Consent Agenda:
  • Confirm appointments to University Budget & Finance and Campus Planning Committees

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
  • Minutes of the 2013-14 Faculty Senate Meeting #5, September 24, 2013 (vote)

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.
  • Culture and Climate Assessment Committee/Cultural Competencies (Suarez/Baillargeon)
  • Parking and Transportation Services (Root)

VII. Committee Reports.

  Committee on Committees – Vacancies/changes Summer/early Fall 2013 (vote) (Ytreberg)
  University Curriculum Committee:
  • FS-14-002 (UCC-14-005) Rename Foreign Language major and Women’s Studies minor (vote) (Mihelich)
  • FS-14-003 (UCC-14-006) Discontinue GR Certificate, Semiconductor Theory and Devices (vote) (Willis)
  • FS-14-004 (UCC-14-007) Discontinue GR Certificate, Water Resource Engineering (vote) (Willis)
  • FS-13-005 (UCC-14-008) Discontinue GR Certificate, Advanced Materials Design (vote) (Willis)

VII. Special Orders.
  • FS-14-006 –FSH 4700 – visitors to attend class, strike “visiting scholars” (vote) (Eckwright)

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.
  • University Judicial Council referral

X. Adjournment.

Professor Trish Hartzell, Chair 2013-2014, Faculty Senate
Attachments: Minutes of 2013-2014 FS Meeting #5
  Parking and Transportation Services
  Committee vacancies/changes
  FS-14-002 through FS-14-006
  UJC referral
**Present:** Aiken (w/o vote), Awwad-Rafferty, Baillargeon, Becker, Brandt, Couture (Boise), Eckwright (w/o vote), Flores, Frey, Karsky, Kennelly, Morra, Murphy, Pendegraft, Perret, Pregitzer, Safaii, Smith, Stoll, Stuntzner (Coeur d’Alene), Ytreberg **Absent:** Bird, Cobb, Davis, Hartzell, Manic, Miller, Ostrom, Qualls, Wolf

**Guests:** 8

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

**Minutes:** It was moved and seconded (Stoll, Baillargeon) to approve the minutes of meeting #4. Motion carried unanimously.

**Chair’s Report.** Vice-Chair Ytreberg reported on the following items:
- Senator Awwad-Rafferty became chair of the Board of Directors of the International Environmental Design Research Association in August 2013. Senator Awwad-Rafferty explained that this is an interdisciplinary organization that studies the relationship between humans and their environment.
- Staff Appreciation Fair is Thursday, September 26, from 10am-2pm. All staff are invited to attend.
- University of Idaho Homecoming is this weekend and there are many events scheduled to celebrate the occasion, including the 104th homecoming parade in downtown Moscow at 10am on Saturday. The football game features the University of Idaho vs Temple University at 2pm in the dome.
- French Film Festival continues tonight at the Kenworthy Theater with a showing of the film “Rust and Bone.”
- Vice-Chair Ytreberg added that this is his first time chairing a senate meeting and he wanted to quickly review a few rules of order before beginning today’s discussion:
  - Senators must raise their hand and wait to be recognized by the chair before speaking.
  - A senator may not speak on a given issue twice until everyone who wishes to speak has spoken once.
  - All remarks must be courteous and directed to the Vice-Chair (not directed to other senators, guests, or observers).

**Provost’s Report.** Provost Aiken reported on the following items:
- There will be communications coming out this week on two items:
  - efforts to refine the staff classification system.
  - work toward adding specificity to Focus for the Future.
- Provost Aiken echoed Vice-Chair Ytreberg’s reminder about Homecoming events. She added that students are very engaged in Homecoming activities and alumni will also be in Moscow, strolling around the campus. Provost Aiken encouraged all to showcase that which we excel at: the friendly nature and the great participatory atmosphere at the University of Idaho. We are glad to have these UI supporters come here and we want to be sure we make them feel welcome.

Vice-Chair Ytreberg then invited Bruce Pitman, Dean of Students, and Craig Chatriand, Associate Dean of Students, to introduce the Student Code of Conduct discussion by providing information about the motivation for the proposed update. Vice-Chair Ytreberg reminded senators that the purpose of today’s meeting is to discuss overarching ideas. Senate will not be doing any word-smithing at this time nor will we be voting on this document today.
Dr. Pitman began by noting that over the past few years at the University of Idaho we have been taking a hard look at ourselves regarding safety and alcohol issues. We have commissioned some groups to help us think about how we should do things differently and an area that has come to the forefront is a desire on UI’s part to make changes to the Student Code of Conduct. These proposed changes are long overdue and will help us address campus safety issues. In some cases the changes that we are talking about and eventually will be recommending are common practice on many campuses. Our current code of conduct was written in 1969-1970, well before Virginia Tech [tragedy], well before the internet, and well before a lot of guidance we have received in the past few years on Title IX relating to sexual assault and stalking issues. Our current document was written when the environment, culture and issues were quite different from what they are now. We are starting a broad conversation at UI about what our social contract with students ought to be and we want to begin this conversation by putting the proposal on the table. Craig Chatriand, Bruce Pitman and a few others are taking this proposal to stakeholders for input, including student leaders throughout the state, Faculty Affairs Committee if so directed by senate, individual faculty, small groups of faculty, and so on. The document will change as a result of input from stakeholders. The draft proposal before senators today is simply a “draft” and it is the result of work by UI staff that included looking at model codes and common practices at other institutions. Major priorities we are addressing with the proposed changes:

- Simplify our process. Our present process is very legalistic and the forms, language and some steps in the hearing process all feel more like a criminal court process than an administrative and educational process. We would like to streamline the process and make it possible to resolve appeal processes more quickly. We would like to have the process simplified and somewhat less formal which involves substantial changes.

- Extending jurisdiction of the code of conduct to off-campus behavior. We need this added tool in order to address campus safety issues. All of the public universities in our “neighborhood” have language that permits asserting jurisdiction off-campus. These institutions include: Washington State University, Boise State University, Idaho State University, Eastern Washington University, University of Montana, Montana State University, and University of Washington. UI is probably 10-15 years behind common practice followed at other institutions.

There is one other challenge to amending this document. Faculty-Staff Handbook 2200 “Statement of Student Rights,” provides for the following amendment practice: changes require a vote by a minimum of 35% of the student body with 2/3 of the votes favoring the changes. Changes also require a majority positive vote by a quorum of faculty. This is an incredibly high standard for any amendment process and we are trying to figure out how to handle this. For more information, see FSH 2200 available via this link: http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/2200.html We will continue to get input on these proposed changes over the next weeks and we will not bring it back to senate until Senate Leadership feels it is ready to come forward.

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

- **What is the timeframe for taking this to the students?** We anticipate spending the better part of October going to student groups and it will take several weeks.

- **Some students, particularly those at the centers and other locations throughout the state, have concerns about the effectiveness of using email for required notifications, especially with the possibility of a meeting being scheduled with a coordinator within two days of the email notification being sent. Students may not be reading email messages frequently enough to receive a message concerning a meeting in a timely manner.** The Dean of Students’ office sometimes has challenges with finding students in order to deliver notices in person – students do not always attend class and they do not all live in the residence halls, so notices cannot be delivered there. UI does use email as an official source of communication and while we have attempted to connect with students in person, it is difficult to do.
• Perhaps we could add language about “attempting to contact students in person” regarding scheduling of meetings and hearings. If a student is not able to be contacted in person, the Dean of Students office could extend the meeting date by a day and/or send a message to the student’s school address or to their permanent address, in addition to sending the first email message.

Senators made the following observations regarding proposed changes to the Student Code of Conduct. The Bill of Rights is significantly reduced from the current FSH 2200, specifically:

• Students still have the freedom to associate but they lose the ability to do so without UI approval. This does not seem like true “freedom to associate.”
• The draft policy omits the following clause currently found in FSH 2200 “in no case shall the views or objectives of the association be a basis for exercising these or other regulatory powers.”
• Another clause removed from the draft code which is not as concerning is “In the event that UI regulations are violated, disciplinary action will be taken only against individual students and not against the association.”
• Other clauses from the current FSH 2200 that have been removed or substantially changed in the draft document include:
  o “No ex post facto regulation shall be enacted.” [FSH 2200, Section III]
  o Search and seizure language. [FSH 2200, Section IV]
  o Double jeopardy language. [FSH 2200, Section IV]
  o The right to not testify appears to remain in the new draft but it is not written in that language. It is preferable to make this right clearer in the new document.
  o Clauses that permit accused students to hear and question adverse witnesses have been omitted from the new document. While we recognize that we are moving away from this legalistic language, it is important that students who have been accused have the opportunity to see all of the evidence that has been brought against them.
  o Enumeration clause has been removed [“The enumeration of rights in this statement shall not be construed to deny or disparage other rights retained by students.” FSH 2200, Section VI]
  o Entire section on improper disclosure has been removed [FSH 2200, Section V]
• The current amendment process is set at a very “high bar” but in the proposed document there are no provisions for an amendment process. The current bar could be lowered and the ASUI standards for impeachment and other major changes could be used as a guideline for procedures and included in the Bill of Rights.
• Proposed document lacks a clear statement of presumption of innocence.

A senator responded to the above list of omissions to the proposed code of conduct as follows: It is a good idea to move away from the criminal process in these codes of conduct, especially in the whole first section. It is currently a confrontational, accusatory process and it makes it difficult for mediation to take place, for claims to be settled, to be proactive and to do different things that might enable the whole process to advance. I would omit the entire “association” section from the document because nothing in that section gives more protection than afforded by constitutional rights and could usually only result in less protection.

A senator commented that the notion of “honor” is one of the responsibilities of students. We should have the expectation that students will honor one another and treat one another in a specific way. I would like to hear students say “This is what we want to do because this is what we should do” and not have it be something we are supposed to do. Rather, we have an honor and duty to behave a certain
way. Many institutions have honor codes. It seems that we assume that ethical development will occur and it seems to me that maybe, Dean Pitman, we need to be doing more with the ethical development of our students.

Other concerns voiced by senators:

- The draft code does not allow for hearings, at all.
- Appeals’ process needs to take place somewhere outside of the Dean of Students’ office.
- Students are very apprehensive about expanding the jurisdiction of the policy although it makes sense if it is for an off-campus, school-related event or if it is being applied to students in other locations, for example. Students feel that if they go home and something happens there, it should not come back on them at their school. The statement needs to be further defined to state that the matter needs to relate to the university or to a community that is touched by the campus.
- The proposed policy is too vague in its scope [Article 1-A]: “conduct that adversely affects the university, community and/or person of its objective.” We need to define these objectives in the “definitions” portion of the policy or, at the very least, this portion of the policy needs to point to what these objectives are.
- Third-party notification needs some clarity. Article IV-C 11 refers to allegations of crimes of violence or sex offenses and it describes the circumstances for notifying victims and student, which seem to be after it has been determined that the crime has occurred. The last sentence of 11 states “This notification will generally occur at the same time as the notification to the student.” We need to add a step in which we notify the student that UI has determined there is a need to investigate the alleged crime or we need to change the proposed language so that we are not notifying third parties about alleged crimes that may not have occurred.
- Article IV F-3-c provides reasons for appeals relating to excessive sanctions. Would it be possible to keep data on infringements and sanctions, so that there is a baseline of some sort for imposing sanctions?
- Current code set a $25.00 limit on administration fees but the proposed code changes do not set a limit on fees. Restitution is mentioned and fees are vaguely mentioned in the amnesty policy, Article V 1, which states a student must “pay all associated fees.”
- Current code allows for students to work off restitution at minimum wage and it would be good for this language to be restored to Article V 1.
- Students who have no sanctions under the amnesty policy are still responsible for the payment of fees according to Article V 1a. There is nothing to prevent a student who is supposed to be protected under the amnesty policy from being assessed large fees. A penalty for not paying the fees could include not being able to register for classes the following semester or year, which effectively raises the price for a student to attend UI. Including this penalty in the amnesty policy is a bad idea.
- Article VI-A 8 and 9 address firearms issues in a contradictory manner: 8 prohibits firearms on university premises, but 9 allows for a firearm to be brought onto campus if it is encased and has a trigger lock attached.
- Good language in the draft about sexual harassment, sexual misconduct and gender discrimination but we need comparable language and protections regarding harassment/discrimination in regard to sexual orientation, nationality, ethnicity and race. It could be argued that these protections are included under the general harassment and discrimination language, but we need to make a stronger statement because we have trouble in the courts getting them to recognize sexual harassment is included under “gender discrimination.” Sexual orientation, nationality, ethnicity and race provisions in the code need language parallel to the gender discrimination provisions and stated explicitly in Article VI-A 18.
• The proposed code acknowledges electronic communications in Article VI-A 19, but does not reference them in 14 and 27. The code needs to recognize that instances of harassment could occur via email or other electronic means.

• Article V 6 states “This Amnesty Policy is not designed to protect or shield those students who repeatedly violate the Student Code of Conduct” but later in this paragraph the phrase “serious or repeated incidents” is used. This paragraph should consistently use the word “repeatedly” and “repeated” and not use the word “serious” in the second instance because that seems to suggest this policy may not apply in certain circumstances.

• Article VI-A 36 states “Failure to engage in responsible social conduct that reflects credit upon the University community and models good citizenship in any community.” This is vague – what is “responsible social conduct”? Most of us know it when we see it and it is likely behavior that reflects well on the university. Nevertheless, it needs to be better-defined.

• Article VI-B 1 contains the sentence “Determinations made or sanctions imposed under this Student Code of Conduct shall not be subject to change because criminal charges arising out of the same facts giving rise to violation of University rules were dismissed, reduced, or resolved in favor or against the criminal law defendant.” If the courts decide that a student did not commit an offense, it seems inappropriate for UI to have a lower burden of proof.

Dr. Chatriand and Dr. Pitman responded to these additional questions and comments from senators:

• **What off-campus conduct specifically are you trying to reach with this language and why are you trying to reach it?** We are trying to reach conduct that adversely affects the university because it adversely affects the university. We are most concerned about alcohol, hazing, bias or hate crimes and acts of violence that occur off-campus. It is important for us to be able to communicate our expectations to students whether they are on-campus or off-campus. This is not just about UI trying to change one person’s behavior; this is also intended to advocate for students because when there are off-campus violations of law or code of conduct – the victim is typically a student. We want to manage this when the students are on-campus, because their behaviors and risks do not stop. They come to our doorstep and to our classroom and we want some tools to address those kinds of issues. We also would like to be able to help the city resident who lives next-door to a house where there is a significant amount of high-risk party behavior. We would like to be able to intervene with our code of conduct to make a difference. There are many other examples. Generally the behaviors we are addressing involve a group of students and not just a random student going out and getting into difficulty off-campus. We are concerned about situations involving a single student, unless it involves other UI students or it is in the context of a university-related activity.

• **The only part that gives me heartburn, and gives me real heartburn, is that the Office of the Dean of Students shall, in its sole discretion – and I emphasize “sole discretion” – make that determination. I trust Dr. Pitman with my life, literally, but I do not know who his successor will be and I am not prepared to extend that same level of trust to his successor. I respectfully suggest, at minimum, there needs to be some review of that discretionary power – it is far too sweeping.** I thought those words were struck from the last draft. [Dr. Pitman added “They were, Dr. Chatriand!” and he followed that comment with “I believe those words should be struck from this proposal.”]

• **Two items that were not addressed in the proposed changes are provisions for statute of limitations (civil courts refer to it as a period of prescription) and double jeopardy, particularly as these apply to off-campus behaviors. Clearly, if something very bad happens, we want to be able to address it without time limitations. But for lesser infractions, will there be a time limit on addressing something that happened some years ago, for example?**
• It sounds like the majority of these examples involve violations of law that were being dealt with by police officers or other law enforcement officials. I assume you would be in contact with them and they would have to provide you with information about violations of code of conduct that occur off-campus. Often students will come to our office and complain or report a situation that they do not take to the police. There are a number of times when we learn of a situation that has not been handled by police.

• Regarding off-campus behavior, what is UI legally obligated to do in reference to Title IX and off-campus sexual violence that can be traced to university events or another university connection? It is perhaps more debatable when there is not a clear connection and ought the answer to this question inform our revised student code of conduct? The other part to this question is if it is something that we should be doing, do we have the legal right to do it? [G Costa provided the following response]: One of the things we are seeing is an increase in guidance from the [U.S.] Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights. The Department of Justice has gotten involved in a recent Montana case, so I expect to see more guidance come from that department, as well. The federal government is interested in ensuring that universities are providing the kind of climate they deem appropriate, that climate should be welcoming and safe for everyone. They talk about sexual violence and sexual harassment in Title IX. Title VI covers race, discrimination and national origin. We have not received specific guidance on Title VI in quite some time, but I would expect that they would want to see for race-based harassment and discrimination the same kinds of provisions as they do for sexual-based, gender-based and everything. Another example of cases where we would want off-campus jurisdiction is when two students get into a fight or one student rapes another student. Fortunately, because of past guidance we have amended the student code of conduct and we drafted FSH 2350 which expanded jurisdiction for sexual harassment which included sexual violence. I believe that the guidance and culture expected of the university by the government is not to look narrowly at just sex and gender but rather that we are creating a safe and welcoming community for all students, staff and employees. It is hard to draw specific boundaries and create a checklist of kinds of situations for which we want off-campus jurisdiction. We may get one on sexual harassment, another one on race and another one on something else. We need to have the flexibility to address these scenarios and even the most mundane situations. The senator’s point about “a lot of these things would involve law enforcement” – that may be true for a lot of cases, but not all. The second thing is that law enforcement process takes a long time and the burden of proof is much higher and at the end of the day, if that process comes out inconclusive, they do nothing. But we still have two students on campus, one was raped or beaten or harassed, and if we do not have off-campus jurisdiction, our hands are tied. We have two students who we have to engage with and deal with and try to provide a good, safe, healthy environment for education. There is a legal obligation on a number of things, and definitely, we should be doing more, always. As far as the authority for doing more, the student code of conduct is a social contract we have a lot of leeway and courts defer to universities for that. Courts have repeatedly stated that higher education is not a right, it is a privilege and you enter voluntarily. When you choose to apply to enter an institution of higher learning, you are accepting some responsibilities and many of them are unspoken. It is great to have a definition for everything so that everyone knows what they should be doing at all times, but some things are just impossible to define in any kind of comprehensive way. Playground rules – the things you learn about how to interact with others, such as manners and honor – how do you put these on paper? And if you could, it would probably take thousands of pages. We have been working on this for a long time and we know we are far from the end. We are being honest and frank when we ask for your input, thoughts and suggestions. We want this to be the best possible document for the university. Dr. Pitman added the post script: You are the ones who will be making the decision, not us. We are bringing the best proposal that we can. We are working on this and looking at what is working well and
what we are obligated to do. At some point in time it will be a vote of this body that determines how we fall on certain of these issues.

- I would like to add that Dr. Pitman and his colleagues are trying to help students and improve the culture with this revision. As we move forward and deliberate we should keep in mind that the place this is coming from is a good place.

- Provost Aiken added that she was an undergraduate involved in student government at the time this code of conduct was written and I need to put that out as you talk about what was happening in 1969-1970. Fair is fair. I was a lot different and so was the world – and honesty requires that I admit that upfront. I voted on this the first time around and I was one of those people who said you cannot trust faculty, administration or anyone over 30. To a senator’s inquiry of “And you discovered …?” Provost Aiken replied “True!”

- Article IV-C 8a provides for “sole discretion” of the Coordinator to determine whether a meeting that the student has missed will be rescheduled. Can a Coordinator refuse to reschedule, since rescheduling is the Coordinator’s sole discretion? Yes. The reason for this is that we often have students who will find every reason not to be able to meet with our office. They will reschedule and push things back and push things back at some point we need to have a meeting or the student does not come. This is part of being able to administer a process. In practice we try to accommodate students up to a point.

- Could we guarantee students at least one reschedule date that they [i.e., the students] name within a week or within a certain time-frame? Going back to a point made earlier by another senator – I trust you, your successor I do not know. We can chat about this. One of the things that happens is that in a very short timeframe we have had a lot of on-campus violations that we have had one person managing – a pretty tremendous caseload. For that person to keep track of who has had their one week and who has not had their one week. It becomes administratively challenging to try to track those things. We can talk about putting things like that in. Every time we do that, we multiply it by several hundred for case management and it is really, really difficult to do. That is the opposite side of trying in practice to make this happen. How do we check off the administration of it? We have this part here and then in this part we have this one. I appreciate that you trust me. It is pretty common in what we do in student affairs’ work. That is where the language comes from.

- A number of senators have mentioned concerns about the appeals process. We like having faculty involvement in the appeals process and I am worried about the timeline for doing so which will have the effect of weakening the involvement of the faculty. According to Article IV-F 5b, if a student makes an appeal it goes to the Dean of Students’ office and the dean decides whether the appeal meets the criteria. If it does meet the criteria and it involves a serious sanction, such as suspension or expulsion, then it goes to the faculty committee. The faculty committee provides a written recommendation to the Dean of Students within 5 days or as soon as is reasonable up to 15 days, as decided by the Dean of Students. There seems to be too much power there [i.e., with the Dean of Students]. I understand the need for a short timeframe but in a difficult case one week is a very short time period to bring together three faculty members to discuss the case. The timing worries me.

- Another concern has to do with graduate students. The proscription of the 5 days works well for students who are here on campus, but graduate students who may be in the field may honestly miss their appointment. If we have just one appointment and your done – this really shifts that presumption of innocence to a presumption of guilt. This is very disturbing and I agree with the other senator who proposed granting students at least one reschedule date. Put some language in there that allows for a secondary date that the student can propose. [G Costa provided the following response]: Some challenges relating to timeframe whether it has to do with appeals or meeting with the coordinator – some of these timeframes are imposed on us by the Department
of Education. In their 2011 guidance dealing with sexual harassment and sexual violence they said that all cases from the time that the school is notified of the allegation to the time that all appeals are completed should – on the highest end and most complicated case – take no more than 60 days. We have a State Board of Education (SBOE) policy that allows students to appeal to the board after all of the appeals are done at the institutional level. If we work back 60 days from the most extreme, most complicated case – the more days that you give and the more guarantees of time for the appeal, for the first meeting, and so on, the farther away we get from compliance with the Department of Education. There are multiple competing interests. One of them is ensuring that students have an opportunity to meet with the coordinator and share information. We want to ensure that when the appeals process is triggered that it presents whatever body that hears the appeal with enough time to do so. The process needs to be speedy enough to comply with all of the obligations imposed on us while ensuring that due process is met. If we could, we would love to give everyone indefinite amounts of time, because life happens and situations occur. The people who administer the code want to work with students and want to work with the appellate bodies. The appellate board is not an appellate board. It is merely a recommending board and the final judgment rests with the dean. Given that the dean is the supervisor of the coordinator, if the three faculty recommend a case should be dismissed, the dean now has to choose between three members of the faculty and one of his primary subordinates. I do not like that. I also do not like that there are no students on that appeal. I had the pleasure of working with a student on one of those and I am here to tell you that if I were a student I would rather be judged by the faculty than by a student. I think the entire appeals’ process is a sham. It has to be rewritten.

- Also, for students who are not on the Moscow campus, will the meetings with the coordinator take place in person or over the phone? In-person is a much more effective opportunity to express oneself, especially if one’s credibility is being judged. I encourage folks to consider whether there is a way to ensure that off-campus students have an opportunity to express themselves fully to the coordinator.

- Another senator inquired if it would be possible to use technology, such as that used for distance learning, for students who cannot travel to the Moscow campus for a meeting?

- Is the committee of three faculty members made up of senators or faculty who are appointed to the committee for the entire year or will it be a different three faculty each time a student appeals a case? What training is there for the members of the appeals’ committee? There also must be some student representation on the appeals committee. There ought to be consistency on the appeals’ committee.

- Vice-Chair Ytreberg suggested that this would be a committee appointed by senate and members would serve for a one-year-term. Secretary Eckwright added that her understanding from the proposed revisions is that this appeals committee would not be a standing committee, such as the current University Judicial Council (UJC), but would be appointed by senate as needed to hear appeals — which is what we have done for certain kinds of appeals in the past, i.e., appeals that have already been through the UJC. [G Costa provided the following response]: The appeals committee is one of the more recent additions, but I was not at the meeting with senate leadership when this was discussed. This would be a policy decision and it could go either way or whatever makes sense would be fine. Dr. Chatriand said there is a wide variety of ways to do appeals and for him, the most important thing about the appeals’ process is that it is timely. At this point it takes months for students to go from the “responsible” or “not responsible” state to an appeal. It has to be fast and it needs to be year-round. We have some bad behaviors that might happen near the end of the semester in May. The Department of Education and Office of Civil Rights does not care that people on the committee were on vacation or that they are on 9-month or 10-month appointment. It has to be fast and it has to be year-around. It can be done
lots of different ways, but those are the things that we have to do to manage the system with the timeframes that are imposed on us.

- **I agree with Dr. Chatriand. There has to be an appeal, it has to be meaningful and it has to be outside the Dean of Students’ office. I like the committee idea and if we go that direction we will need to add a standing committee or whatever we do in the Faculty-Staff Handbook to make that happen. It will have to be all year long and if the faculty want to have a significant role in this process we need to suck-it-up and make that kind of committee work, because timeliness is absolutely crucial. I have been involved in cases that drag on forever and it is hideous for students to have it hanging over their heads. They may have reporting responsibilities, it may affect things like eligibility for programs and all kinds of things. The faculty need to stand behind whatever process we have to make sure it happens in a meaningful way. I think the problem student services may be having with faculty appeals is that we have not made them work in a meaningful way.**

- **I want to make sure I understand your concern, Dean Chatriand. What I heard you say, and I am not trying to put words in your mouth, is that you believe the current UJC cannot meet quickly enough to meet the needs of the adjudications that needs to be done. Is that a correct understanding of your comments? I would say two things: I do not think they can meet quickly enough. Are we talking about the hearing or the appeal? The senator responded that UJC currently does not hear appeals. We had two last year and none the year before. The inference that I made is that your concern is over UJC’s ability to meet. My understanding is they met about 20 times last year. What I am hearing you say is that they cannot meet in sufficiently timely fashions to meet the needs of the adjudication process. Dr. Chatriand responded: For UJC, often they cannot, but that is a pretty small point. For me, the UJC system is very adversarial and the main impetus for moving away from the UJC system is more “how we do our business” – moving away from that adversarial role. The senator responded: Now I am really confused because a moment ago you said your major concern over the appeals was timeliness and I am using UJC as the model for what this committee would look like. Are you telling me that UJC cannot meet in a timely fashion? Dr. Chatriand responded: For example, I believe we are in the fifth week of the semester right now – we would not have been able to have a UJC hearing up until this week, because we had to get people appointed, we had to get people trained and we had to get peoples’ schedules together. Certainly there have been infractions of the student code of conduct by now. Same thing happens over the summer with the UJC. My comment earlier was specifically about appeals. We have not put appeals together in a timely way, but often our UJC meetings are not near as timely as we could do in another type of system.**

- **It seems we need a sufficiently large pool of faculty and students with recurring experience so a committee can be formed and respond in a timely way – whether it is the UJC or a subcommittee of senate or a larger pool of people who sign up for training and who will be ready to serve when this comes up.**

Dr. Pitman expressed his thanks for the respectful, thoughtful conversation with particular thanks to Senator Kennelly for his “homework” on this issue. Please email him with any additional comments you may want to provide.

**Adjournment:** It was moved and seconded (Murphy, Karsky) to adjourn at 5pm. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Gail Z. Eckwright
Secretary to Faculty
PTS plans for the future

- **Pedestrian crossing/Traffic calming projects**
  - Deakin between the SUB and VandalStore
  - 6th St. – Academic mall
  - Construction drawings being completed with Summer construction anticipated

- **Bicycle racks added at North side of Renfrew off Academic Mall**
  - Up to 80 new racks added with 20-30 covered
  - New, improved circulation pathway between Rayburn and Academic Mall
  - Meeting greatest demand for additional bike storage in upper Academic mall area between Commons, Library, Renfrew, Ag Science, Brink/Phinney

- **Permits**
  - Continue strategy that began in 2008 to increase Residential permit price ($147) up to Red ($172) by FY16
  - Proposal for Residential permit price increase from $147 to $160 for FY15
  - No other permit changes anticipated at this time

- **Lot Improvements**
  - Design to improve lots 14 and 35

- **Pedestrian Improvements**
  - Complete gaps in sidewalk system
    - between lot 24 and 34 along Stadium
    - West side of Blake between Campus Drive and Sweet Ave.
  - Walkway Zone improvements – improve pedestrian orientation/limit non-essential vehicle travel
    - Surface treatment from asphalt to paving system
    - Improved access control
    - Improved drop-off points

**Campus projects/issues related to PTS**

- IRIC research building
- Education building remodel
- Student Health Center
- Law School Elevator
- Campus Signage
- Perimeter Drive outdoor lighting phase 2
- Entry monument/signage – Stadium, Perimeter
Centrally located parking structure considerations

- **Costs** (estimated)
  - $25K - $30K/space project costs – basic concrete design
  - Costs depend on site issues, size/number of spaces, design/materials
  - Example – 150 space structure = $4.5M
  - 10 year bond annual debt = $500K – permit prices would increase 50% to cover
  - Maintenance costs would be additional
  - Added security likely required
  - Ticket booth/operational staffing would be additional – national average for maintenance and operational costs for structures in vicinity of $2K-$3K/space annually

- **Who pays – 2 main options**
  - Spread cost over all parkers – permit prices would need to increase approx. 50%
    - The permit holders who don’t park there may not be in favor of helping to fund
    - Only select number would be using structure at any one time
  - Users pay
    - Daily fee required $8 and up – who would be willing to pay that amount

- **Location**
  - No ideal location
  - Not identified in Long Range Campus Develop Plan
  - Needs location where additional vehicle traffic/circulation does not create negative impacts
  - Mixed use – retail, offices on ground floor with parking on upper floors
  - Day use and evening event related use near event centers/performance centers

- **Supply/Demand of parking**
  - Surplus of parking on campus within 8 minute walk of core – lots 56, 34, 14, 57 & 60
  - Generally available metered or timed spaces
## 2013-14 Committee Appointments

Vacancies to Senate Committees over Summer/Fall 2013 – Committee on Committee's trying to fill.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee/reason</th>
<th>Vacancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Hearing Board</strong> – Aiken (2014) need replacement</td>
<td>Faculty/Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Petitions</strong>: Rebecca Tallent and Bob Dickow, Spring 2014 (both on sabbatical)</td>
<td>Faculty (Alt) Faculty (Alt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admissions</strong>: Frank Jacobus left UI</td>
<td>Faculty (Alt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commencement</strong>: Enloe Sabbatical Fall 2013</td>
<td>Faculty (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Appeals</strong>: Kevin Woelfel left UI (2015 term)</td>
<td>Dept. Admin. (Alt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library Affairs</strong>: Ron McFarland (2014) Sabbatical Fall 2013</td>
<td>Faculty F13 – unnecessary does not meet (Gail correct?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching &amp; Advising</strong>: Nicotra (2014) Sabbatical Fall 2013</td>
<td>Faculty F13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ubuntu</strong>: Sandra Pinel left UI</td>
<td>Faculty (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UCGE</strong>: Jason Porter, B&amp;E, has class fall 2013 UCGE meets,</td>
<td>Faculty B&amp;E – F13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Committee Changes/Vacancies Filled (approved by ConC 9/27/13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee/reason</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Petitions</strong>: Satz – now dean, stepped down</td>
<td>Jim Gregson, Associate Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities Scheduling</strong> Faculty 2016 term</td>
<td>New Senate committee to be formed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Affairs</strong>: Stephen Lee sabbatical Fall 2013</td>
<td>Kenton Bird, Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grievance Committee for Student Employees:</strong></td>
<td>Beth Canzoneri, Faculty (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Honors Program:</strong></td>
<td>Sanjay Sisodiya replaces Andrew Nutting (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong>: Beth Canzoneri now faculty, was staff</td>
<td>April Buvel, Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Appointments 2013-14 (approved by ConC 9/27/13)

ASUI (undergraduate students)
- Americans with Disabilities Act Advisory Committee: Jessica Smith
- Committee on Committees: Max Cowan
- Facilities Scheduling Policy Committee: Sarah Vetsmany
Arts Committee
Taylor Williams
Arts Committee
Kate Ricart
Library Affairs Committee
Tyler Wittreich
Grievance procedures for student employees
Keaghan Caldwell
Grievance procedures for student employees
Katie Cramer
Grievance procedures for student employees
Katahrine Wongmankitkan
Grievance procedures for student employees
Patrick Tunison
Officer Education Committee
Steven Cleppe
Officer Education Committee
Scott McIntosh
Parking Committee
Halee Schafer
Parking Committee
Kelly Fisher
Safety and Loss-Control Committee
Grady Hepworth
Student Financial Aid Committee
Taylor Williams
Student Financial Aid Committee
Anthony Filicetti
Teaching and Advising Committee
Taylor Williams
Ubuntu
Hunter Howell
Ubuntu
Samantha Hansen
University Budget & Finance Committee
Hayley Lydig
University Budget & Finance Committee
Max Cowan
University Budget & Finance Committee
Nathan Fisher
University Committee for General Education
Colton Latting
University Committee for General Education
Alejandra Gonzalez
University Curriculum Committee
Ashley Morehouse
University Curriculum Committee
Andrew Baldridge
University Judicial Council
Caitlin McDevitt
University Judicial Council
John Bessler
University Judicial Council
Alysia Lohman
University Judicial Council
Kellie Koester
University Judicial Council
Bruno Bennett

GPSA (graduate students)
Library Affairs:
Somayeh Pasebani
Safety and Loss Control:
Sharmin Islam
UCC:
Tess Wolfenson
Univ. Judicial Council:
Jacob Commodore
Ubuntu (GPSA/SBA):
Amrit Dahal

SBA (Student Bar Association) University Budget and Finance – Neomi Gilmore
April 1, 2013

TO: Douglas Baker, Provost and Executive Vice President
FROM: Katherine G. Aiken, Dean, College of Letters, Arts & Social Sciences
RE: Name change for two programs in CLASS

I write to request a name change for two programs in CLASS.

First I request a name change for a degree program in the Department of Modern Languages and Cultures. Since the department has changed its name from Foreign Languages in accordance with best practice on the national level, it stands to reason that the Foreign Language Business B.A. degree should be re-titled Modern Language Business B.A.

The Department of Modern Languages and Cultures has worked closely with the College of Business and Economics to create a degree program that combines language preparation in Chinese, French, German, Japanese or Spanish with business skills that will prepare students for careers in international business.

It is in keeping with our efforts to provide University of Idaho students with vibrant and engaging degree programs.

Secondly, I write to request a name change for the current minor in Women’s Studies. The coordinator of Women’s Studies, Sandra Reineke of Political Science, was on sabbatical leave during academic year 2011-2012. Upon her return, she facilitated a meeting of the Women’s Studies faculty to discuss curriculum. Given the courses included in the minor and the scholarly focus of University of Idaho Women’s Studies faculty, the faculty voted to change the name of the minor to Women’s and Gender Studies.

This change aligns with national trends and more accurately reflects both the content and the intent of the University of Idaho minor. It is a more inclusive title.

I urge you to support both these changes with the State Board of Education Office.
Idaho State Board of Education
Proposal for Other Academic Program Activity and Professional-Technical Education

Date of Proposal Submission: May 7, 2013
Institution Submitting Proposal: University of Idaho
Name of College, School, or Division: College of Engineering
Name of Department(s) or Area(s): Electrical & Engineering

Program Identification for Proposed New, Modified, or Discontinued Program:
Title: Semiconductor Theory and Devices
Degree: Certificate – Graduate level
Method of Delivery: Live and Outreach/video
Proposed Starting Date: Summer 2014
Indicate if the program is: x Regional Responsibility | Statewide Responsibility

Indicate whether this request is either of the following:
☐ New Program (minor/option/emphasis or certificate)  x Discontinuance of an Existing Program/Option
☐ New Off-Campus Instructional Program
☐ New Instructional/Research Unit
☐ Contract Program/Collaborative
☐ Consolidation of an Existing Program
☐ Expansion of an Existing Program
☐ Other

DRAFT OK for Review - MDS
College Dean (Institution) Date
Graduate Dean (as applicable) Date
Chief Fiscal Officer (Institution) Date
Chief Academic Officer (Institution) Date
President Date
Vice President for Research (as applicable) Date
State Administrator, SDPTE (as applicable) Date
Academic Affairs Program Manager Date
Chief Academic Officer, OSBE Date
SBOE/OSBE Approval Date

May 7, 2013
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Before completing this form, refer to Board Policy Section III.G., Program Approval and Discontinuance. This proposal form must be completed for the creation of each new program and each program discontinuation. All questions must be answered.

1. Describe the nature of the request. Will this program/option be related or tied to other programs on campus? Please identify any existing program, option that this program will replace. If this is request to discontinue an existing program, provide the rationale for the discontinuance. Indicate the year and semester in which the last cohort of students was admitted and the final term the college will offer the program. Describe the teach-out plans for continuing students.

Request for the discontinuance of the Semiconductor Theory & Devices Certificate program provided in the Electrical & Engineering Department. No students have completed the certificate since inception. There is no plan for a teach-out because there are no students currently working on the certificate.

2. List the objectives of the program. The objectives should address specific needs (industry) the program will meet. They should also identify the expected student learning outcomes and achievements. This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

3. Briefly describe how the institution will ensure the quality of the program (i.e., program review). Will the program require specialized accreditation (it is not necessary to address regional accreditation)? If so, please identify the agency and explain why you do or do not plan to seek accreditation. This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

4. List new courses that will be added to curriculum specific for this program. Indicate number, title, and credit hour value for each course. Please include course descriptions for new and/or changes to courses. Attach a Scope and Sequence, SDPTE Form Attachment B, for professional-technical education requests. This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

5. Please provide the program completion requirements and attach to this proposal as Appendix A. This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

| Credit hours required in major: |
| Credit hours required in minor: |
| Credit hours in institutional general education or core curriculum: |
| Credit hours in required electives: |
| **Total credit hours required for completion:** |

6. Identify similar programs offered within Idaho or in the region by other colleges/universities. If the proposed request is similar to another state program, provide a rationale for the duplication. Institutions do not need to complete this section for PTE programs. This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

The University of Idaho is not aware of any other certificate programs similar to this regionally or within the state.
Degrees/Certificates offered by school/college or program(s) within disciplinary area under review

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

7. **Describe the methodology for determining enrollment projections.** If a survey of student interest was conducted, attach a copy of the survey instrument with a summary of results as Appendix B. **This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.**

8. **Enrollment and Graduates.** Provide a realistic estimate of enrollment at the time of program implementation and over three year period based on availability of students meeting the criteria referenced above. Include part-time and full-time (i.e., number of majors or other relevant data) by institution for the proposed program, last three years beginning with the current year and the previous two years. Also, indicate the number of graduates and graduation rates.

**Discontinuations.** Using the chart below include part-time and full-time (i.e., number of majors or other relevant data) by institution for the proposed discontinuation, last three years beginning with the current year and previous two years. Indicate how many students are currently enrolled in the program for the previous two years to include number of graduates and graduation rates.

---

**No students have been enrolled since inception.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Relevant Enrollment Data</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Graduate Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. **Will this program reduce enrollments in other programs at your institution?** If so, please explain.

No.

10. **Provide verification of state workforce needs such as job titles requiring this degree.** Include State and National Department of Labor research on employment potential. *This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.*

Using the chart below, indicate the total projected job openings (including growth and replacement demands in your regional area, the state, and nation. Job openings should represent positions which require graduation from a program such as the one proposed. Data should be derived from a source that can be validated and must be no more than two years old. *This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Describe the methodology used to determine the projected job openings. If a survey of employment needs was used, please attach a copy of the survey instrument with a summary of results as Appendix C.

b. Describe how the proposed change will act to stimulate the state economy by advancing the field, providing research results, etc.

c. Is the program primarily intended to meet needs other than employment needs, if so, please provide a brief rationale.

11. **Will any type of distance education technology be utilized in the delivery of the program on your main campus or to remote sites? Please describe.** *This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.*

12. **Describe how this request is consistent with the State Board of Education’s strategic plan and institution’s role and mission.** *This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.*

13. **Describe how this request fits with the institution’s vision and/or strategic plan.** *This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.*
not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals of Institution Strategic Mission</th>
<th>Proposed Program Plans to Achieve the Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. **Is the proposed program in your institution's Five-Year plan? Indicate below.** This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

| Yes | No x |
---|---|

If not on your institution’s Five-Year plan, provide a justification for adding the program.

The College of Engineering is preparing for ABET reaccreditation. The college’s preparation of this process aligns also with institutional policy for program review. The diligent review identified that there has not been strong demand as originally anticipated in the northern region as demonstrated by the enrollment data. It would not be prudent for the college to maintain the graduate level certificate or focus efforts on strong assessment or learning outcomes since there is no demand for the certificate.

15. **Explain how students are going to learn about this program and where students are going to be recruited from (i.e., within institution, out-of-state, internationally).** For request to discontinue program, how will continuing students be advised of impending changes and consulted about options or alternatives for attaining their educational goals?

No students have been working on this certificate program since inception.

16. **Program Resource Requirements.** Using the Excel spreadsheet provided by the Office of the State Board of Education, provide a realistic estimate of costs needed for the overall program. This should only include the additional costs that will be incurred and not current costs. Include both the reallocation of existing resources and anticipated or requested new resources. Second and third year estimates should be in constant dollars. If the program is contract related, explain the fiscal sources and the year-to-year commitment from the contracting agency(ies) or party(ies). Provide an explanation of the fiscal impact of the proposed discontinuance to include impacts to faculty (i.e., salary savings, re-assignments).

There is no fiscal impact. Students interested in this topic have completed graduate degrees. No students have been working on this certificate program since inception.
# Idaho State Board of Education
Proposal for Other Academic Program Activity and Professional-Technical Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Proposal Submission:</th>
<th>May 6, 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution Submitting Proposal:</td>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of College, School, or Division:</td>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Department(s) or Area(s):</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Identification for Proposed New, Modified, or Discontinued Program:**

| Title: | Water Resources Engineering |
| Degree: | Certificate – Graduate level |
| Method of Delivery: | Live and Outreach/video |
| Proposed Starting Date: | Summer 2014 |
| Indicate if the program is: | Regional Responsibility |

**Indicate whether this request is either of the following:**

- New Program (minor/option/emphasis or certificate)
- New Off-Campus Instructional Program
- New Instructional/Research Unit
- Contract Program/Collaborative
- Discontinuance of an Existing Program/Option
- Consolidation of an Existing Program
- Expansion of an Existing Program
- Other

**Draft OK for review - mds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Dean (Institution)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Research (as applicable)</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Dean (as applicable)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Administrator, SDPTE (as applicable)</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chief Fiscal Officer (Institution)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs Program Manager</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chief Academic Officer (Institution)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Academic Officer, OSBE</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBOE/OSBE Approval</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

March 16, 2012
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Before completing this form, refer to Board Policy Section III.G., Program Approval and Discontinuance. This proposal form must be completed for the creation of each new program and each program discontinuation. All questions must be answered.

1. **Describe the nature of the request.** Will this program(option) be related or tied to other programs on campus? Please identify any existing program, option that this program will replace. *If this is request to discontinue an existing program, provide the rationale for the discontinuance. Indicate the year and semester in which the last cohort of students was admitted and the final term the college will offer the program. Describe the teach-out plans for continuing students.*

Request for the discontinuance of the Water Resources Engineering Certificate program provided in the Civil Engineering Department. No students have completed the certificate since 2009. There is no plan for a teach-out because there are no students currently working on the certificate.

2. **List the objectives of the program.** The objectives should address specific needs (industry) the program will meet. They should also identify the expected student learning outcomes and achievements. *This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.*

3. **Briefly describe how the institution will ensure the quality of the program** *(i.e., program review).* Will the program require specialized accreditation (it is not necessary to address regional accreditation)? If so, please identify the agency and explain why you do or do not plan to seek accreditation. *This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.*

4. **List new courses that will be added to curriculum specific for this program.** Indicate number, title, and credit hour value for each course. Please include course descriptions for new and/or changes to courses. *Attach a Scope and Sequence, SDPTE Form Attachment B, for professional-technical education requests.* *This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.*

5. **Please provide the program completion requirements and attach to this proposal as Appendix A.** *This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.*

   | Credit hours required in major: |
   | Credit hours required in minor: |
   | Credit hours in institutional general education or core curriculum: |
   | Credit hours in required electives: |
   | **Total credit hours required for completion:** |

6. **Identify similar programs offered within Idaho or in the region by other colleges/universities.** If the proposed request is similar to another state program, provide a rationale for the duplication. Institutions do not need to complete this section for PTE programs. This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

   **The University of Idaho is not aware of any other certificate programs similar to this regionally or within the state**

*March 16, 2012*
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7. **Describe the methodology for determining enrollment projections.** If a survey of student interest was conducted, attach a copy of the survey instrument with a summary of results as Appendix B. *This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.*

8. **Enrollment and Graduates.** Provide a realistic estimate of enrollment at the time of program implementation and over three year period based on availability of students meeting the criteria referenced above. Include part-time and full-time (i.e., number of majors or other relevant data) by institution for the proposed program, last three years beginning with the current year and the previous two years. Also, indicate the number of graduates and graduation rates.

**Discontinuations.** Using the chart below include part-time and full-time (i.e., number of majors or other relevant data) by institution for the proposed discontinuation, last three years beginning with the current year and previous two years. Indicate how many students are currently enrolled in the program for the previous two years to include number of graduates and graduation rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Relevant Enrollment Data</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Graduate Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Relevant Enrollment Data</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Graduate Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in question 1, no students have earned this certificate since 2009.
9. **Will this program reduce enrollments in other programs at your institution?** If so, please explain.

No.

10. **Provide verification of state workforce needs such as job titles requiring this degree.** Include State and National Department of Labor research on employment potential. *This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.*

Using the chart below, indicate the total projected job openings (including growth and replacement demands in your regional area, the state, and nation. Job openings should represent positions which require graduation from a program such as the one proposed. Data should be derived from a source that can be validated and must be no more than two years old. *This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Describe the methodology used to determine the projected job openings. If a survey of employment needs was used, please attach a copy of the survey instrument with a summary of results as Appendix C.

b. Describe how the proposed change will act to stimulate the state economy by advancing the field, providing research results, etc.

c. Is the program primarily intended to meet needs other than employment needs, if so, please provide a brief rationale.

11. **Will any type of distance education technology be utilized in the delivery of the program on your main campus or to remote sites? Please describe.** *This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.*

12. **Describe how this request is consistent with the State Board of Education's strategic plan and institution’s role and mission.** *This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.*

13. **Describe how this request fits with the institution’s vision and/or strategic plan.** *This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals of Institution Strategic Mission</th>
<th>Proposed Program Plans to Achieve the Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. **Is the proposed program in your institution’s Five-Year plan? Indicate below.** *This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.*

Yes [ ] No [x]
If not on your institution’s Five-Year plan, provide a justification for adding the program.

The College of Engineering is preparing for ABET reaccreditation. The college’s preparation of this process aligns also with institutional policy for program review. The diligent review identified that there has not been strong demand as originally anticipated in the northern region as demonstrated by the enrollment data. It would not be prudent for the college to maintain the graduate level certificate or focus efforts on strong assessment or learning outcomes since there is no demand for the certificate.

15. Explain how students are going to learn about this program and where students are going to be recruited from (i.e., within institution, out-of-state, internationally). For request to discontinue program, how will continuing students be advised of impending changes and consulted about options or alternatives for attaining their educational goals?

No students have been working on this certificate program since 2009.

16. Program Resource Requirements. Using the Excel spreadsheet provided by the Office of the State Board of Education, provide a realistic estimate of costs needed for the overall program. This should only include the additional costs that will be incurred and not current costs. Include both the reallocation of existing resources and anticipated or requested new resources. Second and third year estimates should be in constant dollars. If the program is contract related, explain the fiscal sources and the year-to-year commitment from the contracting agency(ies) or party(ies). Provide an explanation of the fiscal impact of the proposed discontinuance to include impacts to faculty (i.e., salary savings, re-assignments).

There is no fiscal impact. Students interested in this topic have completed graduate degrees. No students have been working on this certificate program since 2009.
Idaho State Board of Education
Proposal for Other Academic Program Activity and Professional-Technical Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Proposal Submission:</th>
<th>May 7, 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution Submitting Proposal:</td>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of College, School, or Division:</td>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Department(s) or Area(s):</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Identification for Proposed New, Modified, or Discontinued Program:

| Title: | Adv. Materials Design Certificate |
| Degree: | Certificate – Graduate level |
| Method of Delivery: | Live and Video Outreach |
| Proposed Starting Date: | Summer 2014 |

Indicate if the program is:

- X Regional Responsibility
- Statewide Responsibility

Indicate whether this request is either of the following:

- New Program (minor/option/emphasis or certificate)
- New Off-Campus Instructional Program
- New Instructional/Research Unit
- Contract Program/Collaborative
- Discontinuance of an Existing Program/Option
- Consolidation of an Existing Program
- Expansion of an Existing Program
- Other

Draft OK for review - mds

College Dean (Institution) | Date |
--------------------------|------|
Vice President for Research (as applicable) | Date |

Graduate Dean (as applicable) | Date |
State Administrator, SDPTE (as applicable) | Date |

Chief Fiscal Officer (Institution) | Date |
Academic Affairs Program Manager | Date |

Chief Academic Officer (Institution) | Date |
Chief Academic Officer, OSBE | Date |

President | Date |
SBOE/OSBE Approval | Date |
Before completing this form, refer to Board Policy Section III.G., Program Approval and Discontinuance. This proposal form must be completed for the creation of each new program and each program discontinuation. All questions must be answered.

1. **Describe the nature of the request.** Will this program/option be related or tied to other programs on campus? Please identify any existing program, option that this program will replace. **If this is request to discontinue an existing program, provide the rationale for the discontinuance. Indicate the year and semester in which the last cohort of students was admitted and the final term the college will offer the program. Describe the teach-out plans for continuing students.**

   Request for the discontinuance of the Adv Materials Design Certificate program provided in the Mechanical Engineering Department. No students have completed this certificate since its inception in 2000-2001. There is no plan for a teach-out.

2. **List the objectives of the program.** The objectives should address specific needs (industry) the program will meet. They should also identify the expected student learning outcomes and achievements. **This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.**

3. **Briefly describe how the institution will ensure the quality of the program** (i.e., program review). Will the program require specialized accreditation (it is not necessary to address regional accreditation)? If so, please identify the agency and explain why you do or do not plan to seek accreditation. **This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.**

4. **List new courses that will be added to curriculum specific for this program.** Indicate number, title, and credit hour value for each course. Please include course descriptions for new and/or changes to courses. **Attach a Scope and Sequence, SDPTE Form Attachment B, for professional-technical education requests.** This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

5. **Please provide the program completion requirements and attach to this proposal as Appendix A.** **This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.**

   | Credit hours required in major: |
   | Credit hours required in minor: |
   | Credit hours in institutional general education or core curriculum: |
   | Credit hours in required electives: |
   | **Total credit hours required for completion:** |

6. **Identify similar programs offered within Idaho or in the region by other colleges/universities.** If the proposed request is similar to another state program, provide a rationale for the duplication. Institutions do not need to complete this section for PTE programs. This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

   **The University of Idaho is not aware of any other certificate programs similar to this regionally or within the state**

*March 16, 2012*  
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Degrees/Certificates offered by school/college or program(s) within disciplinary area under review

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

7. **Describe the methodology for determining enrollment projections.** If a survey of student interest was conducted, attach a copy of the survey instrument with a summary of results as Appendix B. *This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.*

8. **Enrollment and Graduates.** Provide a realistic estimate of enrollment at the time of program implementation and over three year period based on availability of students meeting the criteria referenced above. Include part-time and full-time (i.e., number of majors or other relevant data) by institution for the proposed program, last three years beginning with the current year and the previous two years. Also, indicate the number of graduates and graduation rates.

**Discontinuations.** Using the chart below include part-time and full-time (i.e., number of majors or other relevant data) by institution for the proposed discontinuation, last three years beginning with the current year and previous two years. Indicate how many students are currently enrolled in the program for the previous two years to include number of graduates and graduation rates.

As indicated in question 1, no students are working on this certificate, and no graduates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Relevant Enrollment Data</th>
<th>Number of Graduates</th>
<th>Graduate Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Year 1 Previous</td>
<td>Year 2 Previous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Will this program reduce enrollments in other programs at your institution? If so, please explain.

No

10. Provide verification of state workforce needs such as job titles requiring this degree. Include State and National Department of Labor research on employment potential. This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

Using the chart below, indicate the total projected job openings (including growth and replacement demands in your regional area, the state, and nation. Job openings should represent positions which require graduation from a program such as the one proposed. Data should be derived from a source that can be validated and must be no more than two years old. This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Describe the methodology used to determine the projected job openings. If a survey of employment needs was used, please attach a copy of the survey instrument with a summary of results as Appendix C.

b. Describe how the proposed change will act to stimulate the state economy by advancing the field, providing research results, etc.

c. Is the program primarily intended to meet needs other than employment needs, if so, please provide a brief rationale.

11. Will any type of distance education technology be utilized in the delivery of the program on your main campus or to remote sites? Please describe. This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

12. Describe how this request is consistent with the State Board of Education's strategic plan and institution’s role and mission. This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

13. Describe how this request fits with the institution’s vision and/or strategic plan. This question is
not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals of Institution Strategic Mission</th>
<th>Proposed Program Plans to Achieve the Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Is the proposed program in your institution's Five-Year plan? Indicate below. This question is not applicable to requests for discontinuance.

   No students have ever completed this certificate program

   Yes ___    No   X___

If not on your institution's Five-Year plan, provide a justification for adding the program.

The College of Engineering is preparing for ABET reaccreditation. The college’s preparation of this process aligns also with institutional policy for program review. The diligent review identified that there has not been strong demand as originally anticipated in the northern region as demonstrated by the enrollment data. It would not be prudent for the college to maintain the graduate level certificate or focus efforts on strong assessment or learning outcomes since there is no demand for the certificate.

15. Explain how students are going to learn about this program and where students are going to be recruited from (i.e., within institution, out-of-state, internationally). For request to discontinue program, how will continuing students be advised of impending changes and consulted about options or alternatives for attaining their educational goals?

   No students have worked on this certificate program.

16. Program Resource Requirements. Using the Excel spreadsheet provided by the Office of the State Board of Education, provide a realistic estimate of costs needed for the overall program. This should only include the additional costs that will be incurred and not current costs. Include both the reallocation of existing resources and anticipated or requested new resources. Second and third year estimates should be in constant dollars. If the program is contract related, explain the fiscal sources and the year-to-year commitment from the contracting agency(ies) or party(ies). Provide an explanation of the fiscal impact of the proposed discontinuance to include impacts to faculty (i.e., salary savings, re-assignments).

   There is no fiscal impact, no students completed the program.
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GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF INSTRUCTORS

PREAMBLE: This section outlines certain general responsibilities of all UI instructors in their classes. This material is mostly unchanged from the 1979 Handbook; subsection A was added in May of 1984 and much changed again in July of 1990. Unless otherwise noted, the text is as of July 1996. Further information may be obtained from the Registrar’s Office (208-885-6731) or the Provost’s Office (208-885-6448). [ed. 7-00]

CONTENTS:
A. Registration Duties
B. Course Objectives and Grading System
C. Proscribed Subjects
D. Academic Dishonesty
E. Warnings for Unsatisfactory Academic Performance
F. Administration of Classes

A. REGISTRATION DUTIES. In 4310, which concerns academic advising and counseling, it is stated that the responsibility of faculty members to perform those functions is second only to that for teaching. At the time of preregistration and registration, the volume of student advising and of other steps in the process is very great and very concentrated. All faculty members, and many staff members, may be called on and should be available to assist during this period. Some may have duties assigned by their deans or departmental administrators; others may assist with the central registration under the registrar’s supervision. Performance of some of the routine steps in preregistration and registration should be delegated to adequately instructed and supervised nonfaculty personnel so that faculty members can be primarily concerned with the curricular guidance of individual students.

B. COURSE OBJECTIVES AND GRADING SYSTEM. Instructors are expected to take some time in the first or second class session to discuss course objectives and to explain the grading system that is to be used. In particular, the extent to which grades are affected by attendance should be made clear at the beginning of the course.

C. PROSCRIBED SUBJECTS. Under the UI’s charter, “no instruction either sectarian in religion or partisan in politics shall ever be allowed in any department of the university.”

D. ACADEMIC DISHONESTY. Instructors should proctor examinations diligently and should investigate all cases of suspected or alleged dishonesty in their classes. [See 2300 II. Also see regulation O-2 in the catalog.]

E. WARNINGS FOR UNSATISFACTORY ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE.

E-1. It is an instructor’s responsibility to send a “Warning” notice whenever repeated absence or inadequate work on the part of a student is noted. They should not hesitate to issue warnings; the purpose is to benefit the student—not to harass or cause additional difficulty. Each notice should indicate “warn” or “counsel,” as appropriate.

E-2. The number of absences may be considered excessive when it exceeds the number of credits assigned to the course. Notices reporting absence should show the date of each absence during the period covered by the notice. (A student who is absent because of illness may explain the absence to the instructor, and the instructor will decide whether the explanation justifies excusing the absence. An instructor may verify a student’s report that he or she was at the Student Health Service for treatment by calling the director. The Student Health Service does not provide written excuses. See regulation M in the catalog for procedures applicable to absences that are officially sanctioned.)

E-3. A supply of official “Warning” notice forms (pink slips) is available in departmental and college offices. When an instructor has filled out one of these, it is sent to the Registrar’s Office where it is duplicated and then sent on, usually within 24 hours, to the student’s academic dean. In this way, these officers are enabled to make early investigations and take appropriate corrective action.
E-4. The student’s dean and the administrative officers concerned have the responsibility to act promptly on each warning submitted by instructors. Whenever “counsel” has been indicated, a report of the disposition of the case should be sent to the instructor. One valuable result of prompt follow-up is the early detection of cases of informal (unofficial) withdrawal, in which a student has ceased to attend classes and possibly left UI without anyone’s knowledge. Discouraged, homesick, or bewildered students can often be assisted, frantic calls from relatives can be avoided, and vocationally misdirected students can be referred to the Counseling & Testing Center. [ed. 6-09]

F. ADMINISTRATION OF CLASSES.

F-1. Priority of Enrollment in Oversubscribed Courses or Sections. If the number of students who preregister for a given course section exceeds the enrollment limitation, the students are given preference for admission in the following order: (1) those who expect to graduate before the course is offered again, (2) those who show evidence of extraordinary circumstances, subject to the judgment of the unit, and (3) those who have completed the greater numbers of credits (i.e., other factors being equal, the more credits completed, the higher the student’s priority). Order of preregistration is irrelevant. This provisional placement of students in classes on completion of preregistration is made known to them before the end of the semester. This provisional placement is validated by the student’s formal registration at the beginning of the succeeding semester.

F-2. Admission to Class. Instructors admit to class only those students whose names appear on the class roster or for whom the instructor has signed an “add” card; instructors have the authority, however, to grant or deny access to classes by visiting scholars. Instructors are not authorized to make any change in a student’s study list. [See regulation C in the catalog for procedures that are to be followed for changes in registration and regulation O-6 for changes in section.] [ed. 7-00]

F-3. Class Rosters.

a. Immediately following registration, class rosters are sent by the registrar to all instructors via departmental administrators. Prompt checking of the students attending a class against the roster is important; students cannot receive credit for a course in which they are not registered—even though they may attend regularly and complete the requirements. After the first four weeks of classes, students can register for a course only by petition through the dean and with the instructor’s permission. A student who is attending a class and for whom the instructor has no evidence of enrollment should be referred to the Registrar’s Office.

b. Rosters for courses or sections that are not being given should be marked “course not offered,” signed by the instructor and departmental administrator, and returned to the registrar.

c. After the two-week registration period, corrected rosters are sent to instructors via departmental administrators.

F-4. Grade Reports. The academic calendar specifies dates near the middle and at the end of each semester on which grade reports are due (at midsemester, for undergraduate courses only). Shortly before these dates, the registrar sends class lists, with instructions for their use in reporting grades, to instructors via departmental administrators. As a general rule, at the end of a term, the final grades for a course should be filed within 72 hours after the time scheduled for the final examination in the course.

F-5. Disclosure of Grades on Class Work. [See 2200 V and 2600 for policies concerning student records and improper disclosure.] The posting of individual students’ midsemester or final grades or the grades they receive on daily assignments, quizzes, projects, term papers, examinations, or any other academic work is a violation of the rights guaranteed to students. The same is true of leaving graded papers (for students to search through and find their own) in hallways, offices, etc. Instructors may post, or otherwise release, statistical summaries of grades when individual students are neither identified nor identifiable.

F-6. Grade-Record Books. Grade-record books that are issued to instructors become their personal property upon receipt and need not be turned in when an instructor leaves the employ of UI.

F-7. Recording of Lectures. Students may electronically record lectures only with the consent of the instructor.
The Senate resolves that

- the communication from the Dean of Students of senate meeting 24 Sept 2013 be referred to the University Judicial Committee (UJC),
- that the UJC be charged with making its own suggestion for revision of the SCC and related documents including such portions of the DOS draft as the committee shall find useful, and
- that the UJC be asked to report back to the Senate as soon as possible, but not later than Jan 2014.

The Senate resolves that the Faculty Secretary be directed to

- post, on a readily accessible web site, a version of the Dean of Students communication (Senate meeting 24 Sept 2013) that is not in redline strike out mode to make it clear that the communication is a not a markup of the current FSH sections,
- post copies of the current documents (especially FSH 2200, 2300, 2350, 2400, 2450) on the same web site,
- make the location of the web site known to the Argonaut and student government leaders, and
- complete these tasks as rapidly as possible.

The Senate requests from the Dean of Students (DOS) summary data for each of the past five years as follows

- the number of cases of academic dishonesty, Cleary Act reportable offenses, and any other category of offenses,
- the number in each category cleared by the DOS office without UJC hearing,
- the number in each category dealt with by UJC and their outcomes (convicted / dismissed),
- the number in each category appealed beyond UJC and their outcomes (upheld / dismissed / reheard).