University of Idaho
2015-2016 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #19

3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, February 23, 2016
Brink Hall Faculty-Staff Lounge & Skype

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2015-16 Faculty Senate Meeting #18, February 16, 2016 (vote)

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.

VI. Committee Reports.

Teaching & Advising:
   • FS-16-028: FSH 2700 – Student Evaluation of Teaching (Johnson-Leung)(vote)

University Curriculum Committee:
   • FS-16-039 (UCC-16-033d): Natural Resources – Environmental Water Science Graduate Academic Certificate (Mahler)(vote)
   • FS-16-040 (UCC-16-033e): Natural Resources – Environmental Contamination Assessment Graduate Academic Certificate (Mahler)(vote)
   • FS-16-041 (UCC-16-033f): Natural Resources – Biophysical Science Option - add (Mahler)(vote)

Ubuntu (James)

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Randall Teal, Chair 2015-2016, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2015-2016 FS Meeting #18
FS-16-028; 039 thru 041
Present: Anderson, Brewick, Brown, Caplan, Couture (Boise), Crowley (w/o vote), Dallas, Flores, Folwell, Foster, Godfrey (Coeur d’Alene), Hrdlicka, Jeffery, Jones-Mensah, LaPrath, Latrell, Mahoney, Nicotra, Stoll, Teal, Stevenson for Wiencek (w/o vote). Absent: Adams, Barbour, Boschetti, Brandt, Chung, Folwell, Hiromoto (Idaho Falls), Murphy, Perret, Wiencek (w/o vote), Wolf. Guests: 9

Chair Teal called meeting #18 to order at 3:31. A motion (Stoll/Brewick) to approve the minutes from the February 2nd meeting passed without objection.

Chair & Provost Report: Neither Chair Teal nor Vice Provost Stevenson had a report although Vice Provost Stevenson did encourage everyone to take a look at the Strategic Plan and to provide input. The plan will be finalized in early March.

FS-16-036 (UCC-16-033a): Natural Resources—Restoration Ecology Certificate. Chair Teal introduced Professor Karen Launchbaugh to discuss the proposed undergraduate certificate in Restoration Ecology. She noted the growing demand in this area. Utah State has seen an increase of around 50 students in the last five years. They are moving their undergraduate degree towards having two tracks—one of which would be restoration ecology. When asked about the possibility of jobs in this area, Professor Launchbaugh noted that they have very high demand in both soils and rangeland management and the availability of jobs is very high. The proposal passed unanimously.

FS-16-033 (UCC-16-031a): Geography—Climate Change Certificate. The Chair introduced Professor John Abatzoglou from the Geography Department to discuss a proposed undergraduate certificate in Climate Change. Professor Abatzoglou explained that the department was proposing to create this certificate in Climate Change while dropping a minor in Climate Change. The minor required 18 credits while the certificate requires 12. He thought that the certificate would be more useful to a larger range of students. Since 2012 3-8 students a year obtained the minor. Asked about the current students taking the minor, Professor Abatzoglou noted that the courses were not going away and he thought current students would be grandfathered in. A Senator wondered why the department should remove the minor since it wasn’t in conflict with the certificate. The answer seemed to be that this would be one less administrative issue to worry about. A person can obtain the certificate without being enrolled in a degree program. Thus this certificate would be available to a broader range of students. The proposal passed unanimously.

FS-16-034 (UCC-16-031b): Geography—Climate Change Minor. This proposal was associated with the above proposal. Along with creating the certificate the department is proposing removing the minor. The questions were mainly directed at why it was necessary to eliminate the minor. Professor Abatzoglou thought it was mainly a matter of reporting and we were talking about a small number of students. A Senator noted that the minor contained courses from outside of Geography, but the certificate did not. The proposal passed 11-6-1.

FS-16-035 (UCC-16-031c): Biological Science—Reproductive Biology. Senator Foster was asked to speak to this proposal to discontinue the graduate certificate in reproductive biology. Professor Foster noted that the program never had significant enrollment and some of the professors teaching courses in this area had retired. The proposal passed unanimously.
**FS-16-037 (UCC-16-033b): Natural Resources—Ecology Minor.** Chair Teal introduced Randy Brooks to discuss this proposed minor. Professor Brooks noted that there is a major in Ecology and Conservation Biology but not a minor in Ecology. Within Forestry they were moving towards requiring minors rather than directed electives so this would fill an important role. The proposal passed unanimously.

**FS-16-038 (UCC-16-033c): Tribal Natural Resources Stewardship Certificate.** The Chair introduced Kerri Vierling from the Fish and Wildlife Department. Professor Vierling noted that CNR had held meetings with eight tribal groups to determine what their needs were. They indicated that having a certificate like this would be useful since students would not have to be enrolled in a degree program to take classes towards this certificate. The certificate would also help those interested in jobs in natural resources with the tribes. The certificate would build towards a degree, if a student was so inclined. A Senator, noting that this certificate carried a lot more credits than a normal certificate, wondered why they just didn’t create a major. Professor Vierling introduced Lisette Waits, Chair of Fish and Wildlife Sciences to help discuss the proposal. Professor Waits suggested that the tribal groups had indicated a desire to have a certificate which would aid Native American students in obtaining jobs. Later they might be interested in pursuing an undergraduate degree. A Senator wondered about creating a minor instead of a certificate. Since one needs a major in order to obtain a minor, the certificate would be more flexible while making students more marketable. Also, this certificate would be “stackable” with other certificates. One of the goals of this certificate would be to attract tribal students who are not currently enrolled, but it is also hoped that current students might find the certificate attractive. Several Senators expressed concerns about whether some of the students taking 400 level classes would have the foundation courses necessary to succeed. Professor Waits responded that they had checked with those teaching the courses and they indicated that they would be able to work with those pursuing this certificate. The proposal passed 15-1-2.

**Training Modules and HR Update.** Chair Teal introduced Vice President of Finance Brian Foisy and Elisa Keim Director of Professional Development and Training. Vice President Foisy provided an update on developments in Human Resources. Greg Walters has left the University for a position at the University of Pacific. A search for a new Executive Director of HR has started. Mr. Foisy stated the President had authorized him to explore a transition to a market-based compensation system. Mr. Foisy is interested in severing the link between classifications and compensation. Thus, the search committee would be looking for a person who had experience in managing a transition from a classification based system to a market-based system. They were also interested in someone who had some experience in managing a market-based compensation system. V.P. Foisy also noted that we need a Human Resources Office that is willing to play an advocacy role in helping employees deal with employment issues on campus.

V.P. Foisy stated that he had first thought the Classification Task Force created by the Senate last year should be put on hold while we are waiting for a new Executive Director of HR. However, in discussions with the Senate and Staff Leadership he had been persuaded that the Task Force could be useful in looking at some of the issues related to transitioning to a market-based compensation system. In that light he thought that we should rename the Classification Task Force to the Compensation Task Force. A motion (Foster/Brewick) to rename the task force the Compensation Task Force passed without objection. Mr. Foisy said he would work with Staff Council Vice-Chair Lisa Miller to get the task force moving. He is interested in making this task force a standing committee at some point.

V.P. Foisy also wanted to address some of the issues related to the rollout of the work-related training modules. He noted that the purpose of creating these training modules was to improve the performance of supervisors on campus. In 2013 a survey showed that the number one concern of staff was that supervisors were not performing as well as they should. At the same time, the SBOE requires that we
have a compliance program. Developing a work-related training system is part of that compliance program. Finally, a training program helps to allow for expanded delegation and streamlining of our processes in key areas like human resources.

V.P. Foisy acknowledged that the rollout of the training programs was certainly not without problems. In particular, he noted that the emails that were originally sent out were a mistake caused by an automatic notification program. They have taken the modules down for revising and he believes the process will be improved. Currently, about 50% of the employees and 50% of the supervisors have completed the modules. They are working on allowing people to opt out of training that they have no need for. They are interested in constructive criticism and will continue to modify the training modules.

Several Senators wondered if there might be ways to bypass some of the verbal slides and just let people read through the material. The answer was that at this time it isn’t possible. Another Senator stated that he liked People Admin but wondered if in some cases a streamlined version might be followed. It was suggested that he would probably be happy with some of the changes they were being planned for People Admin.

A Senator wondered if not having full searches for some of the temporary positions might, over-time, inadvertently end up undermining diversity on campus. V.P. Foisy responded that this was certainly not the goal. There would need to be adherence to our affirmative action goals, while we sought greater efficiency.

A Senator suggested that we needed to ensure that people understood that we were doing this to improve the culture. Learning rules isn’t the best way to improve the culture. We need to build into our training modules that we are doing this to improve the culture not just learn rules of compliance.

Several Senators noted that we just dictated that many over-worked under-paid faculty members needed to take supervisory training as if they were department chairs. Is there a way we can customize the modules so that regular faculty members, who don’t do much supervising, would not need to take the same training as department chairs. V.P. Foisy acknowledged that they cast the net pretty broadly in defining supervisory responsibilities. In future versions, we might be able to develop separate modules for those who don’t do very much direct supervising. In time, we should be able to develop a more targeted approach.

Ms. Keim asked that faculty volunteer to test new modules as they are developed so they can get feedback.

Adjournment: With no new business the Chair accepted a motion (Stoll/Mahoney) to adjourn at 4:41.

Respectfully submitted,

Don Crowley
Secretary to the Faculty Senate and Faculty Secretary
RATIONALE FOR PROPOSED STUDENT FEEDBACK FORM

TEACHING AND ADVISING COMMITTEE

Motivation: The evaluation of instructors by students at the University of Idaho serves two synergistic purposes, to evaluate instructors (both annually and for tenure and promotion) and to inform instructors’ self-assessment. In this document we articulate how each of the questions in this new questionnaire contribute to one or both of these purposes. In our view, this revision of the feedback form significantly improves the second function while preserving the first.

Effective teaching is dynamic. The student population is changing nationally and more specifically at the UI. As a result, we need to evaluate our teaching because: (a) it’s the right thing to do for continuous improvement, (b) the UI is attracting more first generation students and more students from underrepresented populations. Consequently, it is necessary for us to reflect on our teaching to evaluate the extent to which it meets students’ needs and interests related to learning.

The data collected from such questionnaire is most trustworthy when the response rates are high. From our committee’s experiments with our own courses, we have seen that response rates rise dramatically when instructors actively encourage students to provide end-of-semester feedback. Unfortunately, for historical reasons, there is a low confidence within the faculty of the efficacy of the existing student evaluation system. In short, the well is poisoned. This new form represents an opportunity to reestablish trust between students, faculty, and administration.

Questions 1, 2, and 3: The first two questions on the form are intended to serve a dual purpose. First, they give context for the participation of the respondent in the course and prepare the student to consider their role in the educational process. Second, they give the instructor information about the student’s perception of the content and difficulty of the course.

Questions 4 and 5. These are the research validated questions that may be used for summative assessment of the instructional atmosphere of a course.

Question 6. This question probes the communications between instructor and student outside of the classroom.

Questions 8 and 9. The final questions greatly improve the formative function of this tool by asking students to reflect on positive and negative aspects of the course. Similar questions have been used by members of the committee to great effect in self-administered midterm evaluations.

Reporting and Use of Data. In order to inspire confidence in the summative results of student evaluations, it is of utmost importance that the summary data be reported with contextual information. This contextual information should include some normalizing of the results as well as a narrative which explains what conclusions can legitimately be drawn from the summative data. We also strongly recommend providing robust training to all administrators tasked with evaluating instructors so that they are able to combine the information gleaned from this instrument with other evidence (eg. peer observation, document analysis) in order to make a well-formed evaluation of instructor performance.

Date: December 11, 2015.
Proposals regarding Student Evaluations of Teaching  
Teaching and Advising Committee

1. We propose that we transition the student evaluation form to the proposed “final” form. The transitional form, including a selection of questions from the current form, will be used to validate the new questions against the historical data.

2. We propose that norming data (beyond raw means) be reported. See the attached example of a norming scheme developed by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment.

3. We advise Senate to amend the FSH so that other materials and/or evidence be required for annual evaluation of faculty performance in teaching and be admitted for consideration for promotion and tenure. The choice of these materials should not be prescribed in the handbook but chosen by the faculty member in consultation with the unit administrator.

Some Frequently Asked Questions

1. Can we return to a paper form? It is our understanding that a paper form is too expensive, primarily because of the data entry issues, and is not a possibility at this time.

2. What about the customizable questions? We have available a completely customizable survey tool for midterm assessments. [https://www.uidaho.edu/provost/ira/fast-teaching-survey](https://www.uidaho.edu/provost/ira/fast-teaching-survey) Our research was clear that midterm feedback from students helps improve the course experience for both students and instructors. Committee members also used paper midterm assessments to great effect in their courses through the process of studying and revising our student evaluation forms.

3. Aren’t student evaluations biased? Yes. In particular, the students themselves carry the inherent biases of their culture, and this is reflected in the survey data. However, the measurements are coarse enough that the bias is within tolerable limits.

4. What do student evaluations measure? First, let us note that student evaluations do not measure student learning nor do they measure the effectiveness of the instructor. The former is ostensibly measured by the students’ grades, and the latter requires first a definition of effectiveness and usually a combination of data including observations (see the work of Heather Hill on mathematics education, for example). Rather, student evaluations give a measure of instructional atmosphere that takes into account the social and emotional aspects of education in addition to the cognitive.
February 2016 – proposed transitional student feedback form

Student feedback on an academic course and learning environment

1. How often did you attend class or online learning environment? (Circle one)
   - Less than 60%
   - 60%+
   - 70%+
   - 80%+
   - 90%+

2. How many hours per week (outside of class) did you do work for this course? (Circle one)
   - Less than 2 hrs.
   - 2+ hrs.
   - 4+ hrs.
   - 6+ hrs.
   - 8+ hrs.

Please use the following scale to answer questions 3, 4 and 5.
SD – strongly disagree; D – disagree; N – neutral; A – agree; SA – strongly agree

3. The instructor expressed clear expectations for learning outcomes in this course.

4. Overall, the content and organization of this course contributed to your understanding of this subject.

5. Overall, the instructor’s delivery and efforts contributed to your understanding of the course material.

6. The instructor was helpful to me outside of class or online learning environment. (Circle one)
   - No
   - Yes
   - N/A (I did not seek help from the instructor outside of class)

Comments:
7. What were some positive aspects of the course that supported learning?

Comments:

8. What aspects and/or content of the course could be improved to better support learning?

Comments:

The items below ask for your evaluation of your experience in [Course Number] this semester. In each case the scale is 0 to 4, with 4 being the highest rating and 0 the lowest rating.

9. Clarity of instructor’s explanations.

10. Likelihood you would recommend this instructor to others.

11. Instructor’s ability to stimulate interest in the course topics.

12. Presentation of course material by the instructor.

13. Course’s value in gaining an understanding of the subject matter.

14. Appropriateness of level at which course material is covered.

15. Relevance of written assignments to course materials.

16. Overall, how would you rate the quality of this course?

17. Overall, how would you rate the instructor’s performance in teaching this course?
February 2016 – proposed student feedback form

Student feedback on an academic course and learning environment

1. How often did you attend class or online learning environment? (Circle one)
   - Less than 60%
   - 60%+
   - 70%+
   - 80%+
   - 90%+

2. How many hours per week (outside of class) did you do work for this course? (Circle one)
   - Less than 2 hrs.
   - 2+ hrs.
   - 4+ hrs.
   - 6+ hrs.
   - 8+ hrs.

Please use the following scale to answer questions 3, 4 and 5.
SD – strongly disagree; D – disagree; N – neutral; A – agree; SA – strongly agree

3. The instructor expressed clear expectations for learning outcomes in this course.

4. Overall, the content and organization of this course contributed to your understanding of this subject.

5. Overall, the instructor’s delivery and efforts contributed to your understanding of the course material.

6. The instructor was helpful to me outside of class or online learning environment. (Circle one)
   - No
   - Yes
   - N/A (I did not seek help from the instructor outside of class)

Comments:
7. What were some positive aspects of the course that supported learning?

Comments:

8. What aspects and/or content of the course could be improved to better support learning?

Comments:
In addition to the changes in *FSH* Section 2700, the Faculty Council approved changes in the instrument to be used in the evaluation process. That revision was approved in May 2001 and then reviewed and revised by the Faculty Council in the Fall of 2001.

**Proposed Instructor/Course Evaluation Form**

| What grade do you expect to receive in this class? | A | B | C | D | F |
| What grade were you working to attain? | A | B | C | D | F |
| How often did you attend class? | 90%+ | 80%+ | 70%+ | 60%+ | <60% |
| How often were you fully prepared for class? | 90%+ | 80%+ | 70%+ | 60%+ | <60% |
| How would you rate the quality of your effort in this class? | A | B | C | D | F |

The items below ask for your evaluation of your experience in [Course Number] this semester. In each case the scale is 0 to 4, with 4 being the highest rating and 0 the lowest rating.

1. Instructor

Rate the instructor of this course relative to each of the qualities listed below. *(highest rating is 4)*

(Menu questions from the “Instructor” section placed here)  

4 3 2 1 0

Overall, how would you rate the instructor’s performance in teaching this course?  

4 3 2 1 0

Comment on the instructor’s performance. What was most helpful? What could be improved?  

[text input]

2. Course

Rate the course itself relative to each of the qualities listed below. *(highest rating is 4)*

(Menu questions from the “Course” section placed here)  

4 3 2 1 0

Overall, how would you rate the quality of this course?  

4 3 2 1 0

Comment on the quality of this course. What was most helpful? What could be improved?

Menu questions can be selected from a list or can be written by the instructor for each course.
PROGRAM COMPONENT (Group B) OR NON-SUBSTANTIVE MINOR REQUEST FORM

Short Form

Instructions: Please use one form for each request/action. Clearly mark all changes using Track Change or strikethroughs for deletions and underlines for additions. Following the approval of the appropriate college curriculum committee, a single representative for the college will e-mail the completed form to the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President, provost@uidaho.edu for approval and then submission to the Academic Publications Editor in the Registrar’s Office for review by the University Curriculum Committee (UCC).

Deadline: This form must be submitted to the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President by December 15th for inclusion in the next available General Catalog and to be available for scheduling beginning with the next summer semester.

Submission Information
This section must be completed

| College: | CNR – University wide program |
| Department/Unit: | Environmental Science Program |
| Dept/Unit Approval Date: | 11/12/15 |
| College Approval Date: | N/A – university wide program |
| CIP code (Consult Institutional Research): | |
| Primary Point of Contact (Name and Email): | Robert L. Mahler rmahler@uidaho.edu |

Program Component Request
Leave blank if not adding, discontinuing, or modifying a program component which consists of option, emphasis, minor, academic certificate less than 30 credits, or teaching endorsement

Clearly mark all changes to existing program components by using Track Change or strikethroughs for deletions and underlines for additions.

| Create New: | Modify: | Discontinue: | x |
| Graduate Level: | x Undergraduate Level: | Law Level: | Credit Requirement: |

Option:

Emphasis:

Minor:

Academic Certificate less than 30 credits: Environmental Water Science Graduate Academic Certificate

Teaching Endorsement (Major/Minor):

Overview of Program Component:
Provide a brief narrative description
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Component Curriculum:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Water Quality Elective (3 cr)**
- BAE 552 Environmental Water Quality (3 cr)
- CE 533 Water Quality Management (3 cr)
- EnvS 546 Drinking Water and Human Health (3 cr)

**Hydrology Elective (3 cr)**
- BAE 450 Environmental Hydrology (3 cr)
- BAE 458 Open Channel Hydraulics (3 cr)
- BAE 558 Fluid Mechanics of Porous Materials (3 cr)
- CE 421 Engineering Hydrology (3 cr)
- For 462 Watershed Science and Management (3 cr)
- Soil 415 Soil and Environmental Physics (3 cr)

**Water Management & Policy (3 cr)**
- AgEc 404 Special Topics (cr arr)
- CSS 573 Planning & Decision Making for Watershed Management (3 cr)
- Geog 524 Hydrologic Applications of GIS and Remote Sensing (3 cr)
- PoIS 562 Natural Resource Policy (3 cr)

Courses to total 12 credits for this certificate

---

**Name or Degree Change Only Requests**

Leave blank if not making a name and/or degree change. This section can be completed for changes to the name of: degree, major, minor, option, emphasis, certificate, teaching endorsement.

- **Current Name:**
- **New Name:**
- **Current Degree:**
- **New Degree:**
- **Other Details:**

---

**Financial Impact**

This section must be completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greater than $250,000 per FY:</th>
<th>Less than $250,000 per FY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brief Description of financial impact:**

---

**Rationale and Assessment Information**

This section must be completed.

Rationale for approval of this request as appropriate; include an explanation of how the department will manage the added workload of the new program component and any relevant assessment information that applies, describe whether the program component, curriculum, and admission requirements remain the same, describe the rationale for a name change or degree designation change.

Due to low enrollments in the certificate program for the last few years, we assumed the Focus for the Future process would discontinue this certificate. Since that did not happen automatically, we propose to discontinue the certificate since there has been a maximum of 2 or 3 students at any one time. Our efforts will continue to focus on our degree programs.

---

**Distance Education Availability**

Program Component or Name Change Only – Group B

Page 2 of 3

Updated 7/2015
To comply with the requirements of the Idaho State Board of Education (SBOE) and the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) the University of Idaho must declare whether 50% or more of the curricular requirements of a program may be completed via distance education. **If the program component is to be offered via distance education, additional or different formwork may be required.** Contact provost@uidaho.edu for assistance.

The U.S. Department of Education defines distance education as follows:

*Distance education means education that uses one or more of the technologies listed below to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the instructor and to support regular and substantive interaction between the students and the instructor, either synchronously or asynchronously. The technologies may include--*

1. The internet;
2. One-way and two-way transmissions through open broadcast, closed circuit, cable, microwave, broadband lines, fiber optics, satellite, or wireless communications devices;
3. Audio conferencing; or
4. Video cassettes, DVDs, and CD-ROMs, if the cassettes, DVDs, or CD-ROMs are used in a course in conjunction with any of the technologies listed in paragraphs (1) through (3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Can 50% or more of the curricular requirements of this program component be completed via distance education?</th>
<th>Yes*</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*If Yes, can 100% of the curricular requirements of this program component be completed via distance education?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Geographical Area Availability**

*This section must be completed*

Identify the geographical area(s) this program component can be completed in:

- Moscow
- Coeur d’Alene
- Boise*
- Idaho Falls*
- Other**

*Note: Programs offered in regions 3, 4, and/or 5 may require additional formwork from the State Board of Education. Contact the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President for additional information.

**Note: If Other is selected identify the specific area(s) this program component will be offered.

**Office of the Registrar Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Effective Date:</th>
<th>Summer 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Received by the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President:</td>
<td>12/15/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received by UCC Secretary:</td>
<td>12/15/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCC Item Number:</td>
<td>UCC-16-033d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCC Approval Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Item Number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Approval Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Policy Report Number or Faculty Meeting Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the President Approval Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board of Education Approval/Acknowledgement Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROGRAM COMPONENT (Group B) OR NON-SUBSTANTIVE MINOR REQUEST FORM

Short Form

Instructions: Please use one form for each request/action. Clearly mark all changes using Track Change or strikethroughs for deletions and underlines for additions. Following the approval of the appropriate college curriculum committee, a single representative for the college will e-mail the completed form to the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President, provost@uidaho.edu for approval and then submission to the Academic Publications Editor in the Registrar’s Office for review by the University Curriculum Committee (UCC).

Deadline: This form must be submitted to the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President by December 15th for inclusion in the next available General Catalog and to be available for scheduling beginning with the next summer semester.

Submission Information
This section must be completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College:</th>
<th>CNR – University wide program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department/Unit:</td>
<td>Environmental Science Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept/Unit Approval Date:</td>
<td>11/12/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Approval Date:</td>
<td>N/A – university wide program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP code (Consult Institutional Research):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Point of Contact (Name and Email):</td>
<td>Robert L. Mahler <a href="mailto:rmahler@uidaho.edu">rmahler@uidaho.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Component Request
Leave blank if not adding, discontinuing, or modifying a program component which consists of option, emphasis, minor, academic certificate less than 30 credits, or teaching endorsement

Clearly mark all changes to existing program components by using Track Change or strikethroughs for deletions and underlines for additions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Create New:</th>
<th>Modify:</th>
<th>Discontinue:</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Level:</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Undergraduate Level:</td>
<td>Law Level:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option:

Emphasis:

Minor:

Academic Certificate less than 30 credits: Environmental Contamination Assessment Graduate Academic Certificate

Teaching Endorsement (Major/Minor):

Overview of Program Component:
Provide a brief narrative description
Program Component or Name Change Only

Program Component Curriculum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ChE 580 Engineering Risk Assessment for Hazardous Waste Evaluations (3 cr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EnvS 509 Principles of Environmental Toxicology (3 cr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EnvS 541 Sampling and Analysis of Environmental Contaminants (3 cr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Elective approved by the Director of the Environmental Science Program (3 cr)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courses to total 12 credits for this certificate

Name or Degree Change Only Requests

Leave blank if not making a name and/or degree change. This section can be completed for changes to the name of: degree, major, minor, option, emphasis, certificate, teaching endorsement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Name:</th>
<th>New Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Degree:</td>
<td>New Degree:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Details:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial Impact

This section must be completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greater than $250,000 per FY:</th>
<th>Less than $250,000 per FY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brief Description of financial impact:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale and Assessment Information

This section must be completed

Rationale for approval of this request as appropriate; include an explanation of how the department will manage the added workload of the new program component and any relevant assessment information that applies, describe whether the program component, curriculum, and admission requirements remain the same, describe the rationale for a name change or degree designation change:

Due to low enrollments in the certificate program for the last few years, we assumed the Focus for the Future process would discontinue this certificate. Since that did not happen automatically, we propose to discontinue the certificate since there has been a maximum of 2 or 3 students at any one time. Our efforts will continue to focus on our degree programs.

Distance Education Availability

This section must be completed

To comply with the requirements of the Idaho State Board of Education (SBOE) and the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) the University of Idaho must declare whether 50% or more of the curricular requirements of a program may be completed via distance education. If the program component is to be offered via distance education, additional or different formwork may be required. Contact provost@uidaho.edu for assistance.

The U.S. Department of Education defines distance education as follows:

Distance education means education that uses one or more of the technologies listed below to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the instructor and to support regular and substantive interaction between the students and the instructor, either synchronously or asynchronously. The technologies may include--
(1) The internet;
(2) One-way and two-way transmissions through open broadcast, closed circuit, cable, microwave, broadband lines, fiber optics, satellite, or wireless communications devices;
(3) Audio conferencing; or
(4) Video cassettes, DVDs, and CD-ROMs, if the cassettes, DVDs, or CD-ROMs are used in a course in conjunction with any of the technologies listed in paragraphs (1) through (3).

Can 50% or more of the curricular requirements of this program component be completed via distance education?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes*</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*If Yes, can 100% of the curricular requirements of this program component be completed via distance education?  
| Yes | No |

Geographical Area Availability  
This section must be completed

Identify the geographical area(s) this program component can be completed in:

- Moscow
- Coeur d’Alene
- Boise*
- Idaho Falls*
- Other** Location(s):

*Note: Programs offered in regions 3, 4, and/or 5 may require additional formwork from the State Board of Education. Contact the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President for additional information.

**Note: If Other is selected identify the specific area(s) this program component will be offered.

Office of the Registrar Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Effective Date:</th>
<th>Summer 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Received by the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President:</td>
<td>12/15/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received by UCC Secretary:</td>
<td>12/15/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCC Item Number:</td>
<td>UCC-16-033e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCC Approval Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Item Number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Approval Date:</td>
<td>Vote Record:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Policy Report Number or Faculty Meeting Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the President Approval Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board of Education Approval/Acknowledgement Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructions: Please use one form for each request/action. Clearly mark all changes using Track Change or strikethroughs for deletions and underlines for additions. Following the approval of the appropriate college curriculum committee, a single representative for the college will e-mail the completed form to the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President, provost@uidaho.edu for approval and then submission to the Academic Publications Editor in the Registrar’s Office for review by the University Curriculum Committee (UCC).

Deadline: This form must be submitted to the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President by December 15th for inclusion in the next available General Catalog and to be available for scheduling beginning with the next summer semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College:</th>
<th>CNR – University wide program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department/Unit:</td>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept/Unit Approval Date:</td>
<td>December 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Approval Date:</td>
<td>NA – university-wide program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP code (Consult Institutional Research):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Point of Contact (Name and Email):</td>
<td>Robert L. Mahler <a href="mailto:bmahler@uidaho.edu">bmahler@uidaho.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Component Request
Leave blank if not adding, discontinuing, or modifying a program component which consists of option, emphasis, minor, academic certificate less than 30 credits, or teaching endorsement

Clearly mark all changes to existing program components by using Track Change or strikethroughs for deletions and underlines for additions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Create New:</th>
<th>Modify:</th>
<th>X Discontinue:</th>
<th>Graduate Level:</th>
<th>Undergraduate Level:</th>
<th>X Law Level:</th>
<th>Credit Requirement:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option:</td>
<td>Add new option: Biophysical Science Option</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Certificate less than 30 credits:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Endorsement (Major/Minor):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of Program Component: Provide a brief narrative description
This is to provide a new option that will be available greater than 50% through distance delivery for place bound students. All courses in the depth areas are available online. This option is intended for students at a distance wishing to pursue technically oriented careers in environmental professions such as natural resource management, bioremediation, and environmental impact analysis. Students need to work closely with an academic advisor to plan the courses needed to fulfill degree requirements which are not available through distance delivery.
E. Biophysical Science Option

This option is intended for students at a distance wishing to pursue technically oriented careers in environmental professions such as natural resource management, bioremediation, and environmental impact analysis. Students need to work closely with an academic advisor to plan the courses needed to fulfill degree requirements which are not available through distance delivery.

Engl 317  Technical Writing (3 cr)
EnvS 497  Senior Research (3-4 cr)
Math 170  Analytic Geometry and Calculus I (4 cr)

One of the following (3 cr):
Phys 111  General Physics (3 cr)
Biol 250  General Microbiology (3 cr)

One of the following (4 cr):
Geog 100, Geog 100L  Physical Geography and Lab (4 cr)
Geol 101, Geog 101L  Physical Geology and Lab (4 cr)

Advisor-directed depth courses (48 credits), including at least one course from each of the six following depth areas (all are available online):

Water and Soils
BE 452  Environmental Water Quality (3 cr)
EnvS 446  Drinking Water and Human Health (3 cr)
EnvS 450  Environmental Hydrology (3 cr)
Soil 205  The Soil Ecosystem (3 cr)
Soil 438  Pesticides in the Environment (3 cr)
Soil 446  Soil Fertility (3 cr)

Sustainability
EnvS 428  Pollution Prevention (3 cr)
FCS 411  Global Nutrition (3 cr)
FS 409  Principles of Environmental Toxicology (3 cr)
FS 436  Principles of Sustainability (3 cr)
Geog 313  Global Climate Change (3 cr)
IndT 415  Impact of Technology on Society (3 cr)

Ecology
For 426  Global Fire Ecology and Management (3 cr)
REM 221  Ecology (3 cr)
REM 410  Principles of Vegetation Measurement and Assessment (3 cr)
REM 440  Wildland Restoration Ecology (3 cr)
REM 459  Rangeland Ecology (3 cr)
WLF 440  Conservation Biology (3 cr)

Energy
EnvS 483  Water and Energy Systems (3 cr)
EnvS 484  History of Energy (3 cr)
EnvS 485  Energy Efficiency and Conservation (3 cr)

Geographical Information Systems
Geog 385  GIS Primer (3 cr)
Geog 424  Hydrologic Applications of GIS and Remote Sensing (3 cr)
REM 407  GIS Application in Fire Ecology and Management (2 cr)

Social Science
IS 322  International Environmental Organizations (3 cr)
EnvS 428  Pollution Prevention (3 cr)
EnvS 484  History of Energy (3 cr)
FCS 411  Global Nutrition (3 cr)
IndT 415  Impact of Technology on Society (3 cr)

Courses to total 120 credits for this degree.

Name or Degree Change Only Requests
Leave blank if not making a name and/or degree change. This section can be completed for changes to the name of: degree, major, minor, option, emphasis, certificate, teaching endorsement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Name:</th>
<th>New Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Degree:</td>
<td>New Degree:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Details:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial Impact
This section must be completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greater than $250,000 per FY:</th>
<th>Less than $250,000 per FY:</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Brief Description of financial impact: The university will offer the depth area courses required for this new option at a distance. Currently, all of the depth courses are available in a distance format or are scheduled to be completed January 1, 2017. The University invested $87,771 for development of the 11 remaining distance courses.

Rationale and Assessment Information
This section must be completed

Rationale for approval of this request as appropriate; include an explanation of how the department will manage the added workload of the new program component and any relevant assessment information that applies, describe whether the program component, curriculum, and admission requirements remain the same, describe the rationale for a name change or degree designation change:

The University of Idaho has a goal to increase enrollment by 50% over the next 10 years, some of which will come from distance education. This Biophysical Science Option in the BS Environmental Science degree program is an integral part of this potential distance education enrollment increase. The on-campus Environmental Science Program is successful and has high enrollment. Market analysis indicates that distance enrollment numbers would also be large for this program. This will be one of only four environmental science programs available nationally through distance delivery. The University of Idaho’s Division of Distance and Extended Education is assisting with the design, marketing and assessment of this program.

Admissions and assessment procedures currently follow University guidelines and will remain the same for this new option.

Distance Education Availability
This section must be completed

To comply with the requirements of the Idaho State Board of Education (SBOE) and the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) the University of Idaho must declare whether 50% or more of the curricular requirements of a program may be
completed via distance education. **If the program component is to be offered via distance education, additional or different formwork may be required.** Contact provost@uidaho.edu for assistance.

The U.S. Department of Education defines distance education as follows:

*Distance education means education that uses one or more of the technologies listed below to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the instructor and to support regular and substantive interaction between the students and the instructor, either synchronously or asynchronously. The technologies may include—*

1. The internet;
2. One-way and two-way transmissions through open broadcast, closed circuit, cable, microwave, broadband lines, fiber optics, satellite, or wireless communications devices;
3. Audio conferencing; or
4. Video cassettes, DVDs, and CD-ROMs, if the cassettes, DVDs, or CD-ROMs are used in a course in conjunction with any of the technologies listed in paragraphs (1) through (3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Can 50% or more of the curricular requirements of this program component be completed via distance education?</th>
<th>Yes*</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*If Yes, can 100% of the curricular requirements of this program component be completed via distance education?*

| | Yes | No | x |

**Geographical Area Availability**

This section must be completed

Identify the geographical area(s) this program component can be completed in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moscow</th>
<th>Coeur d’Alene</th>
<th>Boise*</th>
<th>Idaho Falls*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Other**

Location(s):

*Note: Programs offered in regions 3, 4, and/or 5 may require additional formwork from the State Board of Education. Contact the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President for additional information.

**Note: If Other is selected identify the specific area(s) this program component will be offered.

**Office of the Registrar Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Effective Date:</th>
<th>Date Received by the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President:</th>
<th>1/15/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Received by UCC Secretary:</td>
<td>UCC Item Number:</td>
<td>UCC-16-033f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCC Approval Date:</td>
<td>Vote Record:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Item Number:</td>
<td>Vote Record:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Approval Date:</td>
<td>General Policy Report Number or Faculty Meeting Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the President Approval Date:</td>
<td>State Board of Education Approval/Acknowledgement Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MLK Art/Essay Contest

- Established in 2015; ran for a second year in 2016
- One of the Ubuntu Committee’s major annual projects
- Funding from organizations across campus:
  - ASUI: $500
  - College of Law: $500
  - COGS: $500
  - CLASS: $500
  - DHR: $500
  - GPSA: $200
  - IPO: $200
- Cash prizes in four categories ($500 for top prize, $100 for honorable mention):
  - Best Graduate Art
  - Best Undergraduate Art
  - Best Graduate Essay
  - Best Undergraduate Essay
- 2016 contest prompt: Taking inspiration from Garza’s work, write a short essay (three pages double-spaced) or create a piece of original artwork that imagines how we might work to create a more caring community on the University of Idaho campus.
- Questions?: ejames@uidaho.edu