University of Idaho
2016-2017 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #23

3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, April 4, 2017
Paul J. Joyce Faculty-Staff Lounge & Skype for Business
Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2016-17 Faculty Senate Meeting #22, March 28, 2017 (vote)

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.

VI. Committee Reports.

   Program Prioritization Senate Work Group (Brandt)(FYI)
   University Curriculum Committee
   • FS-17-065 (UCC-17-033) CLASS: New Sociology/Anth Prefix (Haltinner) (vote)
   • FS-17-066 (UCC-17-033a) CLASS: Africana Studies minor (Haltinner) (vote)
   • FS-17-067 (UCC-17-039a) Education: Basic Math minor (Raney) (vote)

VII. Special Orders.
   • FS-17-064: APM 45.35 – Unmanned Aircraft Systems (LaHann)(FYI)

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Liz Brandt, Chair 2016-2017, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2016-2017 FS Meeting #22
PP Report
FS-17-064 through 067
University of Idaho  
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
2016-2017 Meeting #22, Tuesday, March 28, 2017

Present: Anderson (Mike), Anderson (Miranda), Boschetti, Brandt, Brewick, Brown, Cannon (Boise), Caplan, Bailey for Chung (w/o vote), Crowley (w/o vote), Donohoe, Fisher, Folwell, Foster, Hrdlicka, Johnson, Markuson, Morrison, Nicotra, Payant, Sixtos, Vella, Wienczek (w/o vote), Wilson, Wright. Absent: Adekanmbi, Barbour, Chung, Godfrey (Coeur d’Alene), Ostrom (Idaho Falls), Pregitzer. Guests: 6

The Chair called meeting #22 to order at 3:30 pm. A motion (Johnson/Mike Anderson) to approve the minutes from the March 21st meeting passed without objections.

Chair’s Report: Chair Brandt reported that the responses to program prioritization are on the Provost’s website. A small faculty group (Miranda Anderson, Brandt, Crowley, Hrdlicka, and Nicotra) has met to summarize the responses. The report from this group will be sent to the Senate within the next couple of days. The FAC survey on the annual evaluation process has been sent out. Responses to this survey should be returned by April 7th. The “Great Colleges to Work For” survey went out last week. The survey was sent to everyone, but there is reason to believe that it went into “clutter” in many people’s email. So, those who have not received it, please look in the “clutter” folder. The Chair also reminded Senators that it is now time to be conducting elections for next year’s Senate. Current Senators are responsible for setting up and conducting these elections for their college. Election results are due April 15th.

Provost’s Report: Provost Wienczek commented on the process of obtaining feedback on program prioritization. The IPEC is dedicated to taking the feedback seriously with the hope of improving the process. However, he reminded everyone that we do need to launch this process next year. The process will allow us to begin to invest in projects that are high priority. After reviewing the comments, IPEC will issue a final report to be sent to the President. He hinted that UBFC would soon be announcing their recommendations for funding new projects.

FS-17-044: FSH 3520 F-9—Tenure Extension. Vice Chair Hrdlicka stated that this proposed change was initiated by Faculty Senate Leadership and endorsed by Faculty Affairs. He noted that there had been concerns raised about the precise timing for a faculty member to request a tenure extension. The proposed changes are to take out the language in C-2 about the requests occurring “proximate to the events” and to clarify in C-1 that a request must be made by June 1st before the review process begins. It was pointed out the wording “June 1st of the spring semester” was awkward and the words “of the spring semester” should be dropped. This was accepted by the Faculty Secretary as a friendly edit. The wording in C-1 will now read, “The faculty member must request the extension from the Provost in writing by June 1st before the review process begins and must include appropriate documentation of the childbirth, adoption, or other circumstance.” This proposal (as edited) was passed unanimously.

FS-17-057: FSH 1570—Faculty Secretary. Professor Hrdlicka presented this proposed change to FSH 1570 also coming from Faculty Senate Leadership and Faculty Affairs. The changes proposed
will better reflect the actual activities and responsibilities of the Faculty Secretary. He noted that in C-1 there was a slight revision to the nomination process for the Faculty Secretary. The change would make the Faculty Senate Chair (or designee) the chair of the nominating committee. For the current search the President and the Provost have agreed to make Vice-Chair Hrdlicka the chair of the nominating committee. The proposed changes to FSH 1570 passed unanimously.

**FS-17-058 (UCC-17-026a): Science—Statistical Science Graduate Certificate.** The Chair introduced Professor Chris Williams to discuss this proposed certificate. Professor Williams stated that the graduate certificate will be in Data Analytics and represents a collaboration between departments in three colleges, Statistics, Computer Science and Information Systems. The proposal is designed to train students in dealing with big databases and provide them with the ability to access, manage, and make inferences from these databases. The certificate has three required courses and allows students to choose an elective from a list. This certificate is aimed at a student market who do not need a master’s degree, but can use a better background in dealing with large data sets.

In response to a question from a senator, Professor Williams suggested that there were many jobs that desired people with this type of skill. He felt there was a significant demand for this type of program. Several other senators noted that they could see their students wanting a certificate of this nature. Professor Williams suggested that this program might help with collaboration across the university. There was also a short discussion about other courses that might be included as well as a discussion of whether engineering outreach was the best way to offer the courses via distance education. Professor Williams thanked senators for their suggestions indicating they hoped this certificate would generate ideas and he would be happy to receive others. The proposal passed without objection.

**FS-17-059 (UCC-17-035a): Business—PGA Management & Human Resources**
**FS-17-060 (UCC-17-035b): Business—PGA Golf Management & Business Economics**
**FS-17-061 (UCC-17-035c): Business—PGA Golf Management & Finance**
**FS-17-062 (UCC-17-035d): Business—PGA Golf Management & Operations Management**
**FS-17-063 (UCC-17-035e): Business—PGA Golf Management & Information Systems**

Chair Brandt introduced Professor Jeff Bailey to discuss these proposals. Professor Bailey explained that the PGA Golf Management is accredited by the Professional Golfers Association of America. It has been part of the College of Business program associated with the Marketing major. This proposal would allow students pursuing other majors inside the College of Business, to also take this PGA program. Sixteen schools in the U.S. have this program. This expansion will help accommodate some of the demand for this program and expand it to other college majors.

Professor Bailey explained the asterisk (*) that is attached to these programs. The asterisk states that the PGA requires that a person entering the program have at least a 12 handicap and must be a U.S. citizen to become a PGA member. Professor Bailey clarified that resident aliens could become PGA members. A Senator wondered about the citizenship language and whether language regarding the status of resident aliens should be included. The Faculty Secretary noted that this issue had been discussed at UCC. After an email exchange, the following had been
offered as a revision. “International students can complete the degree requirements, but membership to the PGA of America requires U.S. Citizenship or Resident Alien status.” A motion (Hrdlicka/Folwell) to substitute this language for the current language in each proposal passed without objection.

A Senator raised a question about how the financial impact part of the curriculum proposal was developed. It appears that rather than discussing possible cost, the explanation suggests that the program might raise additional revenue in the form of increased enrollment. Professor Bailey responded that this appears true and that the anticipated cost of the expansion of the PGA options would be negligible.

A Senator asked whether the PGA options might be considered as a certificate. Professor Bailey thought this was possible, but felt that students were satisfied and that student placement was 100%.

There was a short discussion of whether the requirement for a 12 handicap should be part of the program. Wasn’t it possible for a person to perform many of these jobs, even if they had a disability that kept them from being a good golfer? It was emphasized that this was a PGA requirement, not a University of Idaho requirement. The proposals all passed without objection.

**Faculty Secretary Position:** Vice-Chair Hrdlicka announced that the vacancy announcement for the Faculty Secretary position had just gone out. He urged any Senators interested to apply and to encourage their colleagues to apply. The deadline for applications is April 10th.

A motion (Foster/Folwell) to adjourn passed unanimously at 4:25.

Respectfully submitted,

Don Crowley, Secretary to the Faculty Senate
and Faculty Secretary
Faculty Comments on Program Prioritization Metrics

1. Nonalignment with Strategic Plan. Many faculty commented that the program prioritization (PP) metrics are not aligned with the priorities in the strategic plan. This disconnect arose in several specific contexts. First, as reflected below, faculty did not believe that the proposed metrics adequately valued research productivity across different disciplines. Faculty also commented that the ranking of individual programs might deter interdisciplinary work and be inconsistent with rebuilding the morale of faculty. They did not believe that outreach, extension and service were adequately measured in the proposed metrics.

2. Problems assessing research productivity and quality.
   - Many people point out that we need a more meaningful way to compare research productivity across very different disciplines.
   - The current metric measures only research expenditures which ignores other indicators of research/creative activity, which in particular will affect the arts and humanities.

   **Suggestion to IPEC/workgroups:** Split academic units up between STEM (COS, CALS, CNR, COEng) and non-STEM units, as this potentially would enable a fairer comparison.

   **Suggestion to IPEC/workgroups:** Create a system where each college does a study of research productivity of individual units using a standard method of study (perhaps counting number of publications/creative activities, quality, and impact factor where applicable). These studies can be evaluated by IPEC and used to factor into the PP process.

3. Concerns about the PP process’s effect on interdisciplinary work. Many comments point to the concern that this will pit departments (and even majors within departments) against each other; that this is a zero-sum exercise that will discourage collaboration and encourage hoarding of resources. For this reason act of ranking programs may itself deter interdisciplinary activities. In addition, the way that the metrics are laid out will further discourage interdisciplinary collaborations and thus damaging morale.

   **Suggestion to IPEC/workgroups:** Give appropriate credit to collaborating departments (e.g., count research funding with the unit where it is expended) but avoid double counting, i.e., do not count a $100,000 collaborative grant between department A and B, as $100,000 for Dept A and $100,000 for Dept B – in other words, give the fair share; funding just used as an example. This approach can apply to other quantifiable metrics.

4. Concerns about weighting.
   - Several metrics seem to reward the same activity, e.g., teaching and credit hours are counted multiple times, in criteria 1a, 2, and 3c, 3d, and 4b. This totals 30%. Similarly, several of the metrics in 5 could be lumped together into one essentiality metric and one impact metric.
   - A few faculty commented negatively on the “percent of faculty meeting expectation” metric as it might dis-incentivize unit administrators from assigning a “does not meet expectations” to marginally performing faculty members.
   - Research isn’t counted heavily enough (see above).
• Essentiality/centrality should be weighted more heavily.
• BLS Demand Data. Comment on this metric was particularly mixed. Some approved of the metric even advocating that it receive greater weight, others questions it (how will graduate school, med school & law school factor into this data; correlation between BLS demand data and student demand questioned).

5. Concern about using the “permanent faculty over temporary faculty” metric (3a). The following comments captured the issue:
   - It is disrespectful to insinuate that instruction offered by TAs or adjuncts is inferior to instruction offered by permanent faculty (one possible interpretation of this metric). For example, lab courses in the sciences often utilize TAs who works under the supervision of a permanent faculty member. Unlike permanent faculty members, well-trained TAs typically are more skilled in the art given that they conduct experimental research as part of their graduate/undergraduate studies. For safety reasons, it is necessary to offer such courses with relatively low student: TA ratios. An alternative interpretation of this metric is to encourage units to transfer adjuncts to permanent faculty lines. As the UI aims to become an R1 institution, there will be an increased need to utilize available financial resources to advance research activities, e.g., by keeping down instruction costs, providing bridge and start-up funds, reduce teaching loads of permanent faculty members, etc... The use of some adjuncts and TAs likely is a necessary evil toward this end. It seems to me that inclusion of this metric in the PPP for this purpose is the wrong place to stage this ideological battle. Finally, the description of this metric is unclear – will the calculation only involve to responsible instructors on record, or also include course-helpers (TAs). There was a lot of confusion in my department regarding this metric.
   - TAs teaching undergraduate classes should not automatically translate into 'poor quality' of the program, especially as we aim to give teaching experience to all of our PhD students, to make them more competitive on the job market
   - I am concerned with the weighting for the permanent vs part time. My program depends on field based learning activities. We rely heavily on part-time faculty to work and observe students in the field.

7. Outreach undervalued. A number of people expressed concerns about lack of focus on/credit given for outreach and extension (and, conversely, concerns that colleges like CALS that have a lot of faculty dedicated to extension would be disadvantaged). This ties back to issue #1 – the criteria don’t connect to the Strategic Plan.

8. Small vs. Large and History. A number of comments focused on how the size of a program would affect the metrics. These people tended to suggest that the metrics be scaled by faculty FTE. Similar comments also were made that the ranking process will disadvantage historically under-resourced departments.

Suggestion to IPEC/Workgroups: Adopt a Carnegie-like hybrid approach for certain quantifiable metrics. Ultimately, Carnegie assigns an absolute value and a “per capita value” for key metrics such as research expenditures in STEM and research expenditures in non-STEM. See the presentation from meeting #5 in the Faculty Compensation Task
Force: https://sitecore.uidaho.edu/uidaho-responsive/home/human-resources/employees/compensation/faculty-task-force. A hybrid approach would reward two aspects that the institution strives for, large size (research expenditures, number of student credit hours, etc…) and efficiency (per FTE basis).

8. Overall concern about position control – as someone pointed out, every department should have to justify refilling positions. In addition, however, a number of people expressed concerns with how position control would work on a continuing basis. They were not clear on how lower quintile programs could change their situation. They also were concerned that over time good programs would fall into the bottom quintiles. Many faculty were concerned about the message that it sends to label the bottom two quintiles, i.e., 40% of all units, as being in a precarious situation. One comment described it as being forced to give 20% of all students in an honor class A’s, B’s, C’s, D’s, and F’s.

**Suggestion to IPEC/workgroups:** We do not have a normal distribution of performance among the academic units. Instead their performance is likely described by a power law function, i.e., a couple of units are hyper (good) performers, as much as 80% are solid performers, and only a small proportion of units fall short of meeting expectations. Perhaps it is worthwhile to rethink the whole quintile approach, and instead move to a slightly different model that falls more in line with a power law function, i.e., a 3-tier position control system: Tier A (top 10%) where resources return to the unit, Tier B (middle 80%) where resources return to the Dean (and Provost?), and Tier C (bottom 10%) where funds move to UBFC for re-allocation.

9. One Size Fits All. Many people were uncomfortable with the “one size fits all” aspect of the proposed metrics. They were concerned particularly about how this approach would work when comparing STEM fields with arts and humanities (see comments above regarding evaluating research productivity or outreach).

10. Morale. Many people expressed concerns that the ranking of departments/programs would damage morale at the institution.

   - Metrics were too qualitative – could lead to uninformative results
   - External demand did not seem like an appropriate measure for internal support units.
   - Efficiency and demand measures might be skewed for Moscow vs. non-Moscow departments

12. Departments with multiple programs. One particular comment cogently explained the problems with averaging the scores for multiple programs in a single banner department:
   
   My first comment is not about weights, it is about the statement in the video that each program in a dept will be evaluated separately and then averaged in order to get an overall dept ranking. I appreciate that we are seeking an improvement over prior processes by attempting to do an overall ranking for depts. as opposed to solely looking at individual programs. However, doing a simple average is not the right way to this. Consider this case: Dept A and Dept B have identical dept-wide metrics (i.e., same
number of faculty serving the same number of students, same revenue in, same costs in salaries, etc). However, Dept A has 2 programs with 25 students each. Dept B has 5 programs with 10 students each. By the current plan to average ratings for individual programs across a dept, Dept A will receive a higher rating than Dept B. Is this really what we want? Consider this: the programs in Dept B might be unique and the UI would not have those students enrolled without those programs in place. Getting rid of those programs will cause overall enrollment at the UI to drop. If Dept B has figured out how to deliver 5 programs in an economical fashion (this usually happens when there is a lot of common coursework among the 5 programs) and are filling student needs that would otherwise go unmet, why should that dept be disadvantaged in this rating process? Again, I applaud the effort to synthesize across a dept, but we need something summative as oppose to a simple average.

13. **Suggestion for IPEC/Workgroups:** Another way to balance the metrics to reflect the different work of different departments is to weigh the metrics according to the teaching/research/outreach/service FTE (or PD) allocation of each unit should be taken into consideration;
Additional Faculty Comments on Program Prioritization Metrics

A number of us were confused about the presence of multiple surveys and so only completed one (thinking that we were providing all requested feedback). The survey interface was quite confusing. I see in the data that, for many questions, a large percentage of the surveys indicated “no response.” If this percentage includes people who responded to one, but not all, of the surveys, this large percentage of “no responses” should not be interpreted as suggesting that people do not have an opinion about those questions. I suspect that, if the “no response” answers are disregarded, the percentage of “unacceptable” responses will increase substantially.

1. Bravo! It is so good to see this process in action.

2. I see no problem with “double counting”. If a grant wouldn’t come to UI (either department) without both participating, why not recognize the synergy? If a grant comes to an Institute (such as IBEST) or Center, which includes faculty from multiple departments, then participation in that unit’s success should be reflect in the departments of the participants. This is how BCB degrees work (a graduate “counts” in the department of the major professor AND for BCB).

This restriction still assumes that the contributions of each department are disjoint, which is contrary to the nature of interdisciplinary work. Double counting encourages teamwork, avoiding it encourages isolation.

3. BLS categories are always behind the times—for example they still don’t include Bioinformatics. Universities should be creating future types of jobs, not just filling the want ads. We need to leave it up to the units to evaluate their market responsiveness without telling them how to do it (which is what we currently do in all UCC proposals, by the way).

4. I oppose penalizing units for using TAs. One of the best teachers I ever worked with was a TA. I couldn’t even nominate him for University recognition, and he eventually left UI. Also, TA experiences are an important part of many graduate degrees. Let’s focus on how well departments are delivering education, not on how they are doing it.

5. Yes, we need to recognize different distributions of ROJD assignments, which also reflect different unit missions. To do that, we need an online ROJD system, so that summary statistics can recognize human resource allocations. This is something we could do NOW, and then tell the SBOE that we not only have a plan—but that we have begun implementing it.

6. Morale. The trick is to use rankings to spur competition, rather than as a reflection of how much a unit is valued. I’m not sure how to do that. Perhaps add special prizes or budget items to low-ranked units that most effectively move up in the quintiles??
College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences

Proposed Catalog Changes

Effective Summer 2017

SOCIOMETRY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

1. Create the following prefix:

   AFST (Africana Studies)

2. Add the following course:

   **AFST 101 Introduction to Africana Studies (3 cr)**
   This course provides an introduction to Africana Studies. Specifically, it will examine aspects of
   African History, Contemporary African politics, the creation of the diaspora, contemporary race
   relations, Africana literature, and Africana music. It will incorporate theories on African
   development, globalization, and racial formation as it explores these topics. This course will be
   cotaught by affiliated faculty in the program, each presenting on their area of expertise.

   **Available via distance:** No
   **Geographical Availability:** Moscow
   **Rationale:** We are proposing an interdisciplinary academic minor in Africana Studies.
   This course will provide students with an overview of the theories of this academic
   discipline as well as the breadth of opportunity available in the study of the African
   diaspora. Students will take this course in order to ground them in the research,
   theories, and experiences related to the Africana Diaspora. Students will also have the
   opportunity to meet the various faculty affiliated with this program as they each teach
   on their topic of expertise.
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 session.

When applicable a Curriculum Change Form and Course Approval Forms must accompany the short form when submitted to provost@uidaho.edu

---

**Submission Information**
This section must be completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College:</th>
<th>CLASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department/Unit:</td>
<td>Sociology and Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept/Unit Approval Date:</td>
<td>11/7/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote Record:</td>
<td>Soc/Anth 13 Y; 1 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Approval Date:</td>
<td>11/28/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote Record:</td>
<td>Affiliated Faculty 19 Y, 0 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP code (Consult Institutional Research):</td>
<td>05.0201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Point of Contact (Name and Email):</td>
<td>Kristin Haltinner <a href="mailto:khaltinner@uidaho.edu">khaltinner@uidaho.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Rationale and Overview of Program Component Request or Name Change**
This section must be completed

Provide the rationale and overview of this request. Include an explanation of how the department will manage the added workload for a new program component; describe whether the program component curriculum and admissions requirements remain the same; describe the rationale for a name change or degree designation change if applicable.

**Direct Student Need**
This proposal is a response to current student demand. Numerous students have approached potential faculty asking for a degree program in Africana Studies. This reflects a broader demand for interdisciplinary programs that focus on the experiences of subaltern populations. Courses will be drawn from those currently offered in the departments of English, French, History, Music, Political Science, and Sociology and Anthropology.

The United States is becoming an increasingly diverse place. A minor in Africana Studies will allow our students to be more competitive in their job search after college. Students who earn this minor will be better able to work with a diverse workforce, work with a diverse clientele, and adapt to societal changes.

Finally, a minor in Africana studies will empower students to better understand the historical, political, and social contexts that have led to and continue to shape contemporary global politics and racial relations. Students will be better empowered to improve community relations in their personal lives and public careers.

**Institutional Enhancement Given Regional Shortcoming**
The state of Idaho does not currently have any programs in African or African American Studies. As the University of Idaho continues to become more competitive among our sister R1 universities, students will be seeking programs that support cultural competency. Currently esteemed R1 institutions including (but not limited to) the University of Minnesota, the University of Wisconsin, the University of Iowa, and other prestigious public universities have similar programs. However, degrees in Africana Studies are less common in the Mountain States, with approximately one program per state (exceptions include Idaho, which currently has no degree offerings, and Colorado which has two such
programs). Programs in this region include: the University of Montana (major, minor, and academic certificate), the University of Nevada (major and minor), the University of Utah (minor), the University of Wyoming (major and minor), the University of New Mexico (major), the University of Northern Colorado (major and minor), Colorado College (minor), and the University of Arizona (major). As such, offering such a program will give students from Idaho an advantage over institutions from neighboring states.

**Strategic Plan**
The proposed minor in Africana Studies meets two key elements of the new strategic plan for the University of Idaho.

First, **Engage.** According the strategic plan outlined by the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Science, engagement is “the vital process through which the University of Idaho touches and enriches the lives of others.” A part of this effort is to create programming that “reflect[s] the richness and diversity of the world around us.” Providing a central place for students to engage in previously provided course material aimed at engaging with American and global diversity, the minor in Africana Studies enhances the ability of UI to accomplish this goal.

Further, the strategic plan calls for students and curricula to **transform.** The strategic plan for the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences argues that the college is: “committed to providing students a liberal education through exposure to a wide breadth of perspectives and experiences that encourage lifelong learning and develop a strong sense of personal and social responsibility”. This proposed minor provides a unique opportunity for our students to learn about the African diaspora, its history, and its continued role in social and political processes. Moreover, students who complete the minor will be given the opportunity to understand the ways that historical processes (colonialism, slavery, migration, apartheid, etc) effected and continue to affect the lives of people of African descent around the world. This will enable students to better understand the perspectives of black people throughout the world in historical and contemporary contexts. The minor will also empower those enrolled to engage with this knowledge in their professions and social lives.

---

**Name or Degree Change Only Requests**

This section to be completed ONLY for changes to the name of: degree, major, minor, option, emphasis, certificate, teaching endorsement. If there are accompanying curriculum or course changes, complete the next section and attach the curriculum and/or course forms. **Note: a substantive change to a program degree, major, or program component may require a program proposal form.**

<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>Effective Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Program Component Request**

Leave blank if not adding, discontinuing, or modifying a program component. Program components consist of option, emphasis, minor, academic certificate less than 30 credits, or teaching endorsement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Create New:</th>
<th>Modify:</th>
<th>Discontinue:</th>
<th>Implementation Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Level:</td>
<td>Undergraduate Level:</td>
<td>X Law Level:</td>
<td>Credit Requirement:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are new courses being created: No Yes X If yes, how many courses will be created: 1
If the request is for an option or emphasis enter the associated major and degree:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major:</th>
<th>Degree:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Enter the name of the program component in the appropriate row:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option:</th>
<th>Emphasis:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor:</td>
<td>Africana Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Certificate less than 30 credits:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Endorsement (Major/Minor):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning Outcomes and Assessment Information
This section must be completed if program component request section is completed

1. List the intended learning outcomes for the program component, using learner centered statements that indicate what will students know, be able to do, and value or appreciate as a result of completing the program:

**Learn and Integrate:** Students will be able to report on the history of Africa, African migration, and the experiences of people of African descent. Students will also be able to report about traditional and contemporary elements of Africana culture including, but not limited to, the development of different styles of music as well as Africana literature. Finally, students will be able to explain sociological theories regarding contemporary race relations and the modern experience of people in the African diaspora.

**Think and create:** Students will be able to discuss the socio-historical and contemporary experiences of people in the Africana diaspora from a variety of disciplinary perspectives (Anthropology, English, History, International Studies, Music, Political Science, and Sociology).

**Communicate:** Students will be able to communicate effectively about topics related to diversity and with diverse communities through oral, written, and visual formats with and among diverse communities.

**Clarify purpose and perspective:** Students will be able to explain their own positionality given socio-political-historical processes.

**Practice Citizenship:** Students will be able to explain the historical contexts that have given rise to our current global society.

2. Describe the assessment process that will be used to evaluate how well students are achieving the intended learning outcomes of the program component:

Each course offered through the minor will continue to be assessed as it has been historically; we will continue to use current assessment tools to verify the quality of affiliated courses. These are completed at the department level and include feedback from students. Further, the program director will be tasked, in part, with monitoring the quality of the courses and instructors affiliated with the program.

Further, the director of the program will be tasked with completing an annual assessment through the college and university. This will include developing and disseminating assessment protocols (pre and post tests) to students as they enter and exit the program.
3. How will you ensure that the assessment findings will be used to improve the program?

The affiliated faculty will meet each semester to discuss the program and implement needed improvements. The director will be tasked with implementing changes as weaknesses become evident. This will be completed in conjunction with the affiliated faculty.

4. What direct and indirect measures will be used to assess student learning?

The director of the program will develop an assessment tool that will be distributed to students in Africana Studies 101. It will then be given to people graduating with the minor in order to evaluate the success the minor has had in reaching the learning outcomes outlined above.

The director will also periodically facilitate a third party’s construction of focus groups and interviews with students to evaluate areas needing improvement.

5. When will assessment activities occur and at what frequency?

Pre-tests will be completed each year in Africana Studies 101. Post-tests will be provided to graduating seniors who have completed the minor. These tests will measure knowledge of Africana history, culture, and social experiences. They will also evaluate students’ understandings of academic theories related to the African diaspora. Interviews or focus groups with enrolled students will occur annually. There will be a faculty meeting every semester.

**Financial Impact**

This section must be completed if program component request section is 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brief Description of financial impact:</td>
<td>The program is built almost exclusively from courses already offered. While enrollment may be slightly elevated in courses currently offered, there should be room to accommodate program participants in the current course schedule. Thus it should not require a significant amount of resources. However, the director of the program may eventually require a course buyout in order to supervise/participate in instruction of AFST 101 and to manage their additional responsibilities as director. Depending on enrollment growth, this is a topic that may need to be revisited in the future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Distance Education Availability**

This section must be completed if program component request section is 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>No</th>
<th>X</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Geographical Area Availability**

This section must be completed if program component request section is completed.

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

- Moscow  X
- 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**

| Implementation Effective Date: | |
| Date Received by the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President: | |
| Date Received by Budget Office, if applicable: | |
| Date Received by Institutional Research and Assessment: | |
| Date Received by UCC Secretary: | 1-26-17 |
| UCC Item Number: | UCC-17-033a |
| UCC Approval Date: | 03-27-2017  Vote Record: |
| Faculty Senate Item Number: | |
| Faculty Senate Approval Date: | |
| General Policy Report Number or Faculty Meeting Date: | |
| Office of the President Approval Date: | |
| State Board of Education Approval/Acknowledgement Date: | |
Required course work (10-12 cr):

AFST 101  Introduction to Africana Studies (3 cr)

One of the following courses on Contemporary Race Relations (3 cr):

ANTH 427  Race and Ethnic Relations (3 cr)
SOC 427  Race and Ethnic Relations (3 cr)
SOC 439  Inequality in the Justice System (3 cr)

One of the following courses on Africana History or Present Experiences (3 cr):

ANTH 462  Human Issues in International Development (3 cr)
HIST 315  Comparative African American Cultures (3 cr)
HIST 331  The Age of African Empires (3 cr)
HIST 441  Slavery and Freedom in the Americas (3 cr)
IS 326  Africa Today (3 cr)

One of the following courses on Africana Music and Literature (1-3 cr):

ENGL 380  Introduction to U.S. Ethnic Literature (3 cr)
ENGL 483  African American Literatures (3 cr)
IS 370  African Community, Culture, and Music (1-3 cr)
MUSA 365  CE: World Beat Ensemble (1 cr)
MUSH 201  History of Rock and Roll (3 cr)
MUSH 410  Studies in Jazz History (3 cr)

Selected electives (6-8 cr):

AMST 301  Studies in American Culture (3 cr)
ANTH 220  Peoples of the World (3 cr)
ANTH 261  Language and Culture (3 cr)
ANTH 412  Human Races (3 cr)
ANTH 462  Human Issues in International Development (3 cr)
COMM 335  Intercultural Communication (3 cr)
EDCI 302  Teaching Culturally Diverse Learners (4 cr)
ENGL 380  Introduction to U.S. Ethnic Literature (3 cr)
ENGL 483  African American Literatures (3 cr)
ENGL 485  Global Literatures in English (3 cr)
FLEN 315  French and Francophone Cinema in Translation (3 cr)
FLEN 391  Hispanic Film (3 cr)
HIST 315  Comparative African American Cultures (3 cr)
HIST 321 Pirates of the Caribbean and Beyond (3 cr)
HIST 331 The Age of African Empires (3 cr)
HIST 441 Slavery and Freedom in the Americas (3 cr)
IS 325 The Contemporary Muslim World (3 cr)
IS 326 Africa Today (3 cr)
IS 370 African Community, Culture, and Music (1-3cr)
LAS 462 Human Issues in International Development (3 cr)
MUSA 365 CE: World Beat Ensemble (1 cr)
MUSH 201 History of Rock and Roll (3 cr)
MUSH 410 Studies in Jazz History (3 cr)
MUSH 420 Studies in World Music (3 cr)
POLS 480 The Politics of Development (3 cr)
SOC 340 Social Change & Globalization (3 cr)
SOC 334 Urban Sociology (3 cr)
SOC 427 Racial and Ethnic Relations (3 cr)
SOC 439 Inequalities in the Justice System (3 cr)
SOC 465 Environment, Policy, and Justice (3 cr)

Courses to total 18 credits for this minor.
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 session.

When applicable a Curriculum Change Form and Course Approval Forms must accompany the short form when submitted to provost@uidaho.edu

Submission Information
This section must be completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College:</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department/Unit:</td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept/Unit Approval Date:</td>
<td>November 11, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Approval Date:</td>
<td>CCC: 11/30/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TECC: 12/1/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CoE: 12/9/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote Record:</td>
<td>Aye: 17 Nay: 0 Abstain: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aye: 12 Nay: 0 Abstain: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aye: 11 Nay: 0 Abstain: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aye: 44 Nay: 0 Abstain: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP code (Consult Institutional Research):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Point of Contact (Name and Email):</td>
<td>Taylor Raney <a href="mailto:tcraney@uidaho.edu">tcraney@uidaho.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale and Overview of Program Component Request or Name Change
This section must be completed

Provide the rationale and overview of this request. Include an explanation of how the department will manage the added workload for a new program component; describe whether the program component curriculum and admissions requirements remain the same; describe the rational for a name change or degree designation change if applicable.

To meet k-12 industry needs for teachers of mathematics, faculty from the departments of Curriculum & Instruction and Mathematics have partnered to propose this strand within the currently approved mathematics teacher endorsement program. Workload will be addressed through the offering of courses every other semester or year, as opposed to every semester or year, so faculty teaching loads will not increase. Assessment will be addressed through the regular assessment model in the College of Education, primarily including uploading into Taskstream of evidence against the Idaho Standards for Preparation of Professional School Personnel.

Name or Degree Change Only Requests
Leave blank if not making a name and/or degree change only request

This section to be completed ONLY for changes to the name of: degree, major, minor, option, emphasis, certificate, teaching endorsement. If there are accompanying curriculum or course changes, complete the next section and attach the curriculum and/or course forms. **Note: a substantive change to a program degree, major, or program component may require a program proposal form.

Current Name:
New Name:  
Current Degree:  
New Degree:  
Other Details:  
Effective Date:  

Program Component Request
Leave blank if not adding, discontinuing, or modifying a program component. Program components consist 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. A curriculum change form and/or course approval forms associated with this request are required to be submitted with this short form.

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

Are new courses being created: No x Yes If yes, how many courses will be created: four

If the request is for an option or emphasis enter the associated major and degree:

| Major: Secondary Education | Degree: B.S.Ed. |

Enter the name of the program component in the appropriate row:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Certificate less than 30 credits:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Endorsement (Major/Minor): Basic Mathematics (teaching minor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning Outcomes and Assessment Information
This section must be completed if program component request section is completed.

1. List the intended learning outcomes for the program component, using learner centered statements that indicate what will students know, be able to do, and value or appreciate as a result of completing the program:

   The degree candidate demonstrates competency regarding the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of mathematics and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of mathematics meaningful for learners.
   The degree candidate demonstrates abilities to regard how students learn mathematics and develop mathematical thinking and provides opportunities that support their intellectual, social, and personal development.
   The degree candidate applies understanding regarding how students differ in their approaches to learning mathematics and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to learners with diverse needs.
   The degree candidate uses a variety of instructional strategies to develop students’ critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.
   The degree candidate uses a variety of communication techniques including verbal, nonverbal, and media to foster mathematical inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

2. Describe the assessment process that will be used to evaluate how well students are achieving the intended learning outcomes of the program component:
Data are collected through an online information management system and used in program, department, and college meetings to make determinations regarding potential changes. These data include signature assignments common to each section of the course offered, faculty feedback regarding those assignments as well as dispositional, knowledge, and performance indicators, and degree candidate outcome scores on summative exams (Praxis II) for content and pedagogy. Data are collected using Taskstream software and maintained by the Director of Assessment and Accreditation, who proactively and reactively provides information to faculty and administration that is used to make curricular decisions.

3. How will you ensure that the assessment findings will be used to improve the program?

National (Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation), regional (Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, and state (Idaho State Board of Education) accrediting bodies require evidence of employment of assessment findings in program improvement. The Department of Curriculum and Instruction employs an ongoing improvement process that compels faculty to utilize assessment findings in any potential revisions to programs. The Basic Mathematics teaching minor program will become a part of the regular review process already in place for the other programs leading to recommendation for teacher certification/endorsement.

4. What direct and indirect measures will be used to assess student learning?

Degree candidates for this proposed strand within the existing C&I program will be assessed using a variety of methods, including assignments such as lesson plan creation and analysis of K-12 student work. Additionally, demonstration of competency in teaching the material to K-12 students is required. Degree candidates deliver mathematics education to students in practicum settings, allowing program faculty to evaluate learning of the material and abilities to deliver it effectively. Each of the identified SLOs above (including each indicator under each standard on the attached document) is evaluated using these identified degree candidate outputs. Each of the above indicators is assessed using formative and summative measures within each teacher preparation class, but the summative evaluation of all of the above is the University of Idaho Teacher Performance Assessment (UI-TPA). The UI-TPA is scored against a validated rubric and all of the above are expected to be demonstrated in that assessment, which is aligned to expected degree candidate learning outcomes.

5. When will assessment activities occur and at what frequency?

Assessment activities for teaching minors are ongoing, including annual spring evaluation of all indicators by faculty and consideration every seven years by the above-mentioned accrediting bodies. Programs leading to recommendation for initial certification/endorsement at the University of Idaho College of Education are up for accreditation consideration during the 2020-21 academic year.

### Financial Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greater than $250,000 per FY:</th>
<th>Less than $250,000 per FY:</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brief Description of financial impact:</td>
<td>While four courses have been created to be completed during this program, efficiencies have been identified by staggering the offerings of other mathematics education courses. Of the four courses, three of them are absorbed (financially, teaching load), while one will be necessarily paid for by Department of Curriculum and Instruction funds. All pertinent department and college administrative faculty have been consulted in this process and have committed to this plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Distance Education Availability

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? Yes* x No

*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 if program component request section is completed

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Location(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeur d’Alene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Falls*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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>Information</th>
<th>Date or Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Effective Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received by the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received by Budget Office, if applicable:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received by Institutional Research and Assessment:</td>
<td>3-8-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received by UCC Secretary:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCC Item Number:</td>
<td>UCC-17-039a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCC Approval Date:</td>
<td>3-27-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote Record:</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>Vote Record:</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>
D. Basic Mathematics Teaching Minor (21 cr)
EDCI 413 Data Analysis and Probability       (3 cr)
EDCI 416 Algebraic and Proportional Reasoning     (3 cr)
MTHE 409 Algebraic and Functional Reasoning     (3 cr)
MTHE 410 Proof and Argumentation       (3 cr)
EDCI 411 Geometry, Measurement, and Trigonometry (3 cr)

One of the following two options:

Elementary Teacher Candidates:
MTHE 235 Mathematics for Elementary Teachers I   (3 cr)
MTHE 236 Mathematics for Elementary Teachers II (3 cr)

Secondary Teacher Candidates:
Six credits of advisor approved electives
POLICY COVER SHEET
(See Faculty Staff Handbook 1460 for instructions at UI policy website: www.webs.uidaho.edu/uipolicy)
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Chapter & Title: APM 45.35 – University of Idaho Unmanned Aircraft Systems
(“UAS”)

All policies must be reviewed, approved and returned by a policy sponsor, with a cover sheet attached to apm@uidaho.edu or fsh@uidaho.edu respectively.
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I. Policy/Procedure Statement: Briefly explain the purpose/reason of proposed addition, revision, and/or deletion to the Faculty/Staff Handbook or the Administrative Procedures Manual.
   a. In September of 2016, the FAA released Section 107, which reduced the requirements to fly small unmanned aerial vehicles commercially. This revision updates UI’s UAV policy to reflect this change.

II. Fiscal Impact: What fiscal impact, if any, will this addition, revision, or deletion have?
   a. No impact.

III. Related Policies/Procedures: Describe other policies or procedures existing that are related or similar to this proposed change.
   a. No other changes.

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

If not a minor amendment forward to: ____________________________________________

Track # ____________________ Date Rec.: __________________
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APM
F&A Appr.: ____________
[Office Use Only]
Preamble: This policy, and the related policies and procedures described herein, is intended to ensure that the University operates any unmanned aircraft system in the furtherance of its educational, research, and service missions, as well as in compliance with applicable federal and state laws. This policy shall be effective immediately.

Contents:
A. Definitions
B. Policy
C. Process/Procedure
D. Contact Information

A. Definitions.

A-1. Aircraft means any contrivance invented, used, intended to be used, or designed to navigate, or fly, in the air.

A-2. Unmanned Aircraft System (“UAS”) means an aircraft that is operated without the possibility of direct human intervention from within or on the aircraft and associated elements (including communication links and the components that control the unmanned aircraft) that are required for the pilot in command to operate safely and efficiently in the navigable airspace of the United States under the regulatory authority of the Federal Aviation Administration (“FAA”).

A-3. Certification of Waiver; Certificate of Authorization (“COA”) means a Federal Aviation Administration grant of approval for a specific unmanned aircraft flight operation. Standard use of a UAS under the Section 107 does not require a COA. [rev. 2-17]

A-4. Navigable Airspace means the airspace of the United States above the minimum altitudes of flight prescribed by the regulations of the FAA, including airspace needed to ensure safety in the takeoff and landing of aircraft.

A-5. Public Operation COA means a COA grant by the FAA for a public aircraft operation. Public aircraft operations are those conducted by a public agency, like the University, in furtherance of a governmental function.

A-6. Governmental Function means an activity undertaken by a government, such as national defense, intelligence missions, firefighting, search and rescue, law enforcement (including transport of prisoners, detainees, and illegal aliens), aeronautical research, biological or geological resource management.

A-7. Civil Operation means any UAS operation falling outside the scope of a public aircraft operation, such as an operation involving a commercial purpose
or an operation involving research or other institutional activity outside the definition of governmental function. FAA authorization to fly a UAS in a civil operation may be granted under a Section 333 Exemption or a Special Airworthiness Certificate. In addition to obtaining FAA authorization for a Civil Operation, a COA must also be obtained from the FAA for any civil UAS flight operations. [rev. 2-17]

A-8. **Commercial Purpose** means the transportation of persons or property or other use of UAS for compensation or hire.

**B. Policy.**

B-1. **Introduction.** The University, in carrying out its educational, research, and service missions, may make use of Unmanned Aircraft Systems ("UAS"), more commonly known as “drones,” in Navigable Airspace when granted authorization to do so by the FAA. As a “governmental instrumentality for the dissemination of knowledge and learning,” the University of Idaho is eligible for Public Operation certificates of waiver or authorization ("COAs") from the FAA that permit the University to fly UASs in the furtherance of a Governmental Function and where use of UAS would otherwise be prohibited under current law. The University has committed to the FAA that it will not use any UAS for purposes that are not Governmental Functions, including but not limited to Commercial Purposes, or for purposes except as otherwise authorized by the FAA, including but not limited to authorization through a Special Airworthiness Certificate, Experimental Category, or through exceptions that may be granted under Section 333 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (“Section 333”) or through 14 C.F.R. §§107.1 et seq. (“Part 107”). This policy is intended to ensure University compliance with federal and state laws regarding UAS. [rev. 2-17]

B-2. **Policy.** No use of UAS may be undertaken by University faculty, staff, and students, or by third parties (including, but not limited to, consultants or contractors) acting on behalf of the University, without: 1) prior review by the UAS Committee; 2) approval by the Vice President for Research and Economic Development (“VPRED”), and, if necessary, 3) approval by the FAA of a COA and/or other authorizations or exemptions applicable to the University use. [rev. 2-17]

Personal use of UAS by University faculty, staff, students, or third parties on University property, including but not limited to recreational or hobby flight of model aircraft, is governed by APM 95.35, Personal Use of Unmanned Aircraft Systems on Campus, which prohibits such use on University property. See also APM 35.35, Public Use and Liabilities.

**C. Scope of Authority and Responsibility for Review, Approval, and Monitoring of University Use of UAS.**

C-1. **UAS Committee.** The UAS Committee is an ad-hoc committee established by the President, pursuant to FSH 1620B-3, to advise the VPRED,
who acts on behalf of the President in matters related to the use of UAS. The Committee will report to the VPRED. The UAS Committee is the principal mechanism by which the University ensures that it is meeting its obligations under federal and state law applicable to UAS use and under any COA approved by the FAA and that ethical issues related to UAS use is given due consideration prior to use.

C-2. The UAS Committee will review and make a formal recommendation to the VPRED, or his or her designee, regarding any proposed use of UAS in Navigable Airspace by any members of the University of Idaho community, including faculty, staff, students, or by third parties acting on behalf of the University. The UAS Committee will consider the legal and ethical issues related to the UAS use and apply relevant law, guidance from federal agencies, etc., in determining whether a proposed use should be recommended to the VPRED for approval.

The UAS Committee will determine whether a proposed use can be recommended for approval as described, needs modification to be recommended for approval, or should be denied. The UAS Committee shall only recommend for approval those uses that it reasonably believes: to be a Governmental Function and therefore eligible for a Public Operations COA; to be within those areas of activity covered by other authorizations or exemptions that may be granted by the FAA to the University for Civil Operations, including Part 107; to be within the Model Aircraft Rule for educational use; or to be covered by an authorization by the FAA for Civil Operations held by a third party, subject to an agreement between the University and third party with respect to such services. [rev. 2-17]

The UAS Committee may deny a proposed UAS use on the basis of factors including, but not limited to: the proposed use constitutes a Commercial Purpose; the proposed use is not a Governmental Function eligible for coverage by a Public Operations COA; the proposed use is not covered by other forms of authorization by the FAA for Civil Operation of UAS; or the proposed use is prohibited by law without written consent of the individual or the owner of a farm, dairy, or other agricultural industry, and such consent has not and/or cannot be obtained.

If the UAS Committee denies a proposed use, the denial may be appealed, in writing, to the VPRED. Any proposed use which the UAS Committee determines needs modification may be recommended for approval, following completion of any required modifications.

The UAS Committee, with the assistance of the Office of Research Assurances (“ORA”), shall provide ongoing review of any use approved by the VPRED and covered by a COA issued or other forms of authorization provided by the FAA. The UAS Committee may, with the assistance of ORA and subject to approval by the VPRED, develop and implement: standard operating procedures for use and operation of UAS; procedures for submission of a proposal to the UAS Committee; procedures for appeal to the VPRED of any denial of a proposed
UAS use by the UAS Committee; and internal rules and procedures for the operation and administration of the UAS Committee, as may be consistent with this policy.

The Committee may recommend suspension or termination of any use it deems inconsistent with the use approved by the VPRED and/or the requirements of the applicable COA or other authorization granted by the FAA. Authority to suspend or terminate any previously approved use rests solely with the VPRED, or designee.

C-3. Approval by VPRED. Any proposed use of UAS recommended for approval by the UAS Committee shall be reviewed by the VPRED, or designee, and approved or denied. Only those uses-operations approved by the VPRED may be covered by an application to the FAA, as necessary, and/or undertaken by University personnel, students engaged in coursework, or third parties operating on behalf of the University: a COA application submitted by the University to or a University-held COA approved by the FAA; an application submitted by the University for authorization for Civil Operations; or a Public Operations COA or other authorization from the FAA for Civil Operations held by a third party performing services on behalf of or collaborating with the University. Only the VPRED, or designee, may submit an application for a Public Operations COA or similar applications to the FAA and/or submit an application for authorization for Civil Operations to the FAA, after consultation with the Office of General Counsel. [rev. 2-17]

The VPRED may, at his or her sole discretion, suspend or terminate any previous approval of UAS under this policy on the basis that actual use is inconsistent with the previous grant of approval by the VPRED and/or the requirements of an applicable COA.

D. Contact Information. For further information regarding implementation of this policy you may contact the Office of Research Assurances, the UAS Committee, or visit the University UAS website.