University of Idaho
2012-2013 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #22

3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, March 26, 2013
Brink Hall Faculty Lounge
IWC Room 390 – Boise
213 – Coeur d’Alene
TAB 321B IF4 – Idaho Falls

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2012-13 Faculty Senate Meeting #21, March 19, 2013

III. Chair’s Report.
   • Spring Enrollment

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Committee Reports.

   Commencement Committee (Sisodiya)
   Campus Planning (Hasko)
   Safety & Loss Committee (Smith, Hutchison, Dorschel)
   Faculty Affairs
     • FS-13-045: Student Bar Association Membership on Senate
       o FSH 1520 – University Constitution (Gunderson) (discussion/possible vote)
       o FSH 1580 – Bylaws of Faculty Senate (Gunderson) (discussion/possible vote)

VI. Other Announcements and Communications.

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Kenton Bird, Chair 2012-2013, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2012-2013 FS Meeting #21
             Spring Enrollment Documents
             Campus Planning Report
             Commencement Committee Report
             FS-13-045
University of Idaho  
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
2012-2013 Meeting #21, Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Present: Aiken, Baillargeon, Baker (w/o vote), Bird (Chair), Budwig (Boise), Dodd, Eckwright (w/o vote), Flores, Garrison, Goddard, Hartzell, Hasko, Hopper, Kasrey, Kennelly, Miller, Morra, Ostrom, Pendegraft, Safaii, Stuntzner (Coeur d’Alene), Strawn, Teal, Ytreberg  

Absent: Frey, Manic, Qualls, Smith  

Guests: 7

A quorum being present, Senate Chair Bird called the meeting to order at 3:32 pm.

Minutes: It was moved and seconded (Garrison, Morra) to approve the minutes of meeting #20. Motion carried with one abstention.

Chair’s Report. Chair Bird reported on the following items:

- Congratulations to the University of Idaho women’s basketball team in winning the Western Athletic Conference championship. They will play in the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) tournament later this week. Two members of the team are students in Chair Bird’s unit, Journalism and Mass Media.

- Presidential transition information:
  - On March 25 Texas Tech University will announce its next president. At that time we will know for certain whether President Nellis is leaving U-Idaho. [N.B. The announcement was made Friday, March 22.]
  - Idaho State Board of Education (SBOE) is seeking nominations for both search committee members and interim president candidates. Please send your nominations to Senate Chair Kenton Bird kbird@uidaho.edu or Mike Rush, SBOE Executive Director mike.rush@osbe.idaho.gov
  - Don Soltman, acting president of SBOE, will meet with senate leadership on Friday, April 19, after the board’s 2-day meeting in Moscow. By that time we will know both the composition of the search committee and the name of the interim president, but this will be a good opportunity to share faculty and staff concerns about the future direction of the university.

- At his cabinet meeting this week, President Nellis reiterated his commitment to the completion of the work begun by several task forces, including the Vision 2020 Task Force and the two committees that are reviewing student health and safety. Senate will have an important role in implementing the goals of those groups.

- Joe Stegner, Special Assistant to the President and U-Idaho’s representative in Boise, reported to the cabinet that it is unlikely that the Legislature will approve any money for state employee raises, since the governor did not include this in his budget. Funding for other areas appears more positive, including deferred maintenance, agricultural research and extension, and the Washington, Wyoming, Alaska, Montana, and Idaho (WWAMI) medical education program. Chair Bird will provide additional information from the cabinet meeting in a written report to senators.

- Colleges and other constituencies must complete their election of senators for 2013-2014 by April 15.
  - The Graduate and Professional Student Association (GPSA) has designated Kate Cobb as the next president, which enables her to return to senate as the GPSA representative in August.
  - U-Idaho – Boise Center faculty have elected Wendy Couture, Associate Professor of law, to replace Senator Ralph Budwig as their senate representative.
Current senators are responsible for organizing elections in their colleges for new senators. The 2013-2014 senate will be seated for an organizational meeting on May 7 during Finals Week. The following constituencies must hold elections:

- College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences (CLASS), 2 seats
- Staff Affairs, 1 seat
- College of Law, 1 seat
- College of Education, 1 seat
- College of Agricultural and Life Sciences (CALS), 1 seat
- [N.B. Chair Bird later added the Faculty-at-Large, 1 seat.]

General Policy Report #56 was sent to faculty this week. The items in the report were approved by Faculty Senate and will be considered to have the necessary faculty approval unless a petition requesting further consideration of these items is signed by five faculty members and submitted to the senate chair within 14 calendar days (by April 1). If no petition is received within 14 days, the report will be submitted to the president for approval and subsequent transmittal to the regents if regents’ action is required. If a petition is received the report will be referred to Faculty Senate. Senate may take one of the following actions: affirm the action and report it to a meeting of the university faculty; amend the action and report it to a meeting of the university faculty; rescind the action.

Commencement Committee and Safety & Loss Control Committee will provide reports at next week’s senate meeting, and senate will also receive a written report on spring semester enrollment.

Next University Faculty Meeting will be held on Tuesday, April 30, at 3pm in the SUB Ballroom.

**Provost’s Report.** Provost Baker reported on the following items:

- Last week Jane Baillargeon, Brenda Helbling, Lodi Price and Heather Chermak attended the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) training session on changing accreditation standards. U-Idaho will submit a major report to NWCCU in 14 months. Senator Baillargeon added that NWCCU is also under review by the U.S. Department of Education (DoE). NWCCU will write a report and present its case to DoE but there are no other specifics available to us at this time. DoE is considering implementing a credit-hours audit and U-Idaho will need to figure out how to make that happen. Provost Baker said that timelines for this process will be provided to senate and he reminded senators that NWCCU will be holding institutions accountable for assessment activities.

- A Provost’s roundtable met yesterday to provide an opportunity for faculty and the provost to discuss issues women face both within the university and around the state. The number of women faculty at U-Idaho has increased to 34% but we would like to see an increase in that percentage. The roundtable generated good discussion about structural and cultural barriers facing women and the group put together a to-do list of action steps to take that we will report on in the future.

- Navajo Supreme Court meets on the U-Idaho, Moscow, campus this week in the College of Law Courtroom. This presents a unique opportunity to observe the supreme court of another sovereign nation and all are encouraged to attend. For more information:

- The first Vandal Friday is this week, March 22. There will be over 1,000 students and their parents visiting the Moscow campus, which is a good turnout, with registrations up 11% over last year. This is an important event and it has a big impact on fall enrollment. The next Vandal Friday will be held on April 5.

- Promotion and Tenure letters were sent to the deans today for delivery to faculty.
FS-13-042: FSH 1565 D-1. Faculty Ranks – Instructor/Senior Instructor and FS-13-043: FSH 3560 D-1. Faculty Promotion. Chair Bird asked senators to make note of the two items in the packet that are being introduced today. FSH 1565 D-1 has to do with mandatory promotion of instructors to senior instructors and FSH 3560 D-1 deals with the upper limit on senior instructors for units. A detailed rationale for the changes is provided in the coversheets to both items. Please study the changes carefully and consult with your constituents about the proposed changes. Senate will discuss these proposed changes at next week’s meeting.

A senator asked about the proposed language in FSH 1565 D-1-c that requires instructors to be evaluated at the end of three years. If the instructor chooses not to be evaluated at the end of the third year, is the instructor considered again the following year or in another three years? The senator then asked if instructors are then subject to review every year, every third year or never again after the first review at the end of three years? Another senator pointed out that some of these changes lend themselves to varying interpretations and the Faculty Affairs Committee may want to revisit the language. Chair Bird asked that senators’ questions and comments pertaining to the proposed changes in FSH 1565 and FSH 3560 be sent to Chair Bird and he will forward them to Professor Robert Perret, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee. Responses to these questions will be made available prior to the next senate meeting where these will be voted upon.

Vision 2020 Task Force: Chair Bird then invited chair Bob Smith, Associate Vice President, Idaho Falls Center, and co-chair Keith Ickes, Executive Director for Planning and Budget, to provide a mid-term report on the Vision 2020 Task Force discussions. Mr. Smith reported that President Nellis established the task force at the beginning of this semester for the purpose of studying the 2020 goals of system-wide enrollment of 16,000 students and a 50% increase in research expenditures (approximately $150 million per year). The task force has looked at a variety of considerations, including historical data, peer data and institutional mission. The group’s modeling approach is to target changes in key university characteristics, i.e., student body profile, faculty mix, and research and creative activities, then linking changes in these areas to revenues and costs. Historic and current enrollment and research expenditures have been compared and the task force used this information to identify key university characteristics and key model parameters.

The task force put together a simple spreadsheet using default values to produce a ratio-based profile of what the university might look like with 16,000 students. For example, if we are to have 16,000 students in 2020 then we would need 113 new faculty members. One of the surprising results of this spreadsheet exercise was the finding that in order to meet the research funding goals, 99% of new faculty would have to be in science, technology, engineering and mathematics disciplines (STEM) – and that will not work because we will need increased teaching, as well. The task force will continue to look at a whole variety of parameters including what we want to change and how those changes will affect the institution. In the next month, the task force will look at a collection of scenarios that they will narrow to one or two scenarios along with recommendations to present to President Nellis in May. These scenarios and recommendations will be the tools for the university to use in order to have a meaningful discussion.

Mr. Smith responded as follows to senators’ comments and questions:

- *I appreciate the effort and need to develop a model based on quantifiable metrics but I am concerned about things that are important to consider but that are not necessarily quantifiable in terms of metrics. There are things that are important to which we cannot assign numbers that have fallen through the gaps in some of our previous efforts at quantifying program qualities and I would like this to be considered by the task force. If you develop a tool and give that tool to...*
decision-makers they will use that tool. We need to think about how to include quality metrics as part of the tool. The specific intent of this exercise is not to take those into consideration, not because they are not important, but because this task force works at a much higher level. The outcome of this will show us whether or not we can make the books balance if, for example, we have a certain number of part-time and full-time students. A more detailed review will come in when we actually decide what to do as an institution to achieve one or another goal. The task force is providing bounding conditions by attempting to capture 95% of what goes on and is not looking at individual programs in order to determine which programs have more value. We are trying to create bounds for what the institution possibly can do and whether it is sustainable. Nuanced information and details will be incorporated and considered in a larger follow-up discussion. A key aspect is to be true to our mission, which cannot be quantified, and must be determined in deliberative sessions such as this.

- The task force’s work appears to capture the 95% that you talked about; it is real bread-and-butter material. We are at the point in education where we need to look at how to change things and we are a small school and we will attract attention if we are innovative. Is the Vision 2020 task force looking at innovative strategies as part of their work? That will be part of phase two, which began yesterday after President Nellis approved the group’s work to-date. At this point we have a progress report without any real conclusions; but, the approach we are working with here is that if we move in a particular direction, we would need to identify revenue streams to make it feasible.

- Have you addressed increasing infrastructure costs in your considerations? The progress report at this point addresses the academic side of things. Mr. Ickes is in the process of addressing the cost and revenue portion that deals with the operational side but as an institution we have not explicitly tracked some of what we need to put into this. There are limitations on data, including financial data. For example, we collect matriculation fees on all students but we have no idea on how much we collect from undergraduate, graduate, non-resident and so on. We know that we have an entire student body contributing to these fees but for modeling purposes we need to be able to split out those dollars and understand what the financial impacts are of having more part-time or full-time students. Some of these things will have to evolve as the institution pays closer attention to the variables.

- Is the path forward predicated upon the idea that we want 16,000 students and a $150 million increase in revenue? Is that the whole objective? No. The objective is to understand the institution and the implication of changes to the institution. The value that comes out of this exercise is to understand the relationship between various things at the institution. For example, the model will help us understand the implications of adding 100 students. We could replace 16,000 and $150 million with other numbers and that changes what the university looks like. We could reconfigure the model another way it will tell us how many students and the amount of research expenditures to expect out of certain student and faculty configurations.

- If it looks like we are not going to make 16,000 students can we fall back and look at an alternative? There are a lot of variables along the way such as: Are we able to achieve the research goal in the absence of the enrollment goal? The task force has briefly looked at these things and it has been suggested that getting to $150 million may not necessarily be as difficult as getting to 16,000 students, in some respects. The models will be complete enough to understand whether 12-15 key hires may be enough to get to $150 million in research, but we need to have the space, the support staff and other variables that determine whether it is sustainable. For example, in 2004 there was a major research spike, but with nothing to shore it up, it fell back on its own. There is a complex set of dynamics involved and we have to see how it plays out. The university will at some point get to the 16,000 students and $150 million increase in funding and whether we can get there by that date [2020] is an exercise we will go through.
The “2020” date appears only in the title of this group and not in the model itself. The task force plans to meet with Steve Neiheisel, Assistant Vice-President for Enrollment Management, to talk about what is possible in enrollment and how we might shape the enrollment profile.

- **Could you explain how to interpret the information represented on the slides, such as the “Current Enrollment & Expenditures” slide on page 4?** This slide illustrates the institutional profile in terms of contribution to teaching mission and contribution to research expenditures. [Mr. Smith explained the relationships between the various data on the slides, such as numbers of faculty and students by college and research expenditures by college.]

- **Does the model include the effects of what is happening outside of the university, such as sequestration, which will negatively affect STEM research?** The normalized per faculty expenditure data for ten years to 2009 indicates a larger change than the 5% sequester. Congress will do what they want to do but the sequestration scenario is within the range of what we have seen in the past.

- **On your spreadsheet you indicate an increase of 113 faculty (approximately 20%) and a research increase of 50%. Will those new faculty have to be weighted toward people who bring in much more research money than the people who are already here?** The assumption in the spreadsheet is that the individual faculty that we bring in on average will look like the faculty who are here now, but in that case 110 will be in STEM disciplines and two will be for all other disciplines – and that will not work. This drives the discussion and we need to reshape the faculty profile and focus in areas we want to grow research. We will be hiring 74 new faculty this year just to fill vacancies (not new positions) and in an average year we hire 50-55. Over the next seven years can we make one or two dozen key selections, can we cluster things in ways that might be strategic steps forward given that we will be hiring that many replacements?

- **On the spreadsheet Law and WWAMI are about the same number for 2012 and 2020 and you have subtracted them. Why is that?** When we put this spreadsheet together we removed portions of enrollment that we have no control over. Law and WWAMI enrollments are determined by SBOE and the state legislature and it does not matter what we put on our spreadsheet.

- **What are “research expenditures”? What does that mean?** The National Science Foundation (NSF) defines a research expenditure as getting a grant, doing research, charging a research sponsor for the work, cost-sharing and student waivers. The per-faculty figure is calculated by dividing the yearly total for an institution by the number of faculty. The calculation is made in the same way for colleges. Scholarly research that does not generate this kind of funding is critical to our success, too, in enabling us to meet our mission as a land-grant institution for the enrichment of the students and the state. Chair Bird added that the task force has focused on funded research but that almost without exception task force members also have recognized the importance of research and creative activities that are not recognized in the numerical formula. Mr. Ickes added that many institutions do quantify information about refereed publications, as well, and we can get comparative data on publications and refereed publications by discipline on a national basis. This can be quantified but it is not a key part of the model at this time because we are looking at the nature of sustainability and the role of funded research.

- **Do you lump all expenditures, such as costs for a graduate student, a centrifuge and expendable materials, into “expenditures” even if the money does not come out of our pocket but comes from a federal grant?** Yes. This model attempts to capture all of the money spent on research.

- **Research expenditures went up in 2002 for three or four years and then something happened; it was not sustainable, and they fell back. Can you give an example of sustainable or non-sustainable internal or external forces?** We had hired 140 new faculty in the closing days of President Hoover’s term and then in 2002-2003 things went bad financially for the state and for
the institution. We had hired more faculty than we could afford as an institution. We lost almost 50 of the 140 new faculty and the percentage change in research matches the change in faculty. If we want to grow expenditures, we know how to do that: hire faculty. But you have to do it in a way that you can pay for them. As for non-sustainability, we have not done an analysis to determine why each faculty member leaves, but as a group – we could not afford the number of faculty that we had hired at that time.

- **It appears in the model that you assume that the percentage of graduate students would remain the same and that is a valid assumption if all we are doing is increasing the numbers of students because graduate students oftentimes are also teaching assistants. But if you are also increasing research expenditures I would expect there to be more research assistantships as well?** For this model that is presented here we simply took whatever the value was for the 10-year-average and stuck it in the slot. These are not scenarios but rather are averages and nothing else is taken into consideration. Mr. Ickes added that the task force is examining peers to see if we are talking about a scenario that no one else has reached. Graduate students are a particular concern in comparison with peers and there are questions about how to sustain them. We run the models and see what they say and we also go back to revisit our peers’ profiles. We will continue to look at peer data as we check for sustainability in the market.

- **Did the drop in research expenditures coincide with early retirements where we did not rehire?** Early retirements were part of that loss of 50 faculty members. During that time graduate students comprised 25% of the student population. Based on Mr. Ickes experience looking at other institutions’ data, an institution like us cannot afford financially to have that many graduate students. Keep in mind that after excluding law and WWAMI students, nearly 60% of our graduate students are part-time. We are talking about shaping the graduate student profile, we are not talking about having fewer full-time graduate students that are available for teaching assistantships and research assistantships. We need to determine if we want to continue to grow programs that attract part-time graduate students. We want full-time graduate students because they support the research enterprise and teaching.

- **In what areas or disciplines are the part-time graduate students? What constitutes a part-time graduate student – a certain number of credits?** I work in Idaho Falls and most of the students there are engineering students and science graduate students. Most of them are employed and most of them are part-time graduate students. Also, lots of people work in education-related jobs and they are attending school to earn advanced degrees.

- **Staff ask questions about the operational side of things relating to student services, extracurricular activities, infrastructure and other non-academic things.** Mr. Ickes noted that it is difficult to find information about recommended student-staff ratios or staff-faculty ratios. Those things were done 30 years ago and everyone was interested for a while, but then everyone became bored with it and it has been left alone again. A key question is what kinds of measures do we anticipate applying outside of the faculty-student relationship. That is not a trivial question.

- **It is worrisome that the spreadsheet shows a faculty increase in the hundreds and currently the staff-faculty ratio is close to 2:1 so that suggests a big expense if you plan to hire 300-400 faculty.** Mr. Ickes responded that the University Budget and Finance Committee met today and briefly discussed the faculty-staff ratio at peer institutions. Using benchmarks from our peers Mr. Ickes could demonstrate that we would need to add 400 employees in order to add 100 new faculty. But that data is from our peers and the question is whether that is an acceptable model for U-Idaho and is that a place where we are going to go? Or will we sustain current levels of support, which is a different question. If you know of any studies that have looked at those ratios please let me know.
Chair Bird then asked what type of information senators would like from the task force as it moves forward and what is the most effective way to communicate and share information with your constituents? A senator asked if there is a website for the task force where people could post ideas or ask questions? Mr. Ickes replied that there is no website at this time but that he could ask staff in the President’s Office to set up a website. He also added that this is President Nellis’ task force and the task force members touch base with the president to ensure that they are working within the parameters of his original charge to the group. There are periodic stages for releasing information and talking about possible scenarios. That does not mean they cannot give input to him, too. Chair Bird called senators’ attention to the frequently asked questions handout [included in the agenda for the meeting] and asked them to share it with their constituents. He reminded senators that the task force will not make specific recommendations about growing, shrinking or eliminating programs, as that is beyond the scope of the task force.

**Adjournment:** It was moved and seconded (Garrison, Baillargeon) to adjourn at 4:57pm. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Gail Z. Eckwright  
Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Senate
University of Idaho -- Faculty Senate
Enrollment Update (as of March 15th)
March 26, 2013

Spring 2013 enrollment – SBOE Census date (PSR-1 report)

See press release

Fall 2013

- **New students admission**
  - Undergraduate
    - Currently very positive numbers for applications, admissions and Vandal Friday.
      - New freshmen
        - Applications = 7392 → up 558 (+8%)
        - Admits = 4691 → up 272 (+6%)
      - New transfers
        - Applications = 832 → up 11 (+1%)
        - Admits = 493 → down 13 (-3%)
      - Vandal Friday reservations = 1274 → up 123 (11%)
        - includes both freshmen and transfers
        - Initial registrations will be at Vandal Fridays on March 22nd and April 5th.
        - New undergraduates not attending Vandal Friday may begin registration April 15th.
    - Emphasis going forward is on increasing completion rate and yield/enrollment rate.
  - Graduate
    - National trends with declining graduate level enrollments
    - Concerns in several academic departments regarding the impact of sequestration and research funding affecting Fall 2013 admissions
      - Applications = 1401 → up 1 (+0%)
      - Admits = 242 → down 24 (-9%)
  - Law
    - National trends showing significant decline in applications this year (over 20% nationwide and in the Mountain West)
      - Applications = 565 → +9 (+2%)
      - Offers = 273 → +13 (+5%)
      - Deposits = 19 → +6

Combinations of above factors indicate an overall increase in new students for Fall 2013. The size of the increase will be determined by the results of efforts related to completion and yield based on positive applicant pools at all levels.
• **Continuing students** -- key factors for monitoring and estimating Fall continuing enrollment include:
  
  o **Retention**
    
    - Mixed signals at this stage based on monitoring new freshmen cohort
    - Spring to fall retention declined for second year in a row in fall 2012
    - Fall to spring retention for Spring 2013 increased
    - Initial indicator for Fall 2013 will be based on priority registration which begins April 15th -- first continuing student Fall 2013 enrollment report scheduled April 22nd.

  o **Graduation rates**
    
    - Increased graduation rates and number of graduates expected based on change to 120 credit hour graduation requirement for some programs
    - Accelerating graduation rates/numbers for non-residents over past 2 years.
    - Initial indicator for number of graduates will be number of graduate applications and tracking of eligible students -- will be reviewed and available in late April.

  o **Spring enrollment**
    
    - Students eligible to continue from Spring 2013 to Fall 2013 (not graduating and not suspended) represents a smaller pool than the previous year based on several factors
      
      - Smaller freshmen classes for Fall 2011 and Fall 2012
      - Declining retention rates for past two years for new freshmen cohorts
      - Increased graduations for non-residents

**Combinations of above factors indicate a decline in number of continuing students for Fall 2013. The size of the decline will be determined by the efforts to stabilize and/or improve retention at all levels.**

**Overall enrollment is simply the combination of new and continuing -- the next best indicators of the size of the above shifts will be in late April.**
March 22, 2013

Media Contact: Karen Hunt, University Communications, (208) 885-7251, klhunt@uidaho.edu; Gemma Gaudette, University Communications-South, (208) 334-2252, gemma@uidaho.edu

U-Idaho Announces Spring Enrollment Numbers

MOSCOW, Idaho – The University of Idaho’s snapshot of enrollment stands at 11,551 students under the new March 15 ‘census’ date and reporting guidelines enacted this academic year by the Idaho State Board of Education.

The new SBOE guidelines replace the traditional 10th day of the spring semester reporting date with March 15.

Enrollment on the Moscow campus is 10,499 for spring semester 2013. A total of 8,078 students are in-state residents.

With 1,454 of Fall’s full-time new freshmen returning for the spring semester, the University of Idaho’s freshman retention rate from fall to spring is 92 percent. Of these, 30 percent are first generation students, defined as neither of their parents earned a bachelor’s degree.

“Our focus has been on consistent and sustainable enrollment growth and seeking students who have an affinity for an interdisciplinary and engaging approach to education, which includes not only recruitment, but retention as well,” said Steve Neiheisel, assistant vice president for enrollment management.

Diversity and international enrollments continue to be important factors at U-Idaho with 551 international students on campus that reflects students from 70 countries.

A total of 1,504 students, or more than 13 percent of the student body, self identify as a member of an ethnic or racially diverse background. A breakdown of these students include: 802 Hispanic or Latino, 104 American Indian or Alaska Native, 176 Asian, 100 Black or African American, 29 Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, and 293 mixed race.

The university is currently ramping up its enrollment and recruiting efforts for freshman and transfer students in anticipation of the fall semester. The University of Idaho will host two Vandal Fridays offering students the chance to ‘test drive’ the college experience, and include an overnight stay in university housing, a comprehensive introduction to the student-life, a student activities fair, attending selected college classes, and the chance to meet other admitted students. Vandal Friday participants also get the jump on fall semester by registering for classes.

Admitted students have two Vandal Friday dates to choose from: March 22 or April 5. The registration deadline for Vandal Friday is one week prior to the event.

“Even as we report on spring enrollment and move toward the conclusion of this academic year, we’re excited about the energy, enthusiasm and the quality that the newest Vandals will bring to the university next Fall,” said Neiheisel.
For consistent reporting purposes, most universities use fall enrollment numbers as the official totals for the current academic year.

###

**About the University of Idaho**

The University of Idaho inspires students to succeed and become leaders. Its land-grant mission furthers innovative scholarly and creative research to grow Idaho’s economy and serve a statewide community. From its main campus in Moscow, Idaho, to 70 research and academic locations statewide, U-Idaho emphasizes real-world application as part of its student experience. U-Idaho combines the strength of a large university with the intimacy of small learning communities. It is home to the Vandals, and competes in the Western Athletic Conference. Through the university’s $225 million Inspiring Futures capital campaign, private giving will enhance student learning, faculty research and innovation, and a spirit of enterprise. Learn more: [www.uidaho.edu](http://www.uidaho.edu).
Committee performs a variety of activities to support commencement activities, including but not limited to:

- Screening of honorary degrees (Section 4930) and recommending candidates for honorary degree (Section 4910)
- Provide the president with a list of recommended speakers for the general ceremony
- Review policies and guidelines for awarding honorary degrees
- Review polices applicable to commencement exercises
- Consider and communicate concerns of faculty and colleges with regard to the entire commencement proceedings
- Provide advice to the president and registrar

Additional responsibilities of Committee Chair:
- Serves as an ex-officio member on the Administrative Commencement Committee
- Participate in graduation as member of stage party

Structure of the Committee: Five faculty members (one of whom serves as chair), one honors student (nominated by ASUI in consultation with the director of the University Honors Program), and the registrar. The chair of this committee also serves as an ex-officio member of the administrative committee charged with production of the commencement activities.

2012-13 members: Sanjay R. Sisodiya (Chair, Faculty), Lori Enloe (Faculty), Alex Kyrios (Faculty), Samantha Ramsay (Faculty), Michelle Weist (Faculty), Brita Meyer (Faculty), Nancy Krogh (Registrar)

Meeting frequency: Typically twice a semester, discuss honorary degrees and recommended speakers

Challenges we face
- Soliciting recommendations for commencement speakers
- Obtaining complete packets
- Increasing faculty participation in graduation

2012 Commencement Speakers
- December: Doug Oppenheimer, Skip Oppenheimer
- May: General James F. Amos, Horace Axtel, David Nicandri,

2012 Commencement Speakers
- December: Dean Lynn Baird
- May: General James F. Amos
Administrative Commencement Committee  
University of Idaho

Highlights of Administrative Commencement Activities:
- Speaker will be Jim Lemley ‘88, film producer (Abraham Lincoln: Vampire Hunter, We Were Soldiers) and son of Jack Lemley ‘60
- 50th anniversary of the first Ph.D. awarded by the University
- College banners will be physically carried by faculty/staff/other trained individuals. Colleges may still select an honored student to be introduced as “leading” the college procession. This is to eliminate the difficulty from prior years in finding a rehearsal time to properly train the student banner bearers.

Details for Moscow Campus Commencement:
- Saturday, May 11 – 8:15am lineup, 9:30am start time
- Moscow attendee numbers appear to be right in line with Spring 2012 – official pre-ceremony numbers will be publicly released at the end of the month in press release with speaker info and other details
- GradFest March 25th-26th (will be happening during your Senate Meeting if anyone wants to come by and see it; open until 6 pm)
- GradImages will continue to provide photography service at the ceremony and at GradFest, with green-screen options (different backgrounds may be inserted) and one free print for those students that provide contact info at either opportunity.
John,

provided below is some feedback related to the comments/questions you heard at the last Faculty Senate meeting. Take a look through, and let me know if you’d like to discuss further in advance of Wednesday’s CPAC meeting. Thanks, Brian

- **Would CPAC consider looking at a performance paradigm rather than a visual paradigm for the bicycle shelters?** Why use the university’s Gothic arch stamp for the design of something that is about health and sustainability? Could this be viewed as an opportunity for rainwater catchment or something that relates to bicycles? This is a good suggestion and I will take it back to the committee as the plans are still in the beginning stages. The fact that we are doing bike shelters at all is a health and sustainability measure in and of itself….this measure can and should be part of the UI brand. One of the admonitions of the long range plan is to “grow more ivy.” That is a metaphor for figuring out what architectural design language make UI unique and different from other universities and to then play to that strength – expand on it and reinforce it. The intent here is to establish a form/structure that is usable not only for potential bike shelters, but also for other shelter type structures on campus (e.g., you-are-here signage, meeting/informational kiosk at the arboretum, bus stop, etc.). Rather than create multiple or one-off forms, our desire is to create a common architectural language that creates and reinforces a sense of place across the campus. The gothic arch has been used in a variety of campus forms, including some buildings, benches, railings, and building signs. The gothic arch in the proposed bike shelters reinforces the sense of place on campus, and the presence of new bike shelters will promote and enhance the themes of health and sustainability. Rainwater capture will likely not be very efficient given the small roof area and the distributed nature of these shelters (so, little gallons collected at far points (are they all to be piped together? what does that infrastructure cost?

- **Who decides what to build and when?** The $250,000 price tag for emplacement at each of three locations seems like a lot of money. CPAC set a priority for classroom repair before entrance beautification this year, but those decisions are made by someone in Facilities. Each year Facilities staff review the amount of money available and then they use that information to determine project priorities. For example, the roofs are being replaced on a number of buildings around campus and these become a priority because buildings without adequate roofs are unusable. Other priorities include addressing ADA compliance issues in buildings. Yet another consideration is that some donors specify that they want their money to be used for a certain project. Also, note that the drawings for the entrance emplacements are dated 2011, so this has been a “back-burner” project for some time.

Classroom enhancements are a high priority for the executives (President, Provost, VP’s, and Budget Director). Cash in hand is being used to implement the improvements in TLC and Renfrew classrooms. Meanwhile, the university is working to refinance past bond debt to take advantage of historically low interest rates. This refinance will generate immediate debt service savings—to be used on the Ad Science classroom. All told, roughly $1.1M will go to the classroom improvements. Additionally, the executives wanted to take the opportunity to
consider other ‘small’ projects which could be accomplished as part of the refinance effort. Given the paucity of funding in recent years supporting only limited visible campus improvements, the executives wish to see a few projects which outwardly portray the University as a vibrant and growing entity. So the refinance of past debt, paired with the recent acquisition of the railroad frontage along Highway 8, suggested the need to provide some physical enhancements to that edge of campus. The campus gateways are something recommended in the long range plan. That recommendation was made 1997 and reinforced in the 2000 document. The Sweet Ave entry gateway was completed 2001, so these other gateways have been a long term desire that has been put off for years.

- You mentioned that the priority list for entrance improvement is Stadium Drive first followed by Perimeter Drive. Since Stadium Drive was recently redone would it be possible to put Perimeter Drive as the first priority for entrance improvement since it is also relatively unimproved? Is it Facilities or upper administration that makes these decisions? They had established the 1-2-3 order of Stadium, Perimeter and Line but they are still talking about it and it is not clear whether it is Facilities or upper administration that are making the decisions.

Stadium Drive was always planned to have such a gateway – it is not “complete and done” in its present form. The entry monuments will serve to better define the ‘face’ of the university to the community, and serve as a first step in serving to better ‘knit’ the university and community along this historically industrialized corridor. A series of planning efforts in the 1990’s and early 2000’s addressing the campus as a whole, and more specifically the northern edge of the campus each identified priorities for entry improvements as, first, Stadium Drive, then Perimeter Drive, and lastly at Line Street. Greater weight is given to Stadium Drive, given its direct access to (more so) the core of campus, with access to community events at Hartung Theater and the Kibbie Dome. These same findings were reinforced in the 2010 signage/wayfinding master plan, and endorsed by campus executives.

- What is the purpose of these improvements? Is it to intellectually understand what the University of Idaho is or is it to provide a threshold between the city and the university? We may want to pursue different options or prioritize differently depending upon the answers to these questions. I will take these suggestions back to the committee.

As explained above, the executives wish to see a few projects which outwardly portray the University as a vibrant and growing entity. The entry monuments will serve to better define the ‘face’ of the university to the community, and serve as a first step in serving to better ‘knit’ the university and community along this historically industrialized corridor. The proposed monuments are intended to carry the same weight/gravity as those at Hwy 95 and Sweet Avenue, recognizing the importance and visibility of these entrances to the many visitors and community members approaching from the north and west. The entry monuments provide:

- entry experience and sequence
- gateway
- town/gown transition
- first impression
- establishing a sense of permanence and tradition

- Do we know what the room capacity will be for the different rooms that are being upgraded? No, CPAC received no documentation indicating room capacity although the Renfrew rooms have room for approximately 60 people. The TLC classroom will serve 36 students, while the two Renfrew rooms are slated to accommodate 90 – 106 students each.
All of these improvements—classroom improvements, traffic calming, entry gateways, signage—are improvements by and for the common good. In that sense they are like basic campus infrastructure. They are improvements that need to be supported centrally for the common good of all concerned as they are not items any one college or department program will support. They provide the support infrastructure to which the various campus units will plug into—the framework upon which the colleges, departments, programs will hang.

Brian Johnson
Assistant Vice President, Facilities
University of Idaho
P.O. Box 442281
Moscow, ID 83844-2281
(208) 885-6246
johnsonb@uidaho.edu
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College/Division/Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Econ. &amp; Rural Sociology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural &amp; Extension Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal &amp; Veterinary Science</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological &amp; Ag. Engineering</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Food Science</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Extension Centers: Aberdeen</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy M. Cummings REEC</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREEC</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetonia</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALS: Overall Averaged Score</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Art and Architecture</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business and Economics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Law</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Letters, Arts and Soc. Sci.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Natural Resources</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Science:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Science: Overall Averaged Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Services</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFA - Other (Controller's Office only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Commons / TLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Union Building</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs: Overall Averaged Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho - Boise</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho - Coeur d'Alene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho - Idaho Falls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Averaged Score - All units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>To do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Workers Compensation Claims & Costs
2007 through 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Claims Filed</th>
<th>Incurred Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>$736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>$345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>$374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>$392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>$328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>$138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Elements</td>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> University Policies and Procedures</td>
<td>To educate personnel on University policies and procedures regarding safety.</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> Unit Safety Committee</td>
<td>To establish a safety committee, or safety officer, for each unit.</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> Job Hazard</td>
<td>To identify if job tasks are being performed safely, if the appropriate procedures, techniques, and personnel protective equipment is being used.</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong> Safety Training</td>
<td>To identify and track the training that is necessary for that person to safely perform their tasks.</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong> Accident Reporting and Investigation</td>
<td>To have accident and near miss reports properly completed, especially workers compensation claims.</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong> Inspections</td>
<td>To correct and control reoccurrence of safety deficiencies noted in Idaho Division of Building Safety inspections in a timely manner.</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong> Emergency Response Plan</td>
<td>Develop an emergency response plan for personnel to follow during various situations.</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong> Vehicle Safety and Use</td>
<td>Comply with University vehicle use policies and procedures.</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong> Hazardous Materials Use</td>
<td>To have units develop, implement, and maintain controls to hazardous materials</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Workers Compensation Claims for 2008 - 2012

- 2008: 124 claims, 74% severe
- 2009: 137 claims, 78% severe
- 2010: 115 claims, 81% severe
- 2011: 108 claims, 82% severe
- 2012: 81 claims, 52% severe

WC Claims
Severe Claims
Severe Claims as a percentage of total claims
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Facilities: Building Trades</td>
<td>$13,289.77</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$10,685.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$4,886.51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$45,856.71</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$10,230.34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Facilities: Building Services</td>
<td>$31,212.68</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$6,480.91</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$45,192.90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$25,336.99</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$7,586.16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Facilities: Landscaping &amp; Exterior Services</td>
<td>$28,230.31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$48,380.95</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$15,599.49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$3,720.29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$2,454.90</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Facilities: Utilities &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$526.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$17,594.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$792.24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$7,310.32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>University Support Services</td>
<td>$12,047.94</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$5,332.76</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$815.88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$19,692.60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$977.44</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>University Residences</td>
<td>$10,682.38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$39,743.81</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$85,662.90</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$805.48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$35,053.46</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Athletic Department</td>
<td>$2,505.03</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$13,467.79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$4,943.95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$352.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>$55.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$23,292.63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,396.74</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Campus Recreation</td>
<td>$9,320.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$9,074.16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$10,588.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Outreach &amp; Technologies</td>
<td>$14,287.94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$145.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$700.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$4,823.28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>College of Agriculture &amp; Life Sciences</td>
<td>$3,194.72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$55,725.72</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$11,832.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$15,962.98</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$9,735.51</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>Palouse R&amp;E Center</td>
<td>$1,961.96</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$30,233.14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$210.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$921.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,914.94</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>N. Cummings R&amp;E Center</td>
<td>$1,781.56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,140.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$61,464.32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$2,227.39</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Aberdeeen R&amp;E Center</td>
<td>$1,487.30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,961.51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$21,508.35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,805.09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,667.86</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Kimberly R&amp;E Center</td>
<td>$442.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$32,089.30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$22,840.58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$762.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>U.S. Sheep Experiment Center</td>
<td>$589.48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$730.31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$10,188.30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Cooperative Extension</td>
<td>$85,082.88</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$14,440.26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$11,162.23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$280.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$3,029.13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$36,301.29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$22,921.68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>College of Natural Resources</td>
<td>$69,926.83</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$37,269.26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$7,720.48</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$20,855.88</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$5,183.48</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>College of Science</td>
<td>$2,397.67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$2,625.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$3,922.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$45,136.30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$5,604.01</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>College of Art &amp; Architecture</td>
<td>$7,938.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$39,563.92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$996.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>College of Letters &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>$16,599.84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$4,889.42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$242.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,963.48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$7,163.46</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Other Academic Organizations</td>
<td>$4,517.52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$583.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$23,393.95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$3,003.08</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I. Policy/Procedure Statement: Briefly explain the purpose/reason of proposed addition, revision, and/or deletion to the Faculty/Staff Handbook or the Administrative Procedures Manual.

As the Faculty Senate has evolved into a group advocating shared governance, it has increased its membership to include staff, the GPSA, and ASUI. The Student Bar Association represents a group of students not included in either of these student associations, and constitutes the only members of the University Community without voting membership on the Faculty Senate. The SBA of the College of Law seeks to become a more active participant in matters and affairs that affect all members of the University. The revisions to titles 1520 and 1580 of Chapter 1 would allow the SBA to elect a law student voting member to the Faculty Senate. The SBA members’ close association and familiarity with issues are qualities that would contribute to Senate discussions regarding important policies affecting both law students and the University community.

II. Fiscal Impact: What fiscal impact, if any, will this addition, revision, or deletion have?

None

III. Related Policies/Procedures: Describe other policies or procedures existing that are related or similar to this proposed change.

The SBA is a member of the University Budget and Finance Committee (title 1640.20) and has a say in the important matters that come before that committee. Revisions to titles 1520 and 1580 would parallel the existing membership of the University Budget and Finance Committee, where ASUI, GPSA, and SBA are each represented by their own student voting member. Both the GPSA and ASUI support Faculty Senate voting membership for the SBA.

IV. Effective Date: This policy shall be effective on July 1, or January 1, whichever arrives first after final approval (see FSH 1460 D) unless otherwise specified in the policy.
CONSTITUTION OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY

NOTE: When the university was young, the faculty’s business could be transacted quite satisfactorily in general meetings and through presidential committees. After the mid-20th century, however, the need for a representative form of government became obvious. Shortly after assuming the presidency in 1965, Ernest W. Hartung expressed great confidence in the faculty and urged it to assume the responsibilities entrusted to it by the territorial legislature and the state constitution [see 1120 A-3]. Accordingly, the Interim Committee of the Faculty, a body that performed limited academic functions for a time, recommended the establishment of a council having responsibilities and authority essentially as set forth in this constitution. The university faculty adopted the Interim Committee’s recommendation on October 20, 1966, the regents approved it on November 18, 1966, and elections were held in the several colleges. The first Faculty Council assembled on February 23, 1967, with Professor Thomas R. Walenta (law) as chair; during the ensuing year, the council developed a proposed constitution of the university faculty. The document was amended and approved by the university faculty on March 20, 1968, and, with President Hartung’s support, was ratified with minor amendments by the regents on September 5, 1968. The last major revision took place in 1986. In 2009 the Faculty Council changed its name to Faculty Senate a more common name used in academia, off campus faculty will have voting members on Senate at Coeur d’Alene, Boise, and Idaho Falls, and off-campus faculty will now be counted in the quorum at university faculty meetings with vote through designated sites and delegates given available technology (see 1640.94 and 1540 A). In 2011 Clinical faculty rank was added and language with respect to associated faculty voting was clarified. In 2012 Faculty Senate Center Senator’s role/responsibility was clarified, staff membership increased to two and the required annual venue determination was removed. The text printed here includes all amendments to date (see also 1420 A-1-c). Unless otherwise noted, the text is of 1996. For more information, contact the Office of the Faculty Secretary (208-885-6151). [ed. 7-00, rev. 7-09, 7-11, 7-12]

CONTENTS:
Article I. General Provisions
Article II. Faculty Classifications
Article III. Faculty Meetings
Article IV. Responsibilities of the University Faculty
Article V. Faculty Senate
Article VI. Rules of Order
Article VII. Amendments

ARTICLE I-IV – unchanged.

ARTICLE V--FACULTY SENATE.

Section 1. Function. The Faculty Senate functions as provided in this constitution and in accordance with its bylaws as approved by the university faculty. [See I-3 and 1580.] [ed. 7-09]

Section 2. Structure. The senate is constituted as follows: [ed. 7-09]

Clause A. Elected Members. [ed. 7-00]

(1) College Faculties. The faculty of each college, except the College of Graduate Studies, elects one senator for each 50, or major fraction thereof, full-time-equivalent faculty members in the college, provided, however, that each college faculty elects at least one senator. If, because of a reduction in the membership of a college faculty, there is to be a corresponding reduction in the college’s representation in the senate, the reduction does not take place until the expiration of the term of office of an elected senator from the college. [ed. 7-09]

(2) University Centers. The resident faculty of the university centers in Boise, Coeur d’Alene and Idaho Falls each elects one senator from among its number. Those senators shall have the right to participate and vote in faculty senate meetings by means of available two-way video-audio technology located at the centers.

If the available technology fails, telephone conferencing will be used. Senators elected to represent a center have a unique role on senate, which is to provide a voice and vote from the perspective of their centers. That perspective is not intended to be college and/or discipline specific. [add. 7-09, rev. 7-12]
(3) Faculty-at-Large. Members of the university faculty who are not affiliated with a college faculty constitute the faculty-at-large, and this constituent faculty, in accordance with procedures adopted by the faculty-at-large, elects senators to serve with vote in the senate on the same basis as provided above for college faculties. [See 1566.] [ed. & ren. 7-09]

(4) Dean. The academic deans elect one of their number to serve with vote in the senate. [ed. & ren. 7-09]

(5) Staff. The representative body (Staff Affairs) of the university staff elects two employees who do not have faculty status to serve with vote in the senate. [ed. & ren. 7-09, rev. 7-12]

(6) Students. Two undergraduate students, and one graduate student, and one law student serve as voting members of the senate, and the senate provides regulations governing the qualifications, terms of office, and election of student members, and procedures for filling vacancies in the student membership. [See 1580 VI.] [ed. & ren. 7-09]

Clause B. Members Ex Officiis. The president or the president’s designated representative and the secretary of the faculty are members ex officis of the senate, with voice but without vote. [ed. 7-09]

Section 3. Officers. Each year the senate elects a chair and a vice chair from among the elected faculty members of the senate. Also, each year a secretary is appointed by the chair, subject to confirmation by the senate, from among the members of the senate or from the membership of the university faculty. The appointment of a person who is not a member of the senate to serve as secretary does not carry with it membership on the senate. [ed. 7-09]

Section 4. Terms of Office. Elected faculty members of the senate serve for three years. The academic dean shall serve one year, the staff representatives shall serve for staggered two year terms. The terms of office for student members are as established by the senate. [See 1580 VI.] Newly elected members take office each year on September 1 or on the official opening date of the academic year, whichever is earlier. To carry out the requirement that approximately one-third of the elected faculty members are to take office each year, the senate may shorten the initial term of office of faculty senators elected to fill new positions in the senate to conform to a balanced rotation plan. When members are elected to fill a vacancy, they take office at the first meeting after the election and serve for the unexpired term of the vacancy. No elected faculty member of the senate may serve an immediately ensuing term [but see 1580 III-3]. [ed. 7-09, rev. 7-12]

Section 5. Eligibility. Every member of the university faculty is eligible to vote for members of the senate representing his or her college or other unit. Every member of the university faculty is eligible to serve as an elected member of the Faculty Senate and to hold an elective or appointive office in the senate. [ed. 7-09]

Section 6. Elections. Regular elections for senators in the senate are held before April 15 of each year in which an election is to be held. All elections for members of the senate are by secret ballot. Appropriate procedures for nominations and elections are developed and approved by a majority vote of the faculty of the college or other unit. [ed. 7-09]

Section 7. Vacancies.

Clause A. If it is necessary for a member of the senate to be absent temporarily (more than a month, but less than four months), the candidate who received the next highest number of votes in the most recent election in the college or unit acts as his or her alternate in the senate with full vote. If it is necessary for a member to be absent for more than four months, but less than one year, a special election is held to fill the temporary vacancy. When the senate member returns, he or she resumes the position in the senate. If it is necessary for a member to be absent for more than one year, or if the member is unable to complete the term of office for any reason, a special election is held to fill the unexpired term. [See 1580 VI for procedures covering student vacancies.] [ed. 7-09]

Clause B. The chair of the Faculty Senate must declare a position vacant if a member is absent from three consecutive meetings unless the member has informed the chair of the senate in writing that he or she intends to participate fully in the activities of the senate in the future. When a position is declared vacant, the chair must notify the constituency concerned. [ed. 7-09]

Section 8. Recall. and ARTICLE VI-VII – unchanged.
PREAMBLE: This section contains the bylaws of Faculty Senate which serve to expand on Article V of the Faculty Constitution (1520). This section first appeared in the 1979 edition of the Handbook and has remained substantially the same, minor title changes aside, ever since. In January 2010 the Faculty Council changed its name to Faculty Senate. In 2011 the requirements for publishing senate meeting minutes were revised to reflect changes in publishing processes across the university. In July 2012 the election process for the graduate student representative on Senate was clarified. For further information, contact the Office of the Faculty Secretary (208-885-6151). [ed. 7-00, rev. 7-10, 7-11, 7-12]

CONTENTS:
Article I. Function and Membership
Article II. Duties of Officers
Article III. Terms of Office
Article IV. Election of Officers
Article V. Meetings
Article VI. Student Members
Article VII. Executive Committee
Article VIII. Other Committees

ARTICLE I—V are unchanged.

ARTICLE VI—STUDENT MEMBERS.

Section 1. Qualifications. The two undergraduate-student representatives must have completed at least 26 credits at UI before taking office and must be full-time students as defined in the catalog (regulation O-1). The graduate-student representative must be regularly enrolled in a program leading to an advanced degree.

Section 2. Terms of Office. Student members are elected for one-year terms and are eligible for reelection for a second term.

Section 3. Election. The election of the two undergraduate-student representatives to serve on the senate is entrusted to the ASUI Senate. The election of one graduate-student representative is entrusted to the Graduate and Professional Student Association. [The election of one law-student representative is entrusted to the Student Bar Association.] [ed. 7-10, rev. 7-12]

Section 4. Vacancies. Vacancies occurring in student positions are filled by the ASUI and GPSA as appropriate. [rev. 7-12]

ARTICLE VII—X are unchanged.