University of Idaho  
2013-2014 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA  

Meeting #19  

3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, March 4, 2014  
Brink Hall Faculty-Staff 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 2013-14 Faculty Senate Meeting #18, February 25, 2014 (vote)  

III. Chair’s Report.  

IV. Provost’s Report.  

V. Other Announcements and Communications.  
   • VIVO (Kenyon)  

VI. Committee Reports.  

University Judicial Council (Shook)  
   FS-14-027: FSH 2305 – University Disciplinary Review Process for Alleged Violations of Student Code of Conduct  
   FS-14-028: FSH 2400 – Student Judicial System  
   FS-14-029: FSH 2450 – Appeals to Faculty Senate in Disciplinary Cases  

VII. Special Orders.  

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.  

IX. New Business.  

X. Adjournment.  

Professor Trish Hartzell, Chair 2013-2014, Faculty Senate  

Attachments: Minutes of 2013-2014 FS Meeting #18  
   VIVO  
   FS-14-027 through 029
University of Idaho
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
2013-2014 Meeting #18, Tuesday, February 25, 2014

**Present:** Stevenson for Aiken (w/o vote), Awwad-Rafferty, Brandt, Cobb, Couture (Boise), Davis, Eckwright (w/o vote), Flores, Frey, Hartzell (chair), Karsky, Latrell, Murphy, Ostrom, Pendegraft, Perret, Pregitzer, Qualls, Safaii, Stoll, Stuntzner (Coeur d’Alene), Wolf, Ytreberg **Absent:** Aiken, Baillargeon, Becker, Bird, Manic, Miller, Morra, Smith  **Guests:** 11

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

Chair Hartzell welcomed new ASUI Senator Edwin Latrell.

**Minutes:** It was moved and seconded (Awwad-Rafferty, Wolf) to approve the minutes of meeting #17. Motion carried.

**Chair’s Report.** The Chair reported on the following items:

Senate leadership attended the President’s Breakfast for Progress on February 19. Jeff Dodge, enrollment management, gave an update on enrollment and President Don Burnett talked about investment strategies. Chair Hartzell and Brian Mahoney, chair of staff affairs, presented President Burnett with two copies of *Beacon for Mountain and Plain*. Students, staff, faculty, alumni, Governor Otter and others have signed the books as enduring testaments to their high regard for President Burnett, who was very pleased by the gifts.

A senate subcommittee met last week to begin examining the faculty evaluation process. We agreed that there is widespread unhappiness with the number 3 which is viewed by many as the equivalent of a “C”. The subcommittee is collecting data on the evaluation process at other universities. Chair Hartzell asked that each senator provide feedback to the subcommittee (via Chair Hartzell) on whether your unit has written criteria for evaluation and expectations for achieving 4 and 5.

Chair Hartzell and Ann Thompson, assistant to the faculty secretary, met with Staff Affairs leadership last week and worked on a plan to enhance staff processes and strengthen ties between UI faculty and staff.

In an effort to add some functionality to Brink Lounge, Chair Hartzell is seeking funding to purchase the following: Keurig, water dispenser, microwave, toaster oven, small refrigerator and an attractive cabinet. Chair Hartzell is also looking for a way to buffer sound in the room as the acoustics make it difficult to carry on individual conversations when many people are in the room for larger gatherings.

Last week at the Red Carnation celebration before the Friday evening Jazz Festival program, Don Soltman, president of the State Board of Education (SBOE) and Bill Goesling, SBOE member, thanked President Burnett for his service and presented him with a rocking chair. Senator Cobb added that the rocking chair was given in recognition of President Burnett’s new grandbaby.
Dr. Chuck Staben has officially arrived at UI and he attended the jazz festival on Saturday night. He will give his first official speech as president on Monday, March 3 at 2:30 in the Administration Auditorium.

Teaching Excellence Brown Bag (TEBB) Talk will be held on Thursday, March 6 at 12:30-1:30pm. The title of the talk is “Making Reflective Learning Work for You and Your Students” and it is the first in the series.

Nominations for the U.S. Senator Larry E. Craig ASUI Student Leadership endowment award are due on Monday, March 24.

Provost’s Report. Vice Provost Stevenson had no additional items to report.

Distance and Extended Education. Vice Provost Stevenson said that she was asked to respond to some particular questions provided by Chair Hartzell about Distance and Extended Education (DEE). The first questions relate to the development of online courses and programs and Vice Provost Stevenson provided the following information:

- Priority given to developing programs so that we can offer intact programs for individuals.
- Example: working with national audience who can participate and get a graduate degree in fire ecology management.
- DEE develops a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with colleges to develop degrees and state expectations relating to program design, numbers of courses and faculty involved in partner with DEE staff. DEE is also working on an external review process for the courses and programs as part of the design process.
- DEE continues to provide course consultation and support for faculty who are interested in distance and extended education programs.
- DEE provides resources for the technology aspect of Bblearn and also for design aspects. DEE currently has two instructional designers; and three technical people who formerly were with the former center for teaching innovation under ITS. We have brought the instruction and technical pieces together in DEE.
- Vice Provost Stevenson then said that President Staben has ideas about what he would like to see done with online opportunities at UI. As we know, we are not at the forefront of that work but there are also some things that we do very well and could share with others, such as program delivery. We will hire the next director after we determine the most effective model for UI online programs.

Vice Provost Stevenson responded as follows to senators’ questions and comments about online courses and programs:

- One issue for faculty participating in online learning is “load.” Is “overload” for faculty developing these courses part of the discussions? People are not too creative when they are overloaded. One of the elements of the MOU mechanism is that DEE does not manage the curriculum – that is done by the departments and the chairs in the delivery of programs. The assignment of faculty load is a department responsibility.
- Could three existing faculty members team-up to head DEE? You are describing a discussion about a potential idea for the center for teaching and learning. It is a question of qualifications and expertise of the people involved.
- Will the DEE director be a staff or faculty member? That depends upon the model we use.
- What kind of approval process is there for current courses to go through in order to be offered as online courses? Other courses go through college curriculum committees, university curriculum...
committee and senate before receiving approval, but do we have any process for converting existing courses to online courses? These are faculty governance questions – what should the mode of delivery be and what kind of hallmarks of quality should be met for online course delivery and how this will be determined? What is the role of faculty in this process? Good questions and these are part of the same equation.

- How do Bblearn instructional designers work with faculty in developing online courses? Do they help design the course from the ground-up, including the web component? Yes, absolutely.
- As you develop courses for online learning I encourage you to think about which students and what locations you want to be at? Constituents at the Boise center have noted that some online courses are being filled by students on the Moscow campus and students elsewhere, who are able to attend only via online courses, are unable to get into the courses. Is there a way to identify Moscow students and distance students and create different sections, for example? There are some ways to address these questions but we would all want to consider the role and purpose of online courses in terms of serving students.

Vice Provost Stevenson next explained that units interested in providing dual credit courses should first have an internal discussion among faculty and chairs. Units that have catalog courses that meet both UI and high school requirements should contact Linda Gollberg for further information. UI has not systematically tracked whether high school students who engage in UI dual credit courses later attend UI but there will be some information coming out about that in the next 6-8 weeks.

Vice Provost Stevenson responded as follows to senators’ questions and comments about dual credit courses:

- We had been told that a dual credit course could not come in at a “000” and that it had to be a regular on-campus course offering in order for it to be offered as a dual-credit course, as well. That is correct. Otherwise it is not dual credit, by definition. This is the last academic year that there will be the “000” courses that do not transfer in. Courses need to be available for both college and high school credit simultaneously – “000” courses do not serve one of those.
- As a recap, UI faculty members interested in offering dual credit find a high school teacher or the high school teacher finds us. Linda Gollberg works with them to set it up, then we help the high school teacher with the course and the grading is done here? There are several models. The teacher does grading but partners with the faculty member to ensure a learning experience that is equivalent in quality.
- What is the fee structure? How much are high school students charged for credits? $65 per credit.
- Chair Hartzell said that some of the money collected in fees goes back to the high schools for purchasing supplies and equipment. Another senator added that most of the money goes back to the schools and Chair Hartzell replied that she has heard that it is a negotiable amount.

Campus Planning and Advisory Committee. Professor Diane Armpriest, chair of the Campus Planning and Advisory Committee (CPAC), summarized her written report from last week’s CPAC meeting. The committee discussed a proposal to roll some responsibilities from the current Facilities Scheduling and Planning Committee (FSPC) into the function of CPAC. FSPC members have recommended disbanding FSPC since most of its former responsibilities have been absorbed by the registrar’s office. CPAC approved a motion regarding CPAC’s role in resolving classroom scheduling or non-classroom room assignments. CPAC also approved a motion to recommend to Faculty Senate that the FSPC be formally disbanded. CPAC members feel it is better to disband FSPC and bring back a new committee at a later date when it is needed. It was then moved and seconded (Pendegraft, Cobb) to refer this matter to the Committee on
Committees (ConC). Motion carried unanimously. Vice Chair Ytreberg said that ConC will want to address how to include room for faculty voice in future classroom planning and renovation. He also pointed out that the registrar’s ad hoc classroom committee is a temporary committee and not a long-term solution.

**University Judicial Council. FS-14-027: Student Code Judicial Process.** Chair Hartzell next invited Professor Steve Shook, chair of the University Judicial Council (UJC), to introduce changes to the Student Code of Conduct judicial process. Chair Hartzell said that these proposed changes have been worked on by UJC members, Associate General Counsel Guilherme “G” Costa, an ASUI student representative, Dean of Students office and faculty senate leadership. Professor Shook began by noting that “2305” is a place-holding policy number for the purposes of this revision process and that after all proposed changes have been reviewed and approved, this content will revert to the “2400” FSH policy number. Chair Hartzell suggested that proposed changes have tightened up the process and put more control into the bodies that do the reviews. Proposed changes include:

- Content in 2305 covers disciplinary process for all alleged violations of the student code. This material previously appeared in FSH 2200, 2300, 2400 and 2450 and one of the tasks given to UJC was to unify this information in one place.
- Timeline changes. Some changes, including the 60-day completion time, are based on requirements from Department of Education regulations pertaining to sexual assault and sexual violence.
- Elimination of legal terminology as currently found in FSH policies.
- Several components from the Dean of Students proposal brought to senate in September 2013 were included as they fit into the overall disciplinary process.
- FSH 1640.93 will require a few changes relating to number of members of the UJC and what constitutes a quorum.
- Sanctions imposed for alcohol, D-7, have not changed because it is SBOE policy.
- Sanctions that result in suspension, expulsion or withholding of a degree automatically go to the UJC.
- SDRB has the opportunity to look at other sanctions, too, and may opt to reject reviewing them or may accept a request from the student to appeal.
- Requests that go to faculty senate will not involve an interview or hearing process. Faculty senate leadership will appoint a group of senators who will look at an appeal once faculty senate leadership decides that the appeal is worth hearing.
- Students have the option of appealing decisions to the Board of Regents; in some cases this may bypass the UI president.
- G Costa added that in the revised process the president is not included in the review processes unless there is a substantive review by the first panel and a substantive review by the faculty senate panel. Otherwise, the institutional decision is completed before involving the president. The new president may decide to become involved in the process, however, and then we will need to make a change to that piece. The Board of Regents includes the review process in their policy, but they will not review a case unless there is a final institutional decision.

Professor Shook and Chair Hartzell responded as follows to senators’ comments and questions:

- *The acronym “UDC” (University Disciplinary Committee) is deleted in some cases and SDRB is substituted, but in other cases it is left as UDC. Is this an error?* This is the last thing we worked on and we will go back over it and take care of these discrepancies. Chair Hartzell added that we were unable to find a good substitute for “UJC” without using the word “judicial” and we finally settled upon “Student Disciplinary Review Board” (SDRB).
• If this gets to the point where a senate sub-committee is formed to review the decision, at the very end one of the options is that the faculty senate dismisses and returns the decision. What does “dismiss the decision” mean and what does “return the decision” mean? What does “not uphold the decision” mean? This is spelled out on the next page after the flowchart [i.e., faculty senate sub-committee can: uphold the SDRB decision and sanctions; uphold the decision but revise the sanctions; return to SDRB for reinvestigation and reconsideration; dismiss the decision and sanctions after consulting with General Counsel].

• Is this the only active proposal or is there a parallel proposal from the Dean of Students? This is the only active proposal.

• There are implications in this process for students who are not in Moscow and it makes sense to consider how the process affects those students. In particular, meetings with the Dean of Students and hearings – would these be by videoconference or by phone? Yes, we have more work to do on this.

• Part C-7a(2) states that the review panel can “dismiss the decision and the sanctions after consulting with General Counsel.” Why does General Counsel need to be consulted before senate representatives can make their decision? [G Costa responded to this question] There are a lot of legal implications to the ultimate decisions in this process. The moment we have a “final decision” we are limited in what we can do because of the concept of double jeopardy, which we are maintaining but not using that terminology. We want the faculty panel to have a conversation with one of the attorneys to make sure that there are not any “mines” that need to be navigated in making that decision.

• This is a great start but I would have liked it to go more toward the administrative side of things. Also, I recently chaired an appeal in which the committee considered sending the case back to UJC; having the ability to do that is probably a good thing and right now it is not clear that we can do that. Under the new proposal does an appeal go to the faculty senate only when there is a suspension? The process stops when it gets to SDRB for cases such as plagiarism and cheating; then they have to go to the board.

• With plagiarism and cheating there is a fairly limited review unless a student appeals to the Board of Regents. I understand that students are not likely to be suspended for a first-time violation for plagiarism and cheating, but if they are suspended their appeals options are much more limited. These are serious offenses and some colleges may not admit students who have plagiarism or cheating on their undergrad records. Given the potential long-term consequences this is a very limited appeals process. [G Costa responded to this comment] I agree. But even now we have language in the code which states that even one instance of academic dishonesty may merit expulsion. I would hope that panel members will recognize academic dishonesty as a serious offense and will, at a minimum, suspend a student. If the student is suspended, the student will always be able to appeal.

• The flowchart shows “Other sanctions (alcohol, plagiarism, cheating, etc.)”. Is this correct? The parenthetical part should be removed. G Costa added that it should read “anything less than suspension” – which is what is stated in the document itself.

• At this time failing the class is the most severe penalty for a student found cheating or plagiarizing – but nothing beyond that. Has that changed? [G Costa responded to this comment] No, that has not changed. We have two separate tracks: grading is in the faculty purview, only, and if the faculty member wants to do something with the student by way of assignment or involve the whole class – the faculty member makes that decision and there is nothing that the disciplinary side can do that will affect grades; the disciplinary side is different and that is where suspension, expulsion or other sanctions occur. One does not impact the other – there is true separation
between academic dealing with the situation and the disciplinary dealing with the situation. Bruce Pitman, dean of students, added that the garden variety of academic dishonesty cases result from cut-and-paste in composition classes, for example, and the approach from the disciplinary side is to work with the instructor. The Dean of Students Office makes their own independent decision as to what the sanctions ought to be: for first-time offenses, the sanctions are more likely to be community service hours and working with the faculty member to redo homework assignments; second offenses are taken very seriously and the office often recommends suspension in these cases. Universities that use a single-sanction struggle with this because faculty may hesitate to bring a case forward on a first violation.

- **What is the estimated timeline for the formal proposal?** One or two weeks. The next task is to get the other sections of the FSH squared up, which we have started on. FSH 2200 and 2300 will be much shortened because we have removed all process and put it into 2305 (which will become 2400). Also, FSH 2450 will be pared back, as well.

- **May I circulate these proposed changes with my colleagues?** I have no objections to you doing so. [Chair Hartzell responded to this question and she inquired whether anyone else in the room had objections. There were none.]

Chair Hartzell asked senators to send comments to her: hartzell@uidaho.edu

**Adjournment:** It was moved and seconded (Cobb, Davis) to adjourn at 4:42pm. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Gail Z. Eckwright
Secretary to Faculty Senate and Faculty Secretary
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UI FACULTY-STAFF HANDBOOK
CHAPTER TWO:
STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICIES 2013

2305

UNIVERSITY DISCIPLINARY REVIEW PROCESS FOR ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF STUDENT CODE OF CONDUCT

PREAMBLE: This section outlines students of the UI disciplinary process. The UI disciplinary procedures philosophy is provided to inform students of the process in place at the University for resolving alleged violations of the Student Code of Conduct. The process is designed to allow for fact finding and decision making in the context of the University educational community. The objective is to provide a process that balances the rights of the individual with the legitimate interests of the University. For further information, contact the Dean of Students (208-885-6757).

A. INTRODUCTION. The purpose of the Student Code of Conduct is to educate students about their civic and social responsibilities as members of the University community. The primary focus of the disciplinary process is on educational and corrective outcomes; however, sanctions such as suspension or expulsion from the University may be necessary to uphold community standards and to protect the campus community. Any and all matters consistent with the Student Code of Conduct (“Code”) (2300) and the Statement of Student Rights (2200) are handled by the system under the following rules and regulations.

A-1. DEFINITIONS:

a. Advisor: the person of the student’s choosing who has agreed to advise a student during the University disciplinary process and attend scheduled meetings with the student. The Advisor must be available for any scheduled meetings. Advisor availability is not considered in scheduling meetings. Students should choose an Advisor who is available to attend any scheduled meetings, because Advisor availability is not considered in scheduling meetings.

b. Days: normal University working days when the university is open for business, not including Saturday, Sunday, and University holidays. Time deadlines may be extended during breaks and University holidays, and for extenuating circumstances (e.g., non-Moscow locations) at the Dean of Students’ discretion.

c. Dean of Students (DOS): the Office of the Dean of Students, which is person responsible for the administration of the Student Code of Conduct, and includes the Dean of Students and his/her designees.

d. The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (“FERPA”) is a federal law that governs the confidentiality of student education records.

e. Group: a number of students who are associated with each other, but who have not complied with University requirements for registration as an organization.

f. Notice:

- Any notice required by the Student Code of Conduct shall be provided in writing via email to the student’s official email account (i.e., *@vandals.uidaho.edu).
- Students who do not have an official email account will receive notice via regular mail to the mailing address.
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- Students who do not have an official email account and do not have a mailing address will receive notice via regular mail to the permanent address.
- Notice is deemed received: (i) the day after it is sent by email, or (ii) three days after it is sent via regular mail.

**g. Organization:** any number of persons who have complied with the formal requirements for University recognition.

**h. Student:** includes all persons admitted to the University, either full-time or part-time, to pursue undergraduate, graduate, or professional studies, and includes non-degree seeking students. The following persons are also considered “students”:
- Persons who withdraw after allegedly violating the Student Code of Conduct;
- Persons who are not officially enrolled for a particular term but who have a continuing relationship with the University;
- Individuals participating in the American Language and Culture Program;

**i. Student Code of Conduct:** herein referred to as “Code” (see FSH 2300).

**j. SDRB:** Student Disciplinary Review Board (see FSH 1640.93)

**k. UI’s Office of General Counsel:** herein referred to as “General Counsel” and includes any staff members.

**l. University:** University of Idaho, which includes all campus locations, extension programs, and distance education programs.

**B. REVIEWING BODIES.** The disciplinary system consists of the following: Student Disciplinary Review Board (SDRB), Faculty Senate, President, and Regents.

**B-1. Student Disciplinary Review Board (SDRB),** (see FSH 1640.93)

- **a. Scope of Responsibility.**
  - (1) SDRB adjudicates the following:
    - (a) Any alleged violation of the Code that may not be appropriately handled within the living-group disciplinary body or that is not otherwise resolved by DOS.
    - (b) Any alleged violation of ASUI rules and regulations not specifically designated to be heard adjudicated elsewhere.
    - (c) Any matter that a living-group disciplinary body declines to hear adjudicate.
  - (2) SDRB adjudicates requests for review of decisions of living-group disciplinary bodies and requests for review of decisions of any ASUI disciplinary bodies.

- **b. Range of Sanctions.** The SDRB has the full range of sanctions set forth in D below.

**B-2. Faculty Senate.** The Faculty Senate adjudicates requests for review of all student disciplinary proceeding-SDRB decisions that include a sanction of suspension, expulsion, or withholding or revoking a degree.

**B-4. President.** The President’s office adjudicates requests for review of Faculty Senate decisions.

**B-5. Board of Regents.** The Board of Regents adjudicates final decisions made at the institutional level in
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According with Board of Regents policies.

C. PROCEDURES: All deadlines provided below are default provisions and are subject to change by written agreement of both parties. Failure to abide by any deadline will not be grounds for dismissal of the allegations.

C.1. Reporting of Alleged Violations and Initial Investigation by DOS.

a. Reporting Alleged Violations. Any person who has knowledge of an alleged violation of the Code should inform the Office of the Dean of Students (DOS) of such alleged violation as soon as possible.

b. Initial Investigation. DOS shall receive all reports of alleged violations and investigate to determine whether the allegation is credible.

1) Students who are suspected of violations may be interviewed by DOS, but they must be informed by DOS at the beginning of such interview of the right to not speak to DOS and the reason for the interview. No form of coercion or harassment shall be used in the interview.

2) When a student is being interviewed by a third party and DOS is observing such interview, the student must be informed of the fact that DOS is observing and informed of the right to not speak to DOS (also see Statement of Student Rights, FSH 2200 IV.3).

3) DOS may speak with witnesses of the alleged incident, as well as the persons injured by the alleged violation. Any witness or other person having knowledge of the alleged violation may provide DOS with any relevant information or materials.

c. Notice of Alleged Violation. If DOS determines that the allegation is credible, DOS shall provide the student accused of violating the Code with written notice of the allegation. Such notice shall include:

1. the alleged misconduct,
2. the section of the Code alleged to have been violated,
3. a time and date that does not conflict with the student’s class schedule to meet with DOS to discuss the allegation(s),
4. a statement that the student may have an advisor present with him/her at the meeting,
5. a statement that the student does not have to speak with DOS about the allegation(s),
6. a statement that failure to show up for the meeting or to contact DOS to reschedule the meeting will be presumed to be the student’s exercise of his/her right to not speak with DOS, and
7. a statement that the investigation and determination regarding the allegation will proceed regardless of whether the student speaks with DOS.

d. Meeting with DOS. The student is given an opportunity to meet with DOS regarding the allegations, unless DOS has already interviewed the student (see C.1.b above). Except where the student agrees otherwise, the meeting with DOS may be scheduled no sooner than:

1. 2 days after receiving notice is provided by email, or
2. 5 days after mailing, if receiving notice is provided by regular mail.

At this meeting, the student is given the opportunity to give his/her account of the incident leading to the allegation(s), and to provide DOS with the names and contact information of individuals who have personal knowledge of the incident or circumstances pertaining to the allegation(s). The student may have an advisor present at this meeting. If the student does not appear for
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his/her meeting and fails to contact DOS to reschedule before the meeting time, it will be presumed
that the student has exercised his/her right to not speak to DOS.

e. Investigation & Determination. After the meeting time has passed, DOS shall continue its
investigation of the allegations. DOS may speak with witnesses of the alleged incident, as well as the
persons injured by the alleged violation. Any witness or other person having knowledge of the alleged
violation may provide DOS with any relevant information or materials. Many factors influence the
time spent on investigating allegations with most being concluded within 60 days following receipt
of the allegation(s).

Once the investigation is concluded, DOS shall make a finding as to whether the alleged violation
occurred by a preponderance of the evidence (the “standard”). If DOS finds that the alleged
violation occurred by that standard, DOS shall determine the appropriate sanction(s) and provide
the student with written notice of the determination, the factual basis for the determination, and
any sanction(s).

(1) If the student accepts the determination made by DOS and the sanctions imposed, the
student will sign an agreement to that effect within 5 days of receiving notice of the
determination and sanctions. This agreement will contain language that informs the
student of the following:
(i) that the determination and sanctions are final;
(ii) that the sanctions go into effect immediately; and
(iii) that the student waives his/her right to request a review of the determination and
sanctions.

(2) If the student does not accept the determination made by DOS and the sanctions imposed,
and does not sign an agreement to that effect within 5 days of receiving notice of the
determination and sanctions, then DOS shall refer the matter to the SDRB.

(i) If the sanctions determined appropriate by DOS does not include suspension,
expulsion, or withholding or revoking a degree, then the process continues in
accordance with C-2.

(ii) If the sanctions determined appropriate by DOS include suspension, expulsion, or
withholding or revoking a degree, then the process continues in accordance with C-3.

(3) At the conclusion of each semester, DOS shall provide a descriptive written report to the
SDRB summarizing the accepted determinations entered into during the course of the semester.
This report will also be forwarded by DOS to the Faculty Secretary.

C-2. Requests for a SDRB review for sanctions other than suspension, expulsion, or withholding or
revoke a degree.

a. The student must submit a written request for a SDRB review to DOS no later than 5 days after
the student receives notice of the determination and sanctions via email, or 8 days after
the student receives notice of the determination and sanctions via regular mail. Any
student who fails to submit the written request for a SDRB review by the deadline will be informed
by DOS of the following in a Failure to Seek Review Letter:
(i) that the determination and sanction imposed by DOS is the final institutional decision,
(ii) that the sanctions go into effect immediately, and
(iii) that student may request a review by the Board of Regents pursuant to C-9.

b. The written request for a SDRB review must cite at least one of the following reasons for the
review and must provide supporting arguments and documentation as to why a SDRB review should
be granted on those grounds:

(1) DOS failed to properly investigate the allegation and such failure was both substantial and was to the student’s detriment;

(2) There is such a clear factual error that DOS could not possibly find that a violation of the Code occurred;

(3) The sanctions are excessive for the violation given the circumstances. Simple dissatisfaction with a sanction is not grounds for appealing a sanction under this provision;

(4) New information that could substantially affect the outcome of DOS’s investigation and determination has been discovered since the determination was made. The information must have been unavailable at the time of DOS’s investigation. Failure to inform DOS of information that was available is not grounds for requesting a SDRB review under this provision;

(5) DOS committed a substantial procedural error that materially impacted its investigation and determination to the student’s detriment.

c. DOS shall provide the Chair of SDRB with all received requests for a SDRB review, along with a statement of whether DOS believes each received request meets the requirements above.

d. SDRB shall review each request for a review within 5 days of receipt and make an initial determination of whether the request meets the requirements above.

(1) For requests that fail to meet the requirements above, SDRB will deny the request and inform both the student and DOS of its decision. The determination made by DOS and the sanctions imposed will become final, this is deemed a final institutional decision, and the student may request a review by the Board of Regents in accordance with pursuant to C-9, within 5 days of receiving notice of the SDRB denial.

(2) For requests that meet the requirements above, SDRB will determine whether to adjudicate the request based on written submissions only, or whether to adjudicate the request through a hearing, and will inform both the student and DOS of its determination. SDRB may request additional information or documentation from the student or DOS independent of the form of adjudication chosen.

(i) For reviews involving written submissions only, SDRB will provide DOS with a reasonable amount of time to present any information or materials (generally no more than 5 days).

(ii) For reviews that involve a hearing, the Chair of SDRB will schedule the hearing to occur no later than 10 days after the SDRB decision to adjudicate the request through a hearing, at a time that does not conflict with the student’s class schedule. The Chair of SDRB shall not consider the availability of any advisor in setting the hearing date and time. Both the student and DOS must submit any materials intended to be introduced and considered at the hearing to both SDRB and the other party by noon Pacific time of the day before the hearing. Only materials submitted to both the Chair of SDRB and the other party by the deadline will be allowed to be introduced and considered at the hearing. The hearing will be conducted in accordance with C-4.

C-3. Scheduling a SDRB hearing for a student sanctioned with suspension, expulsion, or withholding or revoking a degree.

a. DOS will notify the Chair of SDRB that a hearing is necessary because the student did not agree to the determination made by DOS and the sanctions included suspension, expulsion, or withholding or revoking a degree.
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b. Except in extraordinary circumstances, the Chair of SDRB will schedule the hearing to occur no later than 10 days after being notified by DOS of the need for a hearing, at a time that does not conflict with the student’s class schedule. Both DOS and the student may have an advisor present at the hearing. However, SDRB shall not consider the availability of any advisor in setting the hearing date and time.

c. Both the student and DOS must submit any materials intended to be introduced and considered at the hearing to both SDRB and the other party by noon Pacific time of the day before the hearing. Only materials submitted to both the Chair of SDRB and the other party by the deadline may be introduced and considered at the hearing. **The hearing will be conducted in accordance with C-4.**

### C-4. SDRB Disciplinary Hearing Process:

a. In hearings involving more than one student, the SDRB chair has the discretion to permit the hearings concerning each student to be conducted separately.

b. The chair of SDRB may issue a notification to any UI student requiring such individual to appear at a SDRB hearing as a witness. Such notification will be delivered in accordance with A-1.f. The notification shall inform the student that it is a violation of the Code to

   1. fail to appear or to refuse to speak as a witness, unless such act would force the student to incriminate him/herself,
   2. disrupt, impede, threaten, or disregard the procedures of the SDRB, and
   3. provide information to the SDRB that the student knows or should know to be false.

c. A student’s failure to appear at the SDRB hearing or to speak as a witness will have no bearing on the question of whether the student violated the Code and may not be used to conclude that a violation occurred, except as to future allegations of failure to appear (FSH 2300 X 19).

d. SDRB shall record the audio of the SDRB hearing. The audio record will be the property of the UI, will be maintained by DOS, and will be used in accordance with applicable privacy laws.

e. Relevancy is the only criteria by which information submitted is evaluated. Relevancy is determined by the Chair of SDRB. All oral or written information statements, records, etc., as well as copies of the same, shall be considered by members of the SDRB as long as the Chair of SDRB determines that such items are relevant.

   1. Second-hand information is relevant if it is of the type commonly relied upon by prudent persons in the conduct of their affairs.
   2. Character witnesses who lack knowledge of the incident being heard or circumstances pertaining to the allegation(s) lack relevant information and therefore may not be witnesses at the hearing.
   3. Any person present at the SDRB hearing may ask the Chair of SDRB to determine whether any oral or written information, statement, record, etc. or question or answer is relevant.
   4. All questions regarding SDRB hearing procedures and determinations of relevancy are subject to the final decision of the Chair of SDRB.

f. The Chair of SDRB may request assistance by General Counsel staff regarding any questions of SDRB hearing procedures and determinations of relevancy.
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g. Hearings shall be conducted in private. The following individuals are permitted at a SDRB hearing:
(1) the student,
(2) the student’s advisor/Advisor,
(3) members of the SDRB,
(4) DOS,
(5) DOS’s advisor/Advisor,
(6) General Counsel/staff,
(7) persons who reported or were injured by the alleged violation.

Except for the student and the persons who were injured by the alleged violation, witnesses are allowed only during their testimony.

h. If the student fails to appear at the SDRB hearing despite proper notice, DOS shall present any information, materials, and witnesses to support its determination of a violation of the Code. Based on the DOS presentation, the SDRB shall make its determination.

i. The Chair of SDRB shall ensure the smooth operations of the SDRB hearing, and may remove any individual who disrupts the SDRB hearing.

j. DOS has the responsibility of providing sufficient information, materials, and witnesses to support its assertion that the student violated the Code. The student has no obligation to provide any information, materials, or witnesses, and is presumed to not have violated the Code.

k. Generally, the SDRB hearing shall be conducted in the following order:
(1) The Chair of SDRB will ask each individual present at the SDRB hearing to identify him/herself by providing his/her name and role at the SDRB hearing
(2) The Chair of SDRB will remind the student of:
(i) the right to have an advisor/Advisor,
(ii) the right to refuse to speak as a witness, and
(iii) that the refusal to speak as a witness will have no bearing on the question of whether the student violated the Code and may not be used to conclude that a violation occurred.
(3) DOS will have the opportunity to make any opening remarks.
(4) The student will have the opportunity to make any opening remarks.
(5) DOS will have the opportunity to present any information, materials, and witnesses.
(i) The student and SDRB members will have the opportunity to ask questions of any witnesses, except as described in C-44(5)(ii) below.
(ii) When the allegations involve sexual harassment or gender-based harassment, neither the student nor his/her advisor will be permitted to directly question the persons injured by the alleged violation. Instead, questions from the student or his/her advisor may be submitted in writing to the Chair of SDRB who will ask any questions determined to be relevant.
(6) The student will have the opportunity to present any information, materials, and witnesses.
(7) DOS and SDRB members will have the opportunity to ask questions of any witnesses.
(8) DOS will have the opportunity to make any closing remarks.
(9) The student will have the opportunity to make any closing remarks.
(10) DOS will have the opportunity to respond to the student’s closing remarks.
(11) The SDRB shall meet in a closed session to discuss and make its decision. The chairperson of the SDRB, or the designee in the event of absence of the chairperson, is permitted to vote only in the event of a tie vote.
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C-5. Results of SDRB.

a. Within 3 days of completing its adjudication, whether through written submission only or through a hearing, SDRB will issue a written determination of its findings to the student and DOS.

   (1) The SDRB decision must be based on a majority vote,
   (2) For SDRB review of matters involving sanctions other than suspension, expulsion, withholding or revoking a degree, the SDRB decision must
      (i) identify the stated basis for SDRB review,
      (ii) state the SDRB’s conclusion as to that basis, and
      (iii) identify the facts, conduct, or circumstances it found to support its conclusion.
   (3) For SDRB review of matters involving sanctions of suspension, expulsion, or withholding or revoking a degree, the SDRB decision must
      (i) state whether the DOS conclusion that the student more likely than not violated the Code is supported by the information, materials, and witnesses presented at the SDRB hearing, and
      (ii) identify the facts, conduct, or circumstances it has found to support its conclusion.

   (4) SDRB can:
      (i) uphold the decision and sanction(s),
      (ii) uphold the decision but revise the sanction(s),
      (iii) return the matter to DOS for reinvestigation and reconsideration, or
      (iv) dismiss the decision and the sanction(s) after consulting with General Counsel.

b. As to students whose sanctions do not include suspension, expulsion, or withholding or revoking a degree, the SDRB decision is the final institutional decision and any sanctions go into effect immediately. Such SDRB decision may be appealed to the Board of Regents in accordance with pursuant to C-9.

c. As to students whose sanctions include suspension, expulsion, or withholding or revoking of a degree, the student may request, in writing, a review of the SDRB decision by the Faculty Senate pursuant to C-6.

C-6. Requests for Review by Faculty Senate.

a. Written requests for a faculty senate review must be delivered to DOS no later than 3 days after the student is provided notice of the SDRB determination via email, or 5 days after the student is provided notice of the SDRB determination via regular mail. Any student who fails to submit the written request for a faculty senate review by the deadline will be informed by DOS of the following in a Failure to Seek Review Letter:
   (i) that the determination and sanction imposed by SDRB is the final institutional decision,
   (ii) that the sanctions go into effect immediately, and
   (iii) that student may request a review by the Board of Regents pursuant to C-9.

b. The written request for review must cite at least one of the below reasons and must provide supporting arguments and documentation as to why a faculty senate review should be granted on those grounds:
   (1) SDRB could not reasonably determine that there was no substantial and detrimental failure to properly investigate by DOS;
   (2) SDRB could not reasonably determine that there was no clear factual error that would prevent concluding that a violation of the Code occurred;
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(3) SDRB could not reasonably determine that the sanctions are not Sanctions imposed by the SDRB are excessive for the violation given the circumstances. Simple dissatisfaction with a sanction is not grounds for appealing a sanction under this provision;

(4) SDRB could not reasonably determine that no New information that could substantially affect the outcome of DOS's investigation and determination has been discovered since the SDRB's determination was made. The information must have been unavailable at the time of DOS's investigation. Failure to inform DOS of information that was available is not grounds for requesting additional review under this provision.

(5) SDRB could not reasonably determine that DOS did not commit There was substantial procedural error that materially impacted its investigation and determination to the SDRB decision to the student’s detriment.

c. DOS shall provide the Faculty Senate Leadership with all requests for a senate review, along with a statement of whether DOS believes each request meets the requirements above.

d. The Faculty Senate Leadership shall review each request within 5 days of receipt and determine whether the request meets the requirements above.

(1) For requests that fail to meet the requirements above, the Faculty Senate Leadership will deny the request and inform the student, the Chair of SDRB, and DOS of its decision. The determination made by the SDRB will become final and the sanctions imposed will become final effective immediately as of the original date of the SDRB determination, this is deemed a final institutional decision, and the student may request a review by the Board of Regents in accordance with C.9, within 5 days of receiving notice of the Faculty Senate Leadership denial.

(2) For requests that meet the requirements above, the Faculty Senate Leadership, will, within 10 days from receipt of the request, appoint three of its members to a review panel. The chair may not be a student. Persons appointed must have no interest in or involvement with the parties to or the subject matter of the situation under review.

e. The senate review panel is a review of the materials submitted only; there is no hearing, although the panel may request additional materials from the parties.

f. DOS will provide the senate review panel with the audio recording of the UIC hearing, along with the DOS response to the student’s submission within a reasonable amount of time (generally no more than 5 days).

C.7. Results of Faculty Senate Review Panel.

a. Except in extraordinary circumstances, the review panel will review all materials submitted, and provide a written decision to both parties within 10 days of receiving all the materials from DOS.

(1) The review panel’s decision must

(i) be based on a majority vote,

(ii) identify the stated basis for faculty senate review,

(iii) state the faculty senate’s conclusion as to that basis, and

(iv) identify the facts, conduct, or circumstances it found to support its conclusion.

(2) The review panel can:

(i) uphold the SDRB decision,

(ii) uphold the SDRB decision but revise the sanction(s),

(iii) return the matter to DOS for reinvestigation and reconsideration or to SDRB for reconsideration, or

(iv) dismiss the decision and the sanctions after consulting with General Counsel.
b. If the decision of the senate review panel is to uphold the SDRB decision the sanctions are effective immediately as of the original date of the SDRB determination.

C. Request for Review by the President.

a. Students whose sanctions include suspension, expulsion, or withholding or revoking of a degree may request a review of the faculty senate decision by the president.

b. Written requests for review by the president are accepted and must be delivered to both DOS and the President’s office no later than 3 days after the student is provided notice of the faculty senate determination via email, or 5 days after the student is provided notice of the faculty senate determination via regular mail.

c. The president has complete discretion whether to engage in any review of the faculty senate decision, including what materials to consider and from whom.

d. The president’s decision after a review, or the president’s decision to decline to engage in any review, is the final institutional decision.

C-9. Requests for Review by the Board of Regents. Any student may appeal a final institutional decision to the Board of Regents in accordance with Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures Section III.P.18.

D. SANCTIONS.

D-1. The following sanctions may be imposed upon any student determined to have violated the Code:

a. Warning: a written notice to the student.

b. Probation: a written reprimand accompanied by a probationary period during which the student must not violate the Code in order to avoid more severe disciplinary sanctions.

c. Loss of Privileges: denial of specified privileges for a designated period of time.

d. Restitution: compensation for loss, damage, or injury. This may take the form of appropriate service and/or monetary or material replacement.

e. Educational Sanctions: completion of work assignments, essays, service to the University, community service, workshops, or other related educational assignments.

f. Administrative fees: minimum of $150.

g. Housing Suspension: separation of the student from University Housing for a definite period of time, after which the student is eligible to return. Conditions for return may be specified.

h. Housing Expulsion: permanent separation of the student from University Housing.

i. University Suspension: separation of the student from the University for a definite period of time, after which the student is eligible to return. Conditions for return may be specified.

j. University Expulsion: permanent separation of the student from the University.

k. Revocation of Admission and/or Degree: admission to or a degree awarded from the University may be revoked for fraud, misrepresentation, or other violation of University standards in obtaining the degree, or for other serious violations committed by a student prior to
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graduation.

I. Withholding Degree: the University may withhold awarding a degree otherwise earned until the completion of all sanctions imposed.

D-2. More than one of the sanctions listed above may be imposed for any single violation.

D-3. A student who fails to comply with the sanction(s) imposed shall have a disciplinary hold placed on his/her record until the student complies with all sanctions imposed.

D-4. Disciplinary sanctions other than suspension, expulsion or revocation or withholding of a degree shall not be made part of the student’s permanent academic record, but shall become part of the student’s disciplinary record. Such sanctions shall be expunged from the student’s disciplinary record seven (7) years after final disposition of the case.

D-5. The Regents of UI adopted guidelines for enforcing alcohol restrictions which include sanctions for violation of these restrictions. The sanctions below are the minimum sanctions imposed on students who have violated alcohol restrictions as described in the Code.

D-6. The University may notify parents of students under the age of 21 when a student has been found to have committed a drug or alcohol-related violation. The student will be responsible for administrative and educational costs of any and all sanctions imposed for alcohol related violations.

D-7. Sanctions imposed for alcohol related violations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First infraction:</th>
<th>Second infraction:</th>
<th>Third infraction:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open container or minor in possession violations.</td>
<td>Without injury; or without conduct likely to lead to injury.</td>
<td>Without injury; or without conduct likely to lead to injury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of educational program.</td>
<td>Completion of a treatment and/or educational program.</td>
<td>Referral to the appropriate administrative body of the institution for appropriate action, which must include, at least, suspension from school for one semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal distribution of alcohol.</td>
<td>With injury; or conduct likely to lead to injury.</td>
<td>With injury; or conduct likely to lead to injury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of community service, period of probation, and educational programs.</td>
<td>Notification to the criminal justice system, strict probation, and, a treatment or educational program.</td>
<td>Referral to the appropriate administrative body of the institution for appropriate action, which must include, at least, referral to the criminal justice system and expulsion from the institution for one year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. INTERIM SUSPENSION. In certain circumstances, the Dean of Students may impose an interim suspension
on a student prior to completing the investigation described in C-1-e. The interim suspension is effective immediately. During the interim suspension, the student shall be denied access to the residence halls and/or to the campus (including classes) and/or all other University activities or privileges for which the student might otherwise be eligible, as the Dean of Students may determine to be appropriate, and as provided in the written notice.

E-1. Interim suspension may be imposed only:

a. To ensure the safety and well-being of members of the University community or preservation of University property;

b. To ensure the student’s own physical or emotional safety and well-being; or

c. If the student poses an ongoing threat of disruption of, or interference with, the normal operations of the University.

E-2. A student placed on interim suspension shall be given written notice of this action, which shall include:

a. the reasons for the interim suspension, and

b. information concerning the right to appeal the decision for interim suspension.

E-3. Interim Suspension Review Process:

a. The student must submit a written document to DOS outlining the basis for the review and supporting documentation and/or other information.

b. The DOS will submit all documents received, as well as DOS response, to the Chair of SDRB within 1 day of receiving the student’s documents.

c. The Chair of SDRB and at least two other SDRB members will review all submitted materials and render a decision within 3 days. This decision is a final institutional decision subject to review by the Board of Regents in accordance with C-9.
PREAMBLE: This section outlines UI's student judicial system. This section dates from the 1979 Handbook with relatively minor revisions, the last of which, in July 1993, changed the membership and the quorum of the University Judicial Council. In 2008 the committee composition previously in B-2 was moved into FSH 1640 Committee Directory. For further information, contact the Dean of Students (208-885-6757). [rev. 7-08]

CONTENTS:

A. Introduction
B. Judicial and Disciplinary Bodies

A. INTRODUCTION. UI's student judicial system is established and maintained for the prosecution and handling of disciplinary matters concerning UI students (as “student” is defined in the preamble to the Statement of Student Rights [2200]). Any and all matters consistent with the Student Code of Conduct [2300] and the Statement of Student Rights are handled by the system under the following rules and regulations. [ed. 7-00]

B. JUDICIAL AND DISCIPLINARY BODIES. The system consists of the following: living-group disciplinary bodies, University Judicial Council (UJC), Faculty Senate, president, and regents. [ed. 6-09]

B-1. Living-Group Disciplinary Bodies.

a. Composition. Each living group has a disciplinary body, the composition of which is to be determined by the group.

b. Jurisdiction. Each living-group disciplinary body has jurisdiction only over those violations that are primarily internal in cause and effect. If the offense also violates the Student Code of Conduct, the living group must communicate with the ASUI student defender and the judicial officer in Student Advisory Services before taking jurisdiction. The determination of jurisdiction is decided by mutual agreement of the ASUI student defender, the judicial officer, and the complaining party. If the ASUI student defender, the judicial officer, and the complaining party fail to agree unanimously on the proper hearing body, the matter is referred to UJC, which decides the case on the merits. However, the living-group disciplinary body at all times has the right to decline to hear a case brought before it, in which instance the matter is referred to UJC, which will hear the case on the merits. If a living-group disciplinary body proceeds without jurisdiction, its proceedings, findings, and sentence are void and are no bar to a new trial.

c. Range of Sanctions. The living-group disciplinary body may order any sanction it deems just, so long as it is consistent with those stated in articles V and XI of the Student Code of Conduct and in the Statement of Student Rights.

B-2. University Judicial Council (see 1640.93)

a. Jurisdiction. [rev. 7-08]

(1) UJC has original jurisdiction in the following instances:

(a) Any violation of the Student Code of Conduct that may not be appropriately handled within the living-group disciplinary body. [See B-1.b.]

(b) Any violation of ASUI rules and regulations not specifically designated to be heard elsewhere.

(e) Any matter that a living-group disciplinary body declines to hear. [See B-1.b.]
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UI FACULTY-STAFF HANDBOOK  
Chapter II: STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICIES  
Section 2400: Student Judicial System

(UJC has appellate jurisdiction over decisions of living-group disciplinary bodies and decisions of the ASUI Judicial Council.  [The ASUI Judicial Council is an internal council of the ASUI. Please refer to ASUI governing policies for further information.)

b. Range of Sanctions. The UJC has the full range of sanctions set forth in the Student Code of Conduct. (see 2450.)

B-3. Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate has appellate jurisdiction over all student disciplinary proceedings and must comply with section IV, paragraph 11, item (d), of the Statement of Student Rights. [See 2450.]

B-4. President. The president has appellate jurisdiction over the Faculty Senate.

B-5. Board of Regents. The regents have final appellate jurisdiction within the UI system.
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APPEALS TO FACULTY SENATE IN DISCIPLINARY CASES

PREAMBLE: This section, added to the Handbook in May, 1984, outlines the appeal process in student disciplinary cases. For further information, contact the Dean of Students (208-885-6757).

CONTENTS:
A. Right of Appeal
B. Appellate Jurisdiction
C. Procedural Requirement
D. Procedures

A. RIGHT OF APPEAL. “Any party to a disciplinary hearing shall have the right to appeal the decision to the faculty or its duly authorized representative. Subsequent appeals may be taken to the president and to the regents when the president and the regents agree to hear the appeal.” [2200 IV-11]

B. APPELLATE JURISDICTION. “The Faculty Senate has appellate jurisdiction over all student disciplinary proceedings and must comply with section IV, paragraph 11, item (d), of the ‘Statement of Student Rights.’” [2400 B-3][ed. 6-09]

C. PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENT. “Appellate bodies shall establish their own procedures; these must include adequate notice to the parties and sufficient opportunity for the parties to prepare their arguments.” [2200 IV-11(d)]

D. PROCEDURES. Pursuant to the authority and responsibility cited above, the Faculty Senate has established the following procedures for the exercise of its appellate jurisdiction over student disciplinary proceedings: [ed. 6-09]

D-1. If a party to a disciplinary proceeding desires to lodge an appeal with the Faculty Senate, the party must notify the Faculty Senate to that effect, in writing, within two weeks following receipt by the party of the written decision of the University Judicial Council (UJC).

D-2. Within two weeks after receiving a notice of appeal, the Faculty Senate appoints five of its members, including one student, to constitute a panel with power to act on its behalf in hearing and deciding the appeal; one of the members is designated as chair. Persons appointed to the panel must have no interest in or involvement with the parties to or the subject matter of the case under appeal. [ed. 6-09]

D-3. The panel, as soon as possible after its appointment, sets the date, time, and place for the hearing and provides notice thereof, in writing, to both parties. The time set must provide the appellant with adequate opportunity to comply with the requirement stated immediately below.

D-4. The appellant must submit a brief to the panel, and see that a copy is delivered to the appellee, at least one week before the hearing date; a copy must be provided for each member of the panel.

D-5. The appellee must submit a brief to the panel, and see that a copy is delivered to the appellant, at least one day before the hearing date; a copy must be provided for each member of the panel.

D-6. A transcript of the UJC hearing is provided to the panel and to both parties by Student Advisory Services.
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D-7. At the hearing, the appellant is allowed 15 minutes for oral argument; the appellant may reserve a maximum of 5 minutes for rebuttal following the appellee’s argument. The appellee is allowed 15 minutes for oral argument and may not reserve any time.

D-8. Oral arguments are recorded on tape and the tape is stored in Student Advisory Services.

D-9. As to questions of law, the panel may review the record of the UJC hearing and all the evidence presented therein and may make an independent resolution of those questions of law.

D-10. As to questions of fact, the panel may reverse the decision of the UJC only on a showing of clear error. Further, on appeal by the university of an adverse UJC ruling, the defendant may not be placed in jeopardy a second time; the purpose of such an appeal is the clarification of rules and establishment of precedent.

D-11. The findings and decision of the panel must be based on concurrence of a majority of its members; these are issued in writing to the parties.
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VIVO at the University of Idaho

Report to the Faculty Senate
March 3, 2014

Jeremy Kenyon
University of Idaho Library
jkenyon@uidaho.edu
What is VIVO?

• A Service: Discovery service for research and creative activity across the University of Idaho
  • Provided by the UI Library
  • Hosting and support by the Northwest Knowledge Network, ORED

• Software: An open-source semantic-web-based application

• Data: Institution-wide, publicly-visible information about research and researchers

• A Community: An open community with strong national and international participation
The value of VIVO

- Enables discovery of research and creative activity for those within and those outside of the university
- Find collaborators and mentors within UI and its partners
- Only standard way to exchange information about research and researchers across diverse institutions.
- Supports search, analysis and visualization
- Structure is highly flexible - covers research resources and services, facilities, publications, datasets, and more
- Provides digital documents with context – key to understanding
Can search/browse for people, organizations, grants, publications, and more:
Faculty profiles document their positions, background, achievements and research activities.
Built-in visualizations can show the relationships between people and groups.
Or look at the activities of a group over time
Data is available both through the website and over the web. This chart is generated on a different server from VIVO, using a completely different tool, no authentication needed.

### Number of Awards By Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>organization</th>
<th>count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Institute for Food and Agriculture</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Center for Research Resources (NCRR)</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of General Medical Sciences (NIGMS)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Research Service</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF Division of Earth Sciences (EAR)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF Division of Environmental Biology (DEB)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF Division of Chemistry (CHE)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Research Service</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF Division of Chemical, Bioengineering, Environmental, and Transport Systems (CBET)</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF Division of Chemistry (CHE)</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF Division of Environmental Biology (DEB)</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF Division of Earth Sciences (EAR)</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of General Medical Sciences (NIGMS)</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIVO supports creating context for university activity and allows you to “follow your nose”
• U-Idaho VIVO: http://vivo.nkn.uidaho.edu

• VIVO Network: http://vivoweb.org

• Other academic installations:
  – U. Florida:  http://vivo.ufl.edu
  – Cornell:  http://vivo.cornell.edu
  – Colorado:  http://vivo.colorado.edu/