University of Idaho
2009-2010
FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #9

Tuesday, October 20, 2009, 3:30 p.m.
BRINK HALL FACULTY LOUNGE

Order of Business

Consent Agenda:
  • Boise Center Delegates

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
  • Minutes of the 2009-10 Faculty Senate Meeting #8, October 13, 2009

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.
  • Benefits discussion follow-up motion (Dan Eveleth)
  • Budget Report (Lloyd Mues)

VI. Committee Reports.

    UCC:
    FS-10-007: NOI: College of Engineering & Education - Transfer Industrial Technology

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.
  • Efficiency Cost Reduction Policy Memo
    1. Senate proposed recommendations concerning Y account management
    2. Department consolidation & department chair issues
    3. Travel freeze
    4. Open/vacant/staff lines

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Jack Miller, Chair 2009-2010, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2009-2010 FS Meeting #8, October 13, 2009
Boise Delegates
Benefits Motion
FS-10-007
University of Idaho
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
2009-10 Meeting #8
Tuesday October 13, 2009

Present: Baillargeon, Baird, Baker (w/o vote), Barlow, Eveleth, Fritz, Geist, Graden, Guilfoyle, Hill (w/o vote), Huber, Limbaugh, Marshall, Mihelich, Miller (chair), Murphy, Padaghm-Albrecht, Stark, Stearns, Sullivan, Williams, Wilson. Off-Campus Senators: Budwig (Boise), Dakins (Idaho Falls), Fletcher for Newcombe (w/o vote, Coeur d’Alene). Absent: Battaglia, Edwards, Holbrook, Newcombe. Guests: 8

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

Minutes: It was moved (Murphy, Huber) to accept the minutes of meeting #7 of the Faculty Senate. Approved.

Chair’s Report: The Chair introduced the topic of the draconian policy changes, affecting determination of salary reductions, benefits, implementation of furloughs and other measures previously contained in financial exigency policy that was proposed for a first reading at the upcoming SBOE meeting. He noted that he had met with President Nellis who had agreed that the path to these proposed changes deviated from the principles of shared governance. The President had then contacted the Regents and the other Idaho university presidents and the outcome is that the proposed policy change has been removed from the SBOE agenda and the process will be reshaped to include a more consultative approach.

The Chair added that he believed that this would not have happened, if not for the concerted efforts of President Nellis, and that the university community owes the president a vote of thanks and appreciation. He went on to encourage the faculty to attend the inauguration celebrations beginning with a breakfast at 8:00 a.m. this Friday at the North Concourse of the ASUI Kibbie Activities Center.

Is the origin of the proposed SBOE policy changes known? The chair replied that there may have been some original direction from the Idaho university administrations but the work was largely done by the lawyers for the institutions and the SBOE. He was not aware of whether the other institution’s presidents were involved, but once President Nellis saw the language of these rules and understood the process by which they had been developed, he agreed that it was appropriate to withdraw the proposal so an appropriate consultative process could go forward.

The chair then went on to withdraw his proposed motion with respect to the proposed SBOE policy change as it was now moot. However, he noted that the issue was not ‘dead’ and there would likely be a need for the senate to address it in some revised form. He asked if there was any further discussion on the issue. There being none, the meeting moved on to the Provost’s report.

Provost’s Report: The Provost thanked the faculty leadership for their role in bringing the SBOE policy revision to the notice of the executive. He went on to address the university’s response to the state budget rescissions. He noted that the re-budgeting would be achieved through a mix of mechanisms including further cuts to travel, a decision not to fill about 1/3 of the open positions and to draw down reserves. It was important not to draw down reserves too heavily as there would be undesirable effects on the university credit ratings and interest rates on borrowings. A last-line option was to consider furloughs and given the extra work-load being carried by faculty and staff and the efforts of many to increase revenues, this was deemed an inappropriate option.
What was the amount of the reserve drawn down? $3M. This is ‘one time’ funds and we could be facing a permanent reduction.

The Provost went on to point out that the university had invested in enrollment which is paying off. In the previous year graduate enrollment was up 25% and this year there was a further 4% increase. Undergraduate enrollment is up slightly also and these increases bring approximately an additional $1M in revenue. Additional investment in research indicated a response of 40% increase in the number of grants submitted and about 60% increase in the dollar value of submitted grants. Of course, this was also due to the hard work of the faculty and staff.

There had been a day-long retreat for the enrollment management group. The discussions were about enrollment planning and how we do and plan what do we do, where can we grow, where do we have capacity? The day was spent with good progress.

The Governor would be attending the President’s inauguration. There would be a leadership summit. A topic addressed would be the role of higher education in revitalizing the state. This was an occasion that would provide many opportunities for our university to shine.

The Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) mid-term (fifth year) review had just been completed. These reviews are extremely important as we must be in compliance to receive federal funds. The materials for the university response to the review were prepared by senator Jane Baillargeon and Vice-Provost Jeanne Christiansen. The Provost thanked the senator and the Vice-Provost who had worked hard to get the materials assembled for the review. The NWCCU reviewers had also met with the faculty leadership and others across the community. The Provost had conducted an exit interview with the reviewers. Their recommendations are not public until January; however, indications are that the review would have a very positive outcome and the reviewers were impressed with all we have done, in spite of the many challenges facing the university.

The Chair then introduced members of the Benefits Advisory Group (BAG), the controller, Jana Stotler and Professors Mark McGuire and Holly Wichman. He noted that the BAG representatives were invited to provide the senate with a sense of the appropriateness of all changes that occurred with the new benefits package and also the broader question how it is doing from a financial perspective.

Ms. Stotler began by addressing the list of questions that had been sent from the community and senators over the recent few weeks (list attached to these minutes). Her role is ex officio and she administers the finances of the benefits program. John Keats, one of the trustees was also in attendance. The trustees have no input into the plan design, determining premiums or actuarial valuations. The trustees are responsible for paying the bills and overseeing prudent investment of the funds.

What were the contributions to the benefit plan for FY 09? A Employees ~$2.4M, B Retirees ~ $1.9M, c University ~ $20.5M.

Was all of the university contributions transferred to the health benefits trust? No. $7,145 of the total per employee amount of $8,440 was transferred to the trust and $1,295 remains in a separate benefits fund on the university’s books. Out of this $1,295 the health trust’s expenses are paid out of a bank account held in the US bank and are paid by US bank employees. The only expenses paid out of this account are the following: medical fees and claims, vision fees and claims, dental fees and claims, employee assistance program expenses, Business Psychology Association’s expenses and administrative
expenses of the plan. Expenses paid by the university are: consultants who help administer the plan, life insurance and disability payments, payments to employees for waiving the plan, employer contributions to the HSA, administration fees for the HSA bank, wellness expenses, software and administrative expenses for the company managing the enrollment and reporting for the plan, adoption expenses, legal and miscellaneous expenses and open enrollment and health fairs.

_How much was paid in health claims in FY09? _$17.4M._

_Are each of the plans self-sufficient? _Yes._

_How were the increased funds ($7,700 to $8,600) used in FY09? _The increase was used to fund plan claims and expenses (as above). Any funds left over are held in reserves._

_What are the employee rates based upon? _The university contribution is determined by the state of Idaho. In FY10 the amount contributed by the university was $8,440 per employee. The employees are charged the difference between this amount and the amount calculated by the advising actuary to cover claims, administrative costs and reserves._

Historically-based costs as well as future trends are used to determine the total benefit plan base. ‘Buck Consultants’ are the actuaries and the university finance office reviews the costs and rates. BAG reviews plan costs and designs.

_What were the reserves in the benefit plan at the end of FY09? _The health trust fund had $4.8M. $2.3M of this is required by the state to be held as reserve with $2.5M as additional reserve. The reserves held on the university books were $1.6M total reserve for a total reserve in the benefit plan of $4.1M._

_What is the university’s plan for the reserve? _The university and the BAG decided to be very conservative in plan design until there were at least two year’s history established for plan claims, expenditures and contributions. The BAG has begun planning the design for the calendar year 2011 plan. When the reserve base is known at the end of the calendar year 2009, BAG will begin to decide whether or not the reserve should be held to mitigate employee rate increases, be reduced by granting a one-pay period premium holiday or used to supplement existing or add new benefits to the plan design. It is anticipated that there will be an increase in claims in calendar year 2010 due to the Mental Health Parity Act, in effect January 1, 2010. This law will require that mental health claims are treated in the same way as any other health claim._

_How is the $5.50 university contribution to the wellness program used and how much is collected? _The university collected $260K from the allocation in FY09. Some funds were used to pay the Student Recreation Center to offset increased use of the facility. An additional $52K was used for personnel costs and operating expenditures for the wellness program._

_From a human cost it is important to know how much is being paid for health expenses from employee HSA funds. _It is difficult to know because these funds are held in people’s private accounts. In plan H nobody has exceeded the cap._

_An impression from talking to people who have lower incomes is that they have little choice whether to fund their HSA. If these people need health care they either pay out of pocket or forego the care._
Under the previous system people with higher earnings paid more. Under the new system the subsidy for low earning employees is effectively nonexistent.

BAG was concerned about people’s willingness to get healthcare. The strategy was to promote the annual health check as a preventative measure.

In development of the plan, was consideration given to providing a tiered contribution structure? One of the difficulties was that it was impossible to predict which plans might be chosen. The intent was to give lower income earners some form of cost break. However, with this system only the employee income can be used. Widely divergent family incomes cannot be factored in to an employee-based program.

Another challenge for the community was that all of the steps happened quickly: choice of plan, implementation.

Whether people were foregoing care was discussed at some length. It was noted that even under the previous plan, it was not possible to estimate who may be foregoing health care. There have been anecdotes of the impact of the plan on lower income employees. This has been a cause for concern for BAG. There is a proposal for BAG to review the three present plans to determine whether rates might be adjusted amongst the plans and whether it is possible to give lower income employees more choice.

The migration to Plan C was 68% of employees. This was much higher than predicted by the actuary (who estimated 15-20% would take Plan C).

The advantage to Plan C is that it provides an option for people to use it as a long-term savings plan, as long as they remain in good health. The intent of the health care plan in the package was to incentivize healthy lifestyle and regular health checks to catch potential problem health issues and treat them early, more effectively and with lower cost.

It was noted that national health care costs are rising in the double digit range and everybody is squeezed. But premiums for the UI plan will not go up next year unlike others (example the WSU plan which is seeing substantially increased premiums).

Analysis of UI claims showed only an increase of 8%.

It was pointed out that the HSA component contribution to this amount needed to be included to get a realistic estimate of the real cost to employees.

It was noted that everyone’s goal was to have healthy employees. It would be useful to have some firm data on which to estimate plan success and effectiveness in meeting employee health care insurance needs. It was suggested that there was talent on campus in social sciences survey expertise that could be used to collect meaningful data on use of health services and the general health of the UI community. This idea was supported by others.

How actively utilized is the wellness program? It is difficult to obtain accurate data.

It was suggested that data are collected to review choices in the wellness program and to consider its redesign with greater choice.
Are off-campus employees getting any benefits from the wellness program? Data suggest that the utilization by off-campus employees is greater than for on-campus employees.

Is there any way that employees on lower incomes can get additional help to make the best choices from the plans? The benefits staff at human resources provide a great service. Employees are advised to get advice well in advance of the open enrollment period which is coming up quickly.

When the plan was first rolled out, there was meant to be an open discussion of whether there was to be a tiered premium structure built into each plan based upon income level. This open discussion needs to occur. There was considerable discussion around this point. The consensus was that this open discussion should happen.

There have been considerable costs with the vendor software and a difficulty in identifying a pool of vendors from which to choose. What is the annual cost of the software and vendor support? In the recent year, $245K. This is a complex cafeteria plan. It is not perfect and there have been some problems in working with the vendor. This would be a very difficult proposition to handle ‘in-house’.

What do you see as the advantages of the present plan over the previous one? Employees have more control over their health expenses. It appears that the federal government will continue to encourage increased use of high deductible plans. The big advantage is the incentives for preventative care that maximizes the benefits of early diagnosis improving health generally. It also minimizes costs associated with diseases that become advanced due to late diagnosis.

It was pointed out by example that the preventative care coverage is very minimal and out-of-pocket expenses can be a very large amount under this scheme: Thus, a person may forego knee surgery that is recommended by a physician but not be able to afford the high deductible and the 70/30 split coverage. [Knee surgery that cost a total of $5,000 would then cost the employee $1,150 + $1,155, a total of $2,300 out-of-pocket].

Ms. Stotler asked if there were other major questions to be answered.

The consensus was that the senate would consider the issues raised today that needed further discussion and a list of questions would be forwarded to BAG.

The Chair and the senate thanked the BAG representatives for a thorough discussion.

The Chair noted that in the previous senate meeting, a resolution (Murphy) had been tabled. Given the late hour he expressed his wish to follow correct protocol and call the resolution off the table (Miller/Barlow). Approved.

It was then moved to table the resolution (Huber/Murphy). Approved.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Rodney A. Hill, Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Senate.
Date: October 6, 2009

To: Dr Rod Hill, Secretary of the Faculty

From: Faculty based at the Boise Center (please see faculty list below)

RE: Proposal for Faculty Participation in General Faculty Meetings via electronic link.

Following recent changes to the University of Idaho constitution, the faculty listed below who are based at the Boise Center site, request full participation in General Faculty meetings beginning in AY 09-10. The information required for the process is outlined below.

The following rooms are suitable for faculty participation in General Faculty meetings and are equipped to provide two-way A-V link with the Moscow campus. We request approval of this venue by Faculty Senate as the A-V venues: Rooms 156, 162, 248, 348 or 448 of the Idaho Water Center, 322 E. Front Street, Boise, Idaho.

The following faculty members agree to be nominated as delegate or alternate delegate at this site and serve as members of the University Multi-campus Communications Committee (FSH 1640). We request approval of two of these nominees by Committee on Committees and Faculty Senate. In addition, we understand that delegates at each site have the responsibility for reserving the site facility for meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominee delegate (first preference)</th>
<th>Print Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sherry McKibben</td>
<td>Sherry McKibben</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Gagel</td>
<td>Charles Gagel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominee alternate delegate (first preference)</th>
<th>Print Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Budwig</td>
<td>Ralph Budwig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominee delegate (second preference)</th>
<th>Print Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marty Yopp</td>
<td>Marty Yopp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominee alternate delegate (second preference)</th>
<th>Print Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This proposal is supported by the following faculty:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Phone/e-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sherry McKibben</td>
<td>Sherry McKibben</td>
<td>(208) 364-4540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Gagel</td>
<td>Charles Gagel</td>
<td>(208) 364-9902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee D. Hays</td>
<td>Lee D. Hays</td>
<td>(208) 364-9013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Budwig</td>
<td>Ralph Budwig</td>
<td>(208) 364-4996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marty Yopp</td>
<td>Marty Yopp</td>
<td>(208) 364-9918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell J. Andersen</td>
<td>Russell J. Andersen</td>
<td>(208) 364-4099</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of UI-owned sites
- Aberdeen
- Boise
- Caldwell
- Coeur d'Alene
- Hagerman
- Idaho Falls
- Meridian
- Parma
- Post Falls
- Preston
- Salmon
- Sandpoint
- Twin Falls
Motion Concerning University Health Benefits:

WHEREAS, one of the University’s four strategic goals is to *create and sustain an energized community that is adaptable, dynamic, and vital to enable the University to advance strategically and function efficiently*,

And

Whereas, health benefits play a critical role in the vitality of the University, through their ability to help the university recruit, motivate and retain valuable employees, give employees a sense of security, and encourage preventative and wellness-oriented behaviors,

And

WHEREAS, the University Benefits Advisory Group has insufficient data to make an informed judgment about the extent to which the current health-benefits plans and procedures have the desired impact on employee and retiree behavior and attitudes,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the University of Idaho recommends to the University Benefits Advisory Group that funds be used, as appropriate, from the health trust fund to hire the Social Science Research Unit to regularly survey University employees and retirees about their health-benefit-related behaviors and attitudes.
IDAHO STATE BOARD OF
EDUCATION
ACADEMIC/PROFESSIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION
NOTICE OF INTENT
To initiate a
New, Expanded, Cooperative, Discontinued, program component or Off-Campus Instructional Program or Instructional/Research Unit

Institution Submitting Proposal: University of Idaho
Name of College, School, or Division: College of Education and College of Engineering
Name of Department(s) or Area(s): Dept. of Adult, Career and Technology Education (COEd) & Dean’s office (COEngr)

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

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

The transfer of the Industrial Technology option of the Technology Training and Development degree program in Idaho Falls from the College of Education to the College of Engineering.
See full description on page 2, item 1.

(Degree or Certificate)

Proposed Starting Date: Fall 2010

For New Programs:

For Other Activity:

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

Program Component (major/minor/option/emphasis)
Off-Campus Activity/Resident Center
Instructional/Research Unit
Addition/Expansion
Discontinuance/consolidation
Contract Program
X Other – Transfer degree program

Dean’s signature on file  9/28/09
College Dean (Institution) Date
AVP/CEO Idaho Falls (Institution) Date
Chief Fiscal Officer (Institution) Date
Chief Academic Officer (Institution) Date
President Date

Dean’s signature on file  9/28/09
College Dean (Institution) Date
VP Research & Graduate Studies Date
State Administrator, SDPTE Date
Chief Academic Officer, OSBE Date
SBOE/OSBE Approval Date

Revised 12/10/08
Page 1
Before completing this form, refer to Board Policy Section III.G., Program Approval and Discontinuance.

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

This request is a coordinated request between the College of Education and the College of Engineering. The intent is to transfer the Industrial Technology option in the B.S. Technology degree program from the College of Education to the College of Engineering. Industrial Technology is currently a program option under the Technology Training and Development (TTD) program housed in the Department of Adult, Career, and Technology Education (ACTE). The TTD program was closed on the Moscow campus in June of 2009 but was kept open on the Idaho Falls campus pending this requested transfer to the College of Engineering. The present TTD program in Idaho Falls has two options: Industrial Technology and Business Technology. With this transfer of the Industrial Technology option to the College of Engineering, the remaining Business Technology option will be closed, thus totally closing the TTD program in the College of Education.

2. Provide a statement of need for program or a program modification. Include student and state need, demand, and employment potential. Attach a Scope and Sequence, SDPTE Form Attachment B, for professional-technical education requests. (Use additional sheets if necessary.).

The TTD program now offered in Idaho Falls is not a teacher preparation program; it is a program focused on technologies of nuclear energy, operations, and industrial safety and is delivered through the Industrial Technology option. This Idaho Falls based part of the TTD program is funded primarily by an Idaho National Laboratory (INL) education contract. This program has existed in various forms, and under various administrative arrangements for nearly 50 years; the service of the University of Idaho to the region, through this program, is well established. With the start of the Center for Advanced Energy Studies (CAES) and feedback from INL management and local students during a study in March, 2009, the university has become aware of strong interest in growing this program and better serving the needs of the region. In short, given the technical interests of the INL and surrounding community, the current College of Education affiliation of the TTD program is limiting the program’s sustainability and potential for future growth. Given the Idaho Falls context of the remaining Industrial Technology program and its technical rather than education focus, it will be beneficial to the students and regional industry for the program to be a part of the College of Engineering. Additionally, the College of Engineering already has a strong presence in Idaho Falls, offering degrees in several engineering disciplines and computer science. This transfer will help the university consolidate and improve administrative responsibilities in the region.

Data on Industrial Technology graduates is published by the Association of Technology, Management, and Applied Engineering (ATMAE, 2009). In a survey of graduates from the past five years, the average annual salary is $55,000, 90% are employed full time, and nearly a third are in graduate school (the implication is that many are working and attending graduate school part-time). Nearly all of the students currently in the program in Idaho Falls are employed and
pursuing the degree on a part-time basis. Most of these students work at the INL. In discussions with several INL managers in March, 2009 these students are highly valued and very qualified for positions at the INL. Since the students are already working, the degree is not used to obtain a job but to qualify for positions of increased responsibility and pay.

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

In the consideration of this transfer, the College of Engineering conducted a Feasibility Study. Plans have been established to increase the quality of the program including two major changes: accreditation and an advisory board. The College of Engineering has a long tradition of accredited undergraduate programs with industrial advisory boards. Upon transfer of the program, the College of Engineering will begin the process of seeking national accreditation from the Association of Technology, Management, and Applied Engineering (ATMAE) and establishing an industrial advisory board.

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.

In Idaho and the surrounding states, there are no other degree programs, accredited or not, in Industrial Technology. In the western US, there are four similar programs accredited by ATMAE, at:

- Arizona State University
- California Polytechnic State University
- California State University – Chico
- San Jose State University

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Relevant Enrollment Data</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Previous Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Degrees offered by school/college or program(s) within disciplinary area under review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution and Degree name</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Specializations within the discipline (to reflect a national perspective)</th>
<th>Specializations offered within the degree at the institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Describe how this request is consistent with the State Board of Education's policy or role and mission of the institution. (i.e. centrality).

From the perspective of the students and industry of the University of Idaho fulfilling its role and mission to the Idaho Falls region, there is no change. This request is for the transfer of the program from one administrative unit (the College of Education) to another (the College of Engineering).

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

   Yes  X      No ____

BS Technology in Industrial Technology, College of Education

If not on 8-year plan, provide a justification for adding the program.
8. Resources--Faculty/Staff/Space Needs/Capital Outlay. (Use additional sheets if necessary):

Funding will continue to be supported by the same UI budgets in Idaho Falls, therefore no new funding is required for the transfer.

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

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

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

* 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.