courses.  
3) The structure breaks down silos while retaining disciplinary integrity.

_A concern is that the changes have really only been implemented to increase the probability that the SBOE will approve the broader introduction of the professional fees rather than satisfying any academic or curricular needs. Further, the Department of Architecture and Interior Design was unanimously opposed to the changes in December, 2009, prior to the college straw poll outlined in the fact sheet._ The
Department of Architecture and Interior Design, has strong faculty numbers in excess of the Provost’s efficiency policy requirements, but had lost positions relative to other departments recently. A further concern was that the Department of Architecture and Interior Design would suffer erosion of quality under the restructure.

Dean Hoversten replied that the positions lost in the department occurred due to retirements in a period of a hiring freeze. Non-replacement of those faculty members was beyond the control of the college. He was committed to maintaining quality across the college. The architecture discipline would remain strong and the changes would strengthen architecture and the other programs within the college.

It was suggested that multidisciplinary research could be accomplished without the restructure and structural change was not essential to facilitate faculty interaction and collaboration.

Dean Hoversten agreed that a restructure was not essential but evidence was that there were presently significant cultural barriers to multidisciplinary research and a new approach was needed to break down cultural barriers to such activities.

What is the student response to the proposed changes?
Dean Hoversten meets every two weeks with student leadership. There had been no negative feedback from students, however, student response rate was typically low.

What is the quality of the interactions with students? Are students too intimidated to reflect with the Dean?
Meetings with student leadership and larger student groups are typically encouraged by providing food. Pizza is offered for the interaction meetings. There were many informal interactions during the meetings. The dean noted that he personally felt the quality of the interactions was good but the student perspective should be sought to accurately reflect their own perceptions.

In support of the proposed integration, it was suggested that through the process of implementation, a conscious effort to operationally integrate the college should be on-going.

The issue of the approach to polling the faculty and staff on the proposed changes was discussed at length. One view was that an individual faculty poll might convey a different sentiment from the anonymous straw poll noted in the fact sheet.

The dean responded that across the college, 80% of faculty and staff had indicated support for the changes. His view was that the anonymous straw poll was a more reliable indicator of individual (and collective) views than votes such as the open departmental vote.

There was further discussion of the benefits of having strong departments. The dean’s perspective was that having strong degree programs should be the primary focus and these should be supported by strong faculty. The discussion centered on the philosophically different views about the importance of a focus on strong departments versus strong degree programs. The dean noted that the profession was changing rapidly and strong interdisciplinary programs would be essential to providing students with a competitive edge. He continued, noting that the degrees offered by the college need to retain accreditation status and continue to be strong. The Provost added that the college advisory board was in favor of the change, taking a greater systems perspective and committing to programs that better prepare students for the profession.
How would the tenure and promotion process be implemented under the new structure? Dean Hoversten noted that NOIs typically contain relatively little depth of detail. However, the college had worked thoroughly through shared governance issues. These processes were the most detailed of any section of the NOI. The tenure and promotion processes had received extensive discussion and this was detailed in the fact sheet. There was additional work to do to effectively implement these processes under the proposed new structure.

Faculty in multiple disciplines are concerned about the creation of an additional administrative position given budgetary constraints and lost faculty positions.

There was additional discussion about whether the changes would weaken the department of Architecture. The dean noted that more than half of the faculty members had voted in favor of the changes in the straw poll and 80% of college faculty and staff were in favor.

The Provost added that it was troubling that this body was extensively re-trying a process that had been thoroughly and extensively discussed within the college. He commended the college for doing excellent work in considering difficult issues requiring change.

It was noted that such changes are always difficult for many of us. However, there were many possible ways to think about the proposed changes. It may be that there is a completely different model that will be discovered by faculty as they worked within a new paradigm. It is not so much the administrative structure that determines the interactions and the success of the faculty and the programs, but the ways in which the faculty approach successfully working together that may be the most important element.

A student perspective was that many of his best learning experiences had come as part of activities that had occurred across organizational units. The reorganization was a positive in fostering integrated learning projects.

Dean Hoversten noted that the proposed changes had been discussed at length through a process conducted over several years. The Provost added that the Architecture Department had recently been through an external accreditation process. The external review team was also supportive of the proposed restructure.

There being no further discussion, the question was called. Approved, 12 in favor, 2 abstentions, 0 opposed.

Adjournment: It was moved (Eveleth / Fritz) to adjourn at 4:43 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Rodney A. Hill, Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Senate
TO: University Curriculum Committee
FROM: Associate Deans Group
RE: Proposed Change Regulation M [Effective: Summer 2010]
DATE: May 19, 2009 Updated 2/22/10

M – Attendance, Repeated Absences, Field Trips, and Official Student Travel

M-1. Attendance. Instructors will make clear at the beginning of each course the extent to which grades are dependent on attendance and in-class participation. Students are responsible for class attendance. Instructors are accountable for communicating with the instructor and making up missed work in the event of any absence. Instructors shall provide reasonable opportunity for students to make up work when the student’s absence from class resulted from: (a) participation in official university activities and programs, (b) personal illness, (c) family illness and care, or (d) other compelling circumstances. Students are responsible for class attendance; in all cases of absence, students are accountable for the work missed. In the case of officially approved absence and on the request of the student, the instructor is obligated to provide an opportunity for the student to make up for missed work. In general, an absence is considered "official" when the student is: (a) participating in an approved field trip or other official UI activity (e.g., athletics, debate, music, or theatre arts); (b) confined under doctor’s orders; (c) called to active military duty during emergency situations; or (d) granted a leave of absence from UI for reasonable cause by his or her academic dean.

M-2. Repeated Absences. In courses where a substantial amount of the content can be mastered only or primarily through class participation, regular and punctual attendance is essential and may, therefore, be reflected in grading. Instructors will make clear at the beginning of each course the extent to which grades are dependent on attendance. Instructors may report to the registrar students who are repeatedly absent from classes (a form is available from departmental and college officials). Absences may be considered excessive when their number equals or exceeds the number of credits in a particular course.

M-22. Field Trips and Official Student Travel. "Field trip" is defined as any required, course-related student travel that exceeds 25 air miles from the campus or conflicts with other classes that the students involved are taking. (A trip taken within 25 air miles during the class scheduled for the particular class or at a time that does not conflict with other classes the students involved are taking is a "local trip," not a "field trip.")

M-32-a. Missed Class Work. Students participating in field trips, as defined above, or other official UI activities are responsible for conferring in advance with the instructors of any classes that will be missed in order to be eligible for making up missed class work. (See M-1.)

M-32-b. Approval of Course-Related Field Trips. Administrative approval for course-related field trips will be obtained by the person in charge of the trip as follows:

1) Each field trip as identified in the catalog course description requires prior approval by the department in accordance with divisional procedures (application for approval should be made at least one week before the expected departure).
2) Each field trip NOT identified in the catalog course description requires prior approval by the departmental administrator, and the dean of the college (application for approval should be made at least two weeks before the expected departure).

M-32-c. Approval of Other Official Student Travel. Administrative approval for official student travel that is NOT course related is obtained from the vice president for student affairs (application for approval should be made at least two weeks before the expected departure).

M-32-d. Costs. When a college can cover all or part of the cost of a course-related field trip from allocated funds, the college should do so. If the college cannot cover the cost, or a portion thereof, the cost (or remaining portion) must be borne in proportionate share by the students in the course. Students missing required field trips identified in the catalog course description must pay their proportionate shares.

M-32-e. Field-Trip Completion Deadline. All field trips and other UI-approved student travel must be completed before 7:30 a.m. on the fifth day of classes before the start of final examinations. Part3 Pg. 4 of 6

M-32-f. Unofficial Student Travel. UI student accident insurance does not cover injuries sustained in the course of travel unless the travel has been officially authorized by the appropriate UI agent.

M-32-gf. Vehicle Information. Information concerning privately owned vehicles (registration, insurance, driver’s license, etc.) to be used for field trips or other official student travel must be filed in the Risk Management Office (Rm. 209, Admin. Bldg.). Administrators of departments and divisions are responsible for ensuring that the required information is filed before the initial use of each privately owned vehicle in a given academic year.

M-43. Accommodation of Religious Observances in the Administration of Examinations. When tests or examinations fall on days objectionable to a student because of religious beliefs, the student should contact the instructor as soon as possible. The instructor may require the student to submit a concise, written statement of the reasons for the request. If the request appears to be made in good faith, the instructor should make alternative arrangements for the administration of the examination or test. If the instructor believes the request not to be in good faith, or if the instructor and the student are unable to agree on...
arrangements, the student or the instructor should seek the assistance of the departmental administrator, dean, or provost, in that order.

**M-5. Drop for Non-attendance.** Students are responsible for notifying their instructors through the Registrar when extenuating circumstances not covered as an officially approved absence as defined in M-1 prevent their attendance during the first week of the semester. Instructors may notify the Registrar to drop students who have not attended class or laboratory meetings nor notified the instructor through the Registrar by the end of the sixth business day following the start of the class. Valid reasons for missing classes do not relieve the student of making up the work missed.

Rationale for proposed changes:

M-1 and M-2: The integration of the current M1, Attendance and M2, Repeated Absences into one section combines the expectations about attendance in one section of the regulation and reduces perceived confusion and possible inconsistencies. The addition of the fifth reason for official absence comes as a resolution from GPSA for consideration and recognizes the responsibilities of students with families who must stay home to care for family members who are ill and cannot be cared for in another setting.

M-3-f: The university does not authorize or carry insurance for unofficial student travel.

M-5: A minor change in wording is recommended to increase understanding of the regulation and process for dropping students who do not attend the first week of the semester.
IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
ACADEMIC/PROFESSIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION
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SBOE/OSBE Approval Date
Before completing this form, refer to Board Policy Section III.G. Program Approval and Discontinuance.

1. Briefly describe the nature of the request e.g., is this a new program (degree, program, or certificate) or program component (e.g., new, discontinued, modified, addition to an existing program or option).

   The purpose of this NOI is to re-name the existing Master of Science in Recreation to Master of Science in Movement and Leisure Sciences to reflect the departmental focus on individual- and community-level active, healthy lifestyles.

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).

   Given the evolution of the current departmental strategic focus and direction that emphasizes the development of leaders to promote individual- and community-level active, healthy lifestyles, we recognize the importance of an interdisciplinary approach that integrates the study of children and adults, as well as schools and communities. This interdisciplinary approach requires students with expertise in Recreation, Physical Education Pedagogy, and Exercise Science. These changes will enhance the expansion of an already successful degree program.

   Specifically, the change in the degree name from Recreation to Movement and Leisure Science reflects this broader focus on a wide range of physical activity experiences (sport, dance, outdoor recreation, and exercise) for the promotion of individual and community health. The use of the term “leisure” as a synonym for recreation is fairly common in the field. Currently, 27 of the 88 programs accredited by the National Recreation & Parks Association use the term “leisure” in their program and/or department name.

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

   No change. There are no accrediting bodies relevant to this degree.

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.

   There is no duplication.

Enrollment and Graduates (i.e., number of majors or other relevant data)
By Institution for the Proposed Program
Last three years beginning with the current year and the 2 previous years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Relevant Enrollment Data</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Previous Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution and Degree name</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Specializations within the discipline (to reflect a national perspective)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSU - Master of Science in Exercise and Sports Studies (MSESS)</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSU - Master of Kinesiology (MK)</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSU - Master of Physical Education in Athletic Administration (joint degree with ISU)</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSU - Master of Arts in Education, Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>Master’s</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).

*We anticipate that the degree will complement three of the areas of focus advocated by President Nellis, specifically to offer a program that is more engaged with an enhanced learning environment, and promotes sustainability and interdisciplinary scholarship.*

6. Is the proposed program in the 8-year Plan? Indicate below.
Yes ____  No  X ____

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

*This is not a new program, simply modification of an existing one.*

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Fiscal Impact</th>
<th>FY __________</th>
<th>FY __________</th>
<th>FY __________</th>
<th>Total __________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Operating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Capital Outlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

* Recurring is defined as ongoing operating budget for the program, which will become of the base.
** Non-recurring is defined as one-time funding in a fiscal year and not part of the base.