University of Idaho
2017-2018 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA
Meeting #23
3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, April 3, 2018
Brink Hall Faculty-Staff Lounge & Zoom

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   
   • Minutes of the 2017-18 Faculty Senate Meeting #22, March 27, 2018 (vote)

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.

VI. Committee Reports.

   Faculty Affairs (vote)
   • FS-18-050: FSH 3050 - Position Description Policy & Form and FSH 3320 - Annual Evaluation Policy (Ytreberg)

   Library Affairs (vote)
   • FS-18-053: FSH 6920 – University Library (Perrett)

VII. Special Orders.

   • Strategic Plan and NWCCU (Pietrzak)
   • Parking and Transportation (Couch)

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Patrick Hrdlicka, Chair 2017-2018, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2017-2018 FS Meeting #22
Handouts
University of Idaho
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
2017-2018 Meeting #22, Tuesday, March 27, 2018

Present: Anderson (Mike), Anderson (Miranda), Arowojolu, Baird, Brandt (w/o vote), Brown, Caplan, De Angelis, Foster, Grieb, Howard, Hrdlicka, Jeffrey, Johnson, Kern (Coeur d’Alene), Mahoney, Morgan, Morrison, Panttaja, Schwarzlaender, Seamon, Tenuto (Boise)(for Cannon w/o vote), Tibbals, Vella, Watson, Wieneck (w/o vote). Absent: Cannon (Boise), Ellison, Leonor, Nicotra, Zhao (Idaho Falls). Guests: 6

Call to Order and Minutes: The chair called the meeting to order at 3:30. A motion (Morrison/Anderson) to approve the minutes was made. The minutes were approved with four abstentions.

Chair’s Report:
• The Registrar launched the new web-based tool for changing majors (Dwaine Hubbard, Heather Chermak) at the beginning of March. We had urged the Registrar to build in a notification tool that would alert advisors by email when a student was requesting a change of major. The work group was adamant that we not send these emails to advisors. Instead, colleges are encouraged to send their weekly reports to the impacted advisors. Several of us have some concerns regarding this approach and we recommend that we all keep eyes to how this new procedure unfolds.
• On March 6th, President Staben released the initial notice regarding the university’s FY2019 Student Fees and Tuition request to the student groups and others including the Chair of Faculty Senate. The university proposes an 8% increase in the resident tuition rate ($600 increase for undergraduates; proposed new tuition $8,088/yr.). Students and other University of Idaho community members will have the opportunity to comment on these proposed changes at an open forum on April 5th at 3:30 in the Commons Horizon/Aurora Rooms and comments can also be submitted via email to studentfees@uidaho.edu. This proposal will be presented to the SBOE at the April 19th meeting.
• A memo was distributed on March 20 to the UI community from Provost Wiencek and Yolanda Bisbee, who is the chair of the "Great Colleges to Work For" task force. The task force has analyzed survey responses from 2016 and 2017, and recommendations from the Campus Culture and Climate subcommittee of the President’s Council on Diversity and Inclusion, to draft an action plan how to address some of the workplace environment challenges that we are facing. Members of the university community are invited to read and provide improvements to the report via email to provost@uidaho.edu by April 4, 2018.
• The deadline for Faculty and Staff to participate in the 2018 Great Colleges to Work for survey is April 6. Senators are encouraged to remind their constituents to participate in this anonymous survey which is our primary instrument for evaluation of our workplace environment. As a member of the Great College Cascaded Plan Workgroup, the chair stressed the importance of faculty and staff participation in the survey. Responses are carefully tabulated and analyzed, and real plans are set in motion to improve the workplace environment based on the survey results.
• Sabbatical applications for the 2019-20 academic year are due Friday, March 30.
• Nominations for honorary degrees for the December 2018 commencement ceremony are due April 15.
• University Faculty Meeting is set for 3 p.m. PDT/ 4 p.m. MDT April 25 in the Vandal Ballroom and by video connection to sites in Coeur d’Alene, Boise, Twin Falls and Idaho Falls.
• University of Idaho Excellence Award banquet is at 6:00 p.m., Wednesday, April 25, 2018, in the International Ballroom, Pitman Center,
Staff Council is looking for enthusiastic board-appointed staff members to fill positions on Staff Council becoming available starting June 1, 2018, for fiscal year 2019. Participants will be required to attend the Staff Council meeting every month, from 9-11 a.m. on the second Wednesday of each month in the Paul Joyce Faculty-Staff Lounge.

Senators should be actively considering running for Chair and Vice Chair of Faculty Senate as there will be complete turnover of leadership year.

Provost’s Report:

- Members of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU), the university’s regional accrediting body, will be on campus on April 12-13 for a formative site visit. The purpose of this visit is to identify areas in which the university is not meeting expectations and encourage necessary improvements. The commission will be examining institutional assessment processes particularly in the area of general education. The provost believes the commission also wants to continue its focus on how the university integrates its planning efforts on campus, how different constituencies are included in the planning process, and how the institution determines whether it is meeting its goals. Last year the commission complimented the university on its planning process. This year it wants to ensure that we are continuing to make progress. The Presidential Leadership Breakfast on March 28 will focus on the NWCCU visit.

- The time for Change in Employee Compensation (CEC) is approaching quickly. The Faculty Compensation Taskforce (F-CTF) has met with the deans to determine how to continue to implement the UI’s new approach to compensation. Considering both the mid-year compensation increase and the 3% CEC approved by the legislature, approximately 4.72% of general education funded compensation will be available for employee compensation. This means that approximately $1.28 million in general education funding is available for faculty CEC this spring. At present, it is not clear whether this includes the amount necessary for promotion increments, or whether those changes in compensation will be funded from different resources. This amount of funding is a significant improvement over recent years. Several factors will be considered in determining compensation changes including keeping up with market inflation, continuing support for the market based compensation approach implemented at mid-year, and providing support for performance-based compensation. Final decisions about allocations have not yet been made.

- The Vandal Success Coalition has conducted several surveys and have shared the result with the larger group looking at UI policies regarding advising. So far, valuable information has been gathered. The group is now conducting a survey of students. They plan to hold a retreat to determine how to align and support the university’s advising efforts.

- The dean search for the College of Natural Resources (CNR) is underway. The search committee will be chaired by Dean Ginger Carney. The goal is to get started before the end of the school year, to retain a search firm over the summer, and to begin campus interviews during the fall semester.

- In addition to the CNR search, the provost is consulting with college leaders in the College of Letters Arts and Social Sciences and CNR regarding interim dean appointments.

- The vacancy announcement for the Vice Provost for Faculty will be posted within the next two days. The search will be open for approximately the next three weeks. The provost encouraged senators to inform colleagues of this important position and to consider nominating qualified individuals for the position. He stressed that this position works with senate among others on many issues of importance to faculty.

- Consideration of the future process for Program Prioritization continues. The Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Committee (IPEC) recommended that the three criteria (centrality to mission, contribution to the strategic plan, and institutional investment) be utilized, but that the evaluation of contribution to the strategic plan be measured differently. Many faculty and staff criticized the measurement process regarding the strategic plan because the standards did not align well with the planning process. IPEC asked a committee of deans and faculty to work on tweaking the process.
The committee, chaired by Dean Ali Carr-Chelman, has expressed the desire to undertake a more comprehensive re-evaluation of the process. The committee and IPEC are meeting to discuss the scope of our efforts. The provost emphasized that we do not need to rush the reconsideration process. While the State Board of Education (SBOE) expects us to refresh our prioritization process, it has not established a strict timeline for doing so.

- The provost has not yet followed up regarding the process for considering college mergers. He plans to get a communication out soon, and to convene a group before the end of the semester charged with examining possible mergers. He would like to have the group undertake some preliminary planning so that the university can collect data over the summer. The group will then be able to get started quickly next fall.

A senator asked the provost to explain the timing he expects for future Program Prioritization efforts. She asked whether the current committee is considering a replacement for what we did a year ago or whether its efforts will be focused on the future. The provost responded that IPEC envisioned the current process as re-thinking how to evaluate the contribution of each unit to the strategic plan. The committee would like to take a more holistic approach. The committee and IPEC are meeting in the coming week to resolve the scope of the current effort. The provost also explained that the direction of the SBOE on timing is fairly vague. The board expects the university to go through a regular process of program prioritization, but has not dictated a particular schedule. The provost is hopeful that we will have a revised process in place by the end of the 2018-19 academic year. At that time, we will consider our next prioritization at the next strategic plan waypoint. However, he added that, the decision about when to launch our next prioritization process is the president’s.

A senator pointed out transparency of the timing is important to the various departments. Faculty and staff are weary of the process and concerned about how it will move forward. The provost agreed that clarity is important, but also stressed the importance of considering the input of the new planning committee. Another senator asked whether resource reallocation is going to happen, based on program prioritization. The faculty secretary pointed out that reallocation has already happened. Regarding future reallocations, the provost stressed that the decision is the president’s decision. He explained that initially the president considered doing an annual reallocation to fund market compensation. However, after this first year, it became clear in many places we are cutting into bone. In addition, we have also recently identified a systemic shortfall in our central reserves. We are going to use one-time money to replenish central reserves next fall. The question is about how we will continue to replenish central reserves. Because of these competing pressures, it isn’t certain whether and how, we will implement a reallocation next year. The provost added that if enrollment grows the amount of any reallocation could be reduced. The situation is evolving.

A senator made the point that it’s important for units that want to position themselves well, to understand how they will be evaluated. The provost acknowledged this and indicated that IPEC is concerned about this issue also. He again stated that IPEC has focused on evaluating unit cascaded strategic plans as the best way to revise the program prioritization process. IPEC is meeting with Dean Carr-Chelman’s committee to refine the process. He stressed that departments should not “game” the system based on the old approach, because it will definitely be changing.

A senator asked how to provide input to the many committees considering the issues. The provost ruefully acknowledged that it would be good to have a comprehensive and central place to access the committees. He indicated that IPEC is working to develop a more robust website to address this issue. Another senator expressed confusion about the role of the various committees. The provost clarified that the program prioritization committee chaired by Dean Carr-Chelman is a sub-committee of IPEC. The committee examining the university’s budget process has been convened by Vice President Foisy. The senator
followed up asking whether the budget committee will be looking at Y accounts as part of its plan to address the budget issue? The provost responded that the committee would be primarily focused on general education funds. He stressed, however, that there are often significant unexplained carry forward balances in Y accounts. He pointed out that it is reasonable for the institution to expect that Y account balances be expended for appropriate purposes and not continually be protected without scrutiny.

**Research Council Report (revision of FSH 1640.72).** Audrey Harris, Biosafety Officer in the Office of Research Assurances presented the report proposing a revision to FSH 1640.72 to eliminate the provision making the Institutional Review Board (IRB) a subcommittee of the Research Council. Harris pointed out that this structure was a relic from a time when all the research assurance committees were standing committees of the Research Council. She indicated that there is not a consultative or communication role between the Research Council and the IRB and that neither committee was aware that the subcommittee provision was part of policy. The proposal was approved unanimously.

**Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) Report.** Professor Marty Ytreberg, chair of the committee, presented the report. He explained that FAC is proposing revisions to FSH 3050 regarding faculty position descriptions. The committee also proposes a small related change to FSH 3320 regarding faculty annual evaluations. The goal of FAC was to respond to substantial input from faculty and administrators urging that position descriptions only be revised when a faculty member has a significant change in responsibilities. The committee also sought to address the lack of coordination between the position description process and the annual evaluation process. Under current policy, we have two intertwined meetings at different times one or two months apart (one at year end on the annual evaluation and one at the beginning of the year on the position description). Another concern considered by the committee was that some departments have developed a very detailed process to determine how information is listed in the position description. The committee believed that this process was related to the numerical faculty evaluation process and the desire to articulate exactly what a “3” means. FAC did not think there is a continuing need for the detailed provisions, given the recent changes made to the annual evaluation process. Ytreberg also pointed out that the typical faculty member’s position description doesn’t change very much from year to year. Finally, the committee wanted to institute an online position description. FAC’s vision is that faculty would complete the position description once and would only change it if the faculty member has significant changes in responsibilities. Examples when a revision to a faculty position description might be appropriate under the proposed policy include a permanent or long-term change to a faculty member’s teaching load, or the assumption of significant administrative responsibilities. The committee also wanted a faculty member to be able to reflect that she or he has no responsibilities during a period of leave. Finally, the committee is also proposing a small change to the annual evaluation provision (FSH 3320) to encourage a discussion of goals during the annual evaluation process.

A faculty member commented that historically the annual evaluation has been a backward-looking process and the position description has been a forward-looking process. He asked how the forward-looking process would be furthered under the proposed approach to the position description. Ytreberg responded that FAC believes that the annual evaluation process should include a forward-looking component. He pointed out that the new annual evaluation form, approved by senate during the fall semester, includes a section for comments on the faculty member’s continued progress in his or her position. FAC wanted to discourage faculty members from mechanically inventorying activities. The committee also wanted to address the disincentive to mention goals for fear that the faculty member might be penalized if the goal is not accomplished. The position description will now have a single box that is a brief description of responsibilities. The committee left it to the faculty member and administrator to determine what information should be recorded on position description.
A senator asked whether the proposed process has been approved by the Office of General Counsel. Secretary Brandt explained that the policy has been forwarded to general counsel and that he has been kept informed of the process and revisions. She indicated that we do not expect him to have legal issues with the process. Another senator expressed reservations about the limit of 250 characters for the description of responsibilities and asked how the description would relate to the description of the position in the vacancy announcement. Ytreberg responded that the committee believes the description in the position description would be a shorter, more compact version of the information in the vacancy announcement.

A senator stated his view that the new form might be disadvantageous in evaluating whether teaching loads of different faculty in a department are equitable. Ytreberg responded that in a typical department most faculty have similar expectations. He acknowledged that while this is not true across the board, the proposed position description still contains percentages and some description to capture differences.

Another senator commented that the percentages on the position description are not descriptive of the allocation of time, but rather are a description of the relative weight given to different aspects of a faculty member’s responsibilities. He argued that it is important that percentages reflect how faculty will be evaluated. Ytreberg agreed, and added that FAC did not include provisions in the position description dictating how the percentages on the position description are interpreted. Rather, policy makes clear how the position description percentages will be used.

A senator commented that the current position description conveys important information about expectations to tenure and promotion evaluators. She asked how this information would be included in the process under the new approach. Ytreberg explained that the general weight of responsibilities would still be reflected by the percentages and this detailed information should be part of a faculty member’s professional portfolio. He also pointed out that the unit is required to have a context statement that details unit norms and expectations.

Chair Hrdlicka encouraged senators to share the proposed changes with their constituents and collect their feedback, with the intent of discussing and voting on the proposed changes at the following senate meeting.

**APM 50.16 -- Criminal Background Check.** Vice President for Finance and Administration Brian Foisy provided information regarding the updated procedures for criminal background checks. The revised procedure requires criminal background checks for all non-student positions, all graduate student appointees, post docs and temporary help employees. In addition, if students’ work involves any contact with minors, a background check is required. This last requirement is a change as the former policy only required background checks for student employees if their contact with minors was “significant”; in practice, the interpretation of the word “significant” was confusing. The requirement of a background check for those with any contact with minors applies to employees, interns, and volunteers. The policy also includes an exception providing that occasional employees, such as an adjunct faculty member who teaches one semester a year, do not have to be re-checked each time they are hired within one year since last employed by UI. In addition, changes in employment status where the employee is still engaged in the same type of work, do not require a background check. However, a unit that believes a background check is necessary, can request such a check. Finally, in a change from the former policy, no person is automatically excluded from employment based on the results of the background check. While exclusion from employment is a likely result, the facts and circumstances of the person’s specific situation can be considered.
A senator asked whether the proposers had considered the 2012 Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) Guidance regarding background checks. The senator commented that he believes the guidance may establish a standard for whether and when an employee can be excluded from employment based on a background check. The concern of the EEOC is that exclusions based on background checks can have a disparate impact on employees of color. Foisy did not know whether this guidance had been considered and indicated that he would follow up on it.

Another senator expressed concern that the university might not know about criminal conduct by an occasional employee during a break in employment. Foisy responded that the institution has to balance the cost of the background checks against the risk of missing some criminal activity. He pointed out that the institution does not have any provision for re-checking long-term employees and has no way of knowing whether they have been involved in criminal activity since their date of hire. At present, we are not in a position to eliminate the risk, only control for it. He also explained that if the institution learns of possible criminal activity, it can then pursue a check of the employee’s background, if warranted.

Another senator asked how we notify prospective employees of the need for a criminal background check. Foisy explained that most prospective employees are informed during their application process through People Admin. If employees are not hired through People Admin, the unit doing the hiring has the responsibility to inform prospective employees of the need for a criminal background check in writing.

**National College Health Assessment (NCHA) – Dr. Greg Lambeth, Director Center for Counseling & Testing (CTC).** Dr. Lambeth reported the results of the NCHA and of additional university-level surveys to senate. The university has participated in NCHA for the past nine years, so we now have access to some significant longitudinal data. In the most recent survey, 980 students or 28.1% of those receiving the survey, responded. Lambeth stressed that the survey was sent to a non-clinical sample of students – it was not distributed only to student who accessed CTC services. He summarized four important takeaways from the survey data. First, the severity of mental health issues experienced by students is increasing at the university. Second, self-harming, suicidal ideation and suicide attempts by students have also increased. Third, the CTC clients have consistently higher acuity of mental health symptoms. Finally, the demand for clinical services at the CTC has been steadily increasing in the past decade.

Lambeth highlighted some of the survey results. He noted that in many of the areas covered by the survey, there appears to be a steeper increase of problems during the past four years. Overall, over 50% of our students report that they experience high levels of stress and that they are overwhelmed by all they have to do. 45% of students report that during the past year they have experienced depression that makes it difficult to function. 68% of students report that they have felt very lonely. Lambeth commented that some people connect the statistic regarding loneliness to what is going on in social media, reasoning that although students are highly connected through social media, these connections may not be meaningful.

A significant percentage of students (up from previous years) report that they feel overwhelming anger and hopelessness. Almost 9% of students report that they have engaged in self-harm such as cutting, burning, bruising, or otherwise injuring themselves. The self-harm statistics are evidence of conduct that is visible in residence halls, to roommates, and to advisors. 16% of students report that in the past year they have seriously considered suicide. This last statistic is very high for a nonclinical survey population.

Students report that mental health issues have a major impact on their academic performance. Their reported incident of alcohol use did not change significantly in the most recent survey, but UI students report binge drinking at higher levels than previously. The number of students who report marijuana use is up slightly (and appears to track with the legalization of marijuana in Washington). Our students report
a small increase in prescription drug use. Poly Drug use (meaning the use of several drugs simultaneously) is also on the rise.

The CTC has seen a dramatic increase in the number of students accessing services at the center. Last year 1200 students (or 11% of all students) sought services at the CTC. This number has increased from 900 students seeking such services ten years ago. Moreover, when these numbers are examined in light of the NCHS results, it appears that many UI students who report mental health problems never access services at the CTC. Lambeth also reported that a significant number of students report concerns about remaining in school. Typically, these concerns are due to mental health issues that often overlap, or are exacerbated by financial and family concerns. Finally, the UI has seen an increase in medical withdrawals.

Lambeth reasoned that these increases in student mental health issues partially reflect national trends. He pointed out that no state in the country reports an increase in peoples’ feelings of well-being. Such large cultural and social impacts are reflected in our college students. He also made some general observations based on his first two years of experience at UI – we have many students from low income backgrounds who have had no access to health insurance and limited health care. The good news is that through the university these students have comparatively good access to mental health treatment.

A senator asked what time of year the NCHS survey was conducted and whether it is conducted at the same time each time it is administered. Lambeth reported that the survey is always conducted in the fall. The data collected outside the NCHS by the CTC is only 3 weeks old. The senator also asked whether the general NCHS data can be broken down more specifically. Lambeth indicated that there is quite a bit of granular data in the NCHS survey.

The time for the meeting having expired a motion (Foster/Tibbals) to adjourn passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 5:11 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Liz Brandt, Faculty Secretary &
Secretary to the Faculty Senate
POLICY COVER SHEET

(See Faculty Staff Handbook 1460 for instructions at UI policy website: www.webs.uidaho.edu/uipolicy)

[Faculty/Staff Handbook [FSH] □ Addition ☑ Revision* □ Deletion* □ Emergency
Minor Amendment

Chapter & Title: FSH 3050 – Position Description Policy & Form and FSH 3320 – Annual evaluation policy

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.

*Note: If revision/deletion request original document from apm@uidaho.edu or fsh@uidaho.edu, all changes must be made using “track changes.”

Originator(s): Marty Ytreberg
(Please see FSH 1460 C) Name Date
Telephone & Email: 208-885-6908 ytreberg@uidaho.edu

Policy Sponsor: (If different than originator.)

Telephone & Email:

Reviewed by General Counsel ___Yes ___X__No Name & Date: ________

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.

FAC approved March 22, 2018. The changes to the position description (PD) policy and form are to: (i) Eliminate the annual process. The PD will be initially created by the unit administrator(s) when a faculty member is hired (or once policy goes into effect for current faculty) and modified only if substantial changes occur. (ii) Make the PD form electronic. There will no longer be paper forms. (iii) Clean up, clarify and simplify language.

The changes to the Annual Evaluation (AE) policy adds the word “and goals” to FSH 3320 A-1. e to encourage a discussion.

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

None

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

None

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.: _____________
Posted: t-sheet _____________
   h/e _____________
   web _____________
Register: _____________
   (Office Use Only)
Faculty Position Description (*link to FSH 3050)

Date: (*autodate-retain all versions, effective date) ___________________________

Faculty Name: ___________________________________________________________  Employee V#: _______________

Rank: ____________________________________ Administrative Title (if applicable): ___________________________________

Unit(s): ___________________________________________________________________________________________

Include several checkboxes (replace following signatures on current form): Faculty Member signature box, confirm button that also assigns date, same for unit administrator, include UAs for those on joint appointments, interdisciplinary/center activities, and college dean.

Responsibility Areas (*link to FSH 1565 C) | PD% (*autofill into pie chart)
--- | ---
Teaching and Advising | 
Scholarship and Creative Activities | 
Outreach and Extension | 
University Service and Leadership | 

Total | 100%

Brief* description of expectations** that must be consistent with the unit(s) context statement and that encompasses the range of expected activities.

*limit box to 250 characters, or consult with FAC
** propose on form a checkbox used for instance when faculty go on full leave for extenuating circumstances, when box checked of no responsibility to equal 0% responsibility for specified time.

Include several checkboxes (replace following signatures on current form): Faculty Member signature box, confirm button that also assigns date, same for unit administrator, include UAs for those on joint appointments, interdisciplinary/center activities, and college dean.

Note to include or weave into online form:
- Position descriptions are one component of the independent process for promotion and tenure. See FSH 3520 and 3560 for details on the promotion and tenure process.
- Instructors will provide syllabi to their unit offices at the beginning of each term for courses for which they are responsible. Each syllabus should include expected learning outcomes for the course and should describe an example of how at least one learning outcome is assessed. Note: Is this still needed for NWCCU? Check with Dale Pietrzak, if so where best to include other than PD form, and what language is needed.
- ***If the joint appt/interdisciplinary box is checked, the unit administrator is responsible to solicit comments from, and discuss with, the interdisciplinary/center administrators listed whether the interdisciplinary/center activities as stated are accurate. All solicited comments are to be attached to this form. (FSH 3050 B-2, 3520 E-1, G-3, G-4 c, 3560 C, and E-2d, and 3320 A-1 d).
**Faculty Position Description**

**Enter Calendar Year** for review period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Name:</th>
<th>V Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title/Rank:</td>
<td>Administrative Title:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit(s):</td>
<td>(if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FTE:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching and Advising</th>
<th>60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship and Creative Activities</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach and Extension</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Service and Leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall description of responsibilities and goals by category**: 

**Faculty Member**: I agree that this is a reasonable description of my responsibilities to the University of Idaho for the forthcoming calendar year.

_________________________  _______________________
Signature of Faculty Member  Date

☐ Interdisciplinary/Center Activities: Attach narrative.

**Unit Administrator(s)**: I agree that this position description is a reasonable reflection of the stated expectations for progress towards tenure, promotion and/or continued satisfactory performance.

_________________________  _______________________
Signature of Unit Administrator  Date

_________________________  _______________________
Signature of Additional Unit Administrator  Date (e.g. joint appointments [if applicable])

_________________________  _______________________
Signature of Additional Unit Administrator  Date (e.g. joint appointments [if applicable])

**College Dean**: I agree that this position description is a reasonable reflection of the stated expectations for progress towards tenure, promotion and/or continued satisfactory performance.

_________________________  _______________________
Signature of Dean  Date

---

1 FSH 3050

2 See FSH 1565 for faculty responsibilities. Also, instructors will provide syllabi to their unit offices at the beginning of each term for courses for which they are responsible. Each syllabus should include expected learning outcomes for the course and should describe an example of how at least one learning outcome is assessed.

3 If the above box is checked, the unit administrator is responsible to solicit comments from, and discuss with, the interdisciplinary/center administrators listed whether the interdisciplinary/center activities as stated are accurate. All solicited comments are to be attached to this form. (FSH 3050 B-2, 3520 E-1, G-3, G-4 c, 3560 C, and E-2d, and 3320 A-1 d).
PREAMBLE: This section describes the creation and use of position descriptions that define responsibilities for faculty. This section was original to the 1979 Handbook; it has been editorially revised at intervals. In July 1998 the year covered by a position description was changed from an academic year to a calendar year. In July 2001 section B underwent some clarifying changes while the form itself underwent extensive revisions. In July 2007 the form underwent substantial revisions to address enforcement and accountability issues in the UI promotion and tenure process as well as to align the form with the Strategic Action Plan. In 2009 the form was revised to better integrate faculty interdisciplinary activities (including ensuring communication among all parties and eliminating the need to obtain multiple signatures) and FSH 3140 was incorporated into this policy. In January 2013 assessment language was added to the form. In 2016 a pilot form was introduced that reduced the amount of detail requested from faculty, streamlining the process and ratified in January 2017 with minor edits. Further information may be obtained from the Provost’s Office (208-885-6448). [rev. 7-98, 7-01, 7-07, 7-09, 1-15, 1-17ed. 12-06]

A. GENERAL. The position description establishes the expectations for each faculty member’s specific responsibilities in the four major responsibility areas identified in FSH 1565 C, Teaching and Advising, Scholarship and Creative Activities, Outreach and Extension, and University Service and Leadership. Expectations must be consistent with the unit(s) context statement. Faculty should ensure that the description fully encompasses the range of their expected activities be careful when preparing their position description to ensure they describe their goals and expectations in all responsibility areas. The position description serves as a reference for a faculty member’s a variety of important functions; in particular, it constitutes the essential frame of reference in annual performance evaluation of faculty members [see 3320], and consideration of faculty members is one component of the independent process for tenure and promotion [see 3520 and 3560]. [rev. 7-98, 1-17, ed. 7-00, 7-02, 7-09, 1-12]

B. PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS. Expectations designated for individual faculty members to achieve tenure or promotion in rank or satisfactory performance evaluation must be compatible with the criteria of the department or other unit concerned. Each faculty member is to be advised of these expectations in writing by the departmental or unit administrator at the time of appointment. [7-09, original text from 3140 .4]

B-1. Expectations are specified in the current faculty position description and are the basis for the annual performance evaluation. Expectations must not be greater than those that can be reasonably supported in the department or unit by providing sufficient time and resources. [rev. 7-09—partial text from 3140 B-1, 4 & 5]

B-2. Except by written agreement between the faculty member and the appropriate administrator, expectations for individual faculty members are in effect for a period of one calendar year. [7-09—original text from 3140 B-2]

BC. PROCEDURE.

CB-1. The calendar year A position description shall be provided to each faculty member by the unit administrator within a reasonable period of time after the faculty member begins employment. The faculty member, and the unit administrator(s), and/or center director, must approve the position description is recorded on the form appended to this section with a due date established by the provost. [rev. 7-98, 1-08, 7-09, ed. 7-01]

C-2. The form should be filled out in collaboration with the unit administrator. Faculty members involved in interdisciplinary activities should check the box on the position description form and attach a narrative explaining their activities and listing units and members involved. For faculty involved in interdisciplinary activities or with centers, the unit administrator is to solicit comments regarding the position description and discuss it with all interdisciplinary/center administrator(s) listed on the faculty member’s narrative attached to the form. The form is then to be signed by the faculty member, approved by the unit administrator, and dean, and sent to the Provost’s Office. [rev. 7-01, 7-02, 1-08, 7-09]

BC-32. The position description shall remain in effect unless revised to reflect substantial changes in expectations. Such a change may include the assumption of administrative responsibilities, a change in teaching
load, an increase in research responsibilities, leave or sabbatical, etc. The faculty member and the unit administrator(s), and/or center director, must approve the revised position description. Any change in duties or responsibilities that represents a significant departure from the position description is permitted only with the written consent of the faculty member and administrator involved. A revised position description should be filed in this event. [7-09 - original text from 3140 B-3]

C-4. When the personnel activity report form (PAR) (see APM 45.09) is completed, the unit administrator should compare the data obtained for each faculty member with the corresponding position description. Perfect agreement between the position description and the record of actual performance is not necessarily expected, but it is desirable that any discrepancy between them be as small as is feasible. [ed. 7-01, 7-09]

(Form follows on the next pages.)
PREAMBLE: This section describes the creation and use of position descriptions that define responsibilities for faculty. This section was original to the 1979 Handbook; it has been editorially revised at intervals. In July 1998 the year covered by a position description was changed from an academic year to a calendar year. In July 2001 section B underwent some clarifying changes while the form itself underwent extensive revisions. In July 2007 the form underwent substantial revisions to address enforcement and accountability issues in the UI promotion and tenure process as well as to align the form with the Strategic Action Plan. In 2009 the form was revised to better integrate faculty interdisciplinary activities (including ensuring communication among all parties and eliminating the need to obtain multiple signatures) and FSH 3140 was incorporated into this policy. In January 2015 assessment language was added to the form. In 2016 a pilot form was introduced that reduced the amount of detail requested from faculty, streamlining the process and ratified in January 2017 with minor edits. Further information may be obtained from the Provost's Office (208-885-6448). [rev. 7-98, 7-01, 7-07, 7-09, 1-15, 1-17ed. 12-06]

A. GENERAL. The position description establishes the expectations for each faculty member in the major responsibility areas identified in FSH 1565 C, Teaching and Advising, Scholarship and Creative Activities, Outreach and Extension, and University Service and Leadership. Expectations must be consistent with the unit(s) context statement. Faculty should ensure that the description fully encompasses the range of their expected activities. The position description serves as a reference for a faculty member’s annual performance evaluation [see 3320], and is one component of the independent process for tenure and promotion [see 3520 and 3560]. [rev. 7-98, 1-17, ed. 7-00, 7-02, 7-09, 1-12]

B. PROCEDURE.

B-1. A position description shall be provided to each faculty member by the unit administrator within a reasonable period of time after the faculty member begins employment. The faculty member, and the unit administrator(s), and/or center director, must approve the position description. [rev. 7-98, 1-08, 7-09, ed. 7-01]

B-2. The position description shall remain in effect unless revised to reflect substantial changes in expectations. Such a change may include the assumption of administrative responsibilities, a change in teaching load, an increase in research responsibilities, leave or sabbatical, etc. The faculty member and the unit administrator(s), and/or center director, must approve the revised position description.

(Form follows on the next pages.)
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS
AND
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS

PREAMBLE: This section contains those policies and their attendant procedures for those periodic reviews of performance that affect faculty members and academic administrators. Policies concerning performance evaluation were part of the original 1979 Handbook, but were completely rewritten in July 2002 and further refined in 2003. In July 2007 Form 1 underwent substantial revisions to address enforcement and accountability issues in the UI promotion and tenure process as well as align the form with the Strategic Action Plan. In January 2008 Form 1 was again revised to include a Disclosure of Conflicts statement to comply with FSH 6240. In 2009 this section was again revised to reflect recent changes to the faculty position description and evaluation forms to better integrate faculty interdisciplinary activities. In July 2010 B was added and FSH 1420 E-6 was incorporated into D to consolidate the evaluation process into one policy. In July 2014 changes were incorporated to ensure all faculty go through a review by their peers. In January 2017 a temporary fix to this policy was put in place to allow for a pilot narrative evaluation process for 2016 and ensure that existing policy would apply. In November 2017 an emergency revision (rewrite of the faculty section, not the administrator section) to this policy was put in place to address the new narrative evaluation process so as to be effective before the next evaluation process. Further information may be obtained from the Provost’s Office (208-885-6448. [ed. 7-03, rev. 7-07, 1-08, 7-09, 7-10, 7-14, 1-17]

CONTENTS:

A. Annual Performance Evaluation for Faculty Members
B. Faculty Performance that does not Meet Expectations
C. Performance Evaluation of Academic Administrators
D. Sequence of Evaluation of Faculty Members and Administrators.

A. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FOR FACULTY MEMBERS.

A-1. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION. Annual evaluation of the performance of each member of the faculty is primarily the responsibility of the faculty member and unit administrator. The provost is responsible for preparing supplementary instructions each year, including the schedule for completion of the annual performance evaluation. Personnel on international assignment see FSH 3380 C. [rev. 7-03, 7-09, 7-14, ed. 7-10, 1-17]

a. Forms. The Annual Performance Evaluation Form is available below. The form may not be altered without following the appropriate governance process (see FSH 1460). The unit administrator is responsible for ensuring that each faculty member uses the proper form together with the supplementary instructions as provided by the Provost Office. [rev. 7-01, 1-17]

b. Performance expectations are described below. The narrative in the evaluation form shall provide evidence to support the evaluation. [ed. 7-10]

i. Performance that Meets or Exceeds Expectations is at least satisfactory performance during the review period of a faculty member relative to the position description.

ii. Performance that does not Meet Expectations denotes performance during the review period that is less than expected of a faculty member relative to the position description and means improvement is necessary. An evaluation of not meeting expectations in one or more responsibility areas triggers procedures outlined in FSH 3320 B below.

c. Annual Report of Efforts and Accomplishments by Faculty Member. Each faculty member shall provide his or her unit administrator with the following materials in preparation for the annual performance evaluation:

(1) Current Curriculum Vitae
(2) UI Faculty Position Description for Annual Performance Review
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Chapter III: EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION CONCERNING FACULTY AND STAFF

Section 3320: Annual Performance Evaluations of Faculty Members and Performance Evaluation of Academic Administrators

(3) Written detailed summary report of faculty activity for the period of the annual performance review that compares accomplishments to expectations in the Position Description for the review period. This report may be in the form of a self-evaluation using the annual evaluation form included in this policy. [rev. 7-09]

(4) Other materials necessary to document efforts and accomplishments for the review period. [add. 7-01, ed. 7-10]

d. Evaluation of Faculty by Unit Administrators. Unit administrators evaluate the faculty members in their unit. The performance of each faculty member during the review period is judged on the basis of the position description(s) in effect during that period. In the case of a faculty member holding joint appointments and/or involved in interdisciplinary activities, as described in the position description, in two or more academic or administrative units, it is the responsibility of the administrator in the faculty member’s primary academic discipline to solicit and consider relevant information on job performance from other administrators with responsibility for the faculty member’s work. [See also 3080 E-3.] [rev. 7-09, ed. 7-10]

Whether a faculty member’s performance meets expectations is determined by comparing the faculty member’s performance to the position description for the review period. For each area of responsibility, the unit administrator shall describe the basis for her/his evaluation of the faculty member’s performance in the narrative on the form. After the unit administrator has completed the narrative evaluation for all faculty for the review period, the unit administrator shall provide the following items to each reviewed individual as they become available: [rev. 7-03, 7-09]

(1) a copy of the individual’s annual evaluation form [rev. 7-09]
(2) if requested, comparative information to help assess performance evaluation

The unit administrator shall also include comments and recommendations for the faculty member’s progress toward tenure, promotion or continued satisfactory performance in the appropriate place on the annual evaluation form.

e. Conference. It is strongly recommended that the unit administrator meet with each faculty member. The unit administrator shall provide each faculty member with the opportunity to meet to discuss the unit administrator’s evaluation. (Suitable alternate arrangements shall be made for off-campus personnel.) The purpose of this meeting is to review and discuss the administrator’s evaluation and the faculty member’s detailed report of activities. The unit administrator should explain the narrative providing a formative assessment on progress towards tenure, promotion, and/or continued satisfactory performance. The faculty member and the unit administrator should work to identify strategies and goals to help the faculty member improve performance. The evaluation may be modified as a result of the discussion. At the conclusion of the review process, each faculty member shall sign the evaluation form indicating that she/he has had the opportunity to read the evaluation report and to discuss it with the unit administrator. If the faculty member wishes to respond to the contents of the review, he/she shall be permitted to append a response to the unit administrator’s evaluation. A copy of the administrator’s final evaluation shall be given to the faculty member. [ren. and rev. 7-01, rev. 7-09, ed. 7-10]

f. College-Level Action. Copies of the performance evaluation materials forwarded by the unit administrator to the appropriate dean(s), for evaluation at the college(s) level, shall include: [rev. 7-09]

(1) the evaluation form with the complete narrative and the comments and recommendations on progress towards tenure, promotion, and/or continued satisfactory performance, and [rev. 7-09]
(2) any comments provided by interdisciplinary/center administrators or from those administrators of faculty holding joint appointments provided pursuant to subsection A-1. d., above. [rev. 7-09]

g. If the unit administrator fails to include the required narrative and comments/recommendations the college shall return the materials to the unit administrator. [add. 7-09, rev. 7-10]
h. If the faculty member has attached a response to the evaluation, the response shall be provided to the dean with the annual evaluation form. The dean shall arrange a meeting with the unit administrator and the faculty member to attempt to resolve the relevant issues.

i. If the college dean disagrees with the unit administrator’s evaluation, the dean shall attach a narrative stating the reasons for the disagreement. A copy of the dean’s narrative shall be provided to the faculty member. The faculty member may respond to the dean’s evaluation before the evaluation is forwarded to the provost. The faculty member, unit administrator, and dean are encouraged to resolve the disagreement before forwarding the evaluation to the provost. If the matter remains unresolved at the college level, the provost shall be notified of the disagreement.

j. The college shall forward all evaluation material at the unit and college level, including the dean’s narrative and faculty responses, if any, to the provost for permanent filing. [ren. and rev. 7-01, rev. 12-06, 7-09, 7-10]

A-2. Relationship to Promotion and Tenure Process. The faculty annual performance evaluation is an administrative review. Annual evaluations are one component of the independent promotion and tenure process. See FSH 3520 and FSH 3560 for details on the promotion and tenure process.

B. FACULTY PERFORMANCE THAT DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS. [add. 7-10]

B-1. If the unit administrator determines that a faculty member is not meeting expectations, the unit administrator should consider the reasons for and explanations of the performance. (see FSH 3190). [ed. 7-09, rev. 7-10]

The unit administrator, in consultation with the faculty member, should address the possible causes of the problem, should suggest appropriate resources and encourage the employee to seek such help. Faculty members and unit administrators may obtain referral information and advice from the Ombuds, Human Resources, or the Provost’s Office. [ed. 12-06, 7-09, 7-14, rev. 7-16]

B-2. PROVOST INVOLVEMENT. In the event of an overall evaluation of “does not meet expectations” where the faculty member’s performance is so far below expectations that it is not acceptable in relation to the position description, the provost may, in consultation with the dean and unit administrator, determine that further review of the faculty member’s performance is required pursuant to FSH 3320 B-5 below. [ren. and ed. 7-09, rev. 7-16]

B-3. FIRST OCCURRENCE. In the event that a faculty member has not met expectations overall or within one or more areas of responsibility, the unit administrator shall offer to meet with the faculty member. At this meeting, the faculty member and the unit administrator shall review the faculty member’s Position Description and examine strategies that would permit the faculty member to improve performance. A mentoring committee shall be formed upon the request of either the faculty member or the unit administrator. The committee shall be composed of two or more faculty members agreed upon by the unit administrator and faculty member. [rev. 7-09, 7-10]

B-4. TWO OCCURENCES WITHIN THREE YEARS. In the event of two annual evaluations within three years concluding that the faculty member has not met expectations overall or within one or more areas of responsibility the unit administrator shall arrange a meeting of the faculty member, the unit administrator and the college dean [ed. 12-06, rev. 7-10]

The intent of the meeting is to review:

a. the current position description and revise it if necessary to address the issues identified during the discussion. [ed. 7-09]

b. the strategies implemented in the previous year(s) and to identify why the strategies did not result in the faculty member meeting expectations. The parties should re-examine strategies that would support improved performance by the faculty member. [ed. 7-09]
B-5. THREE OCCURRENCES WITHIN FIVE YEARS. In the event of three annual evaluations of “does not meet expectations” within a five-year period, either overall or within one or more areas of responsibility, the dean shall initiate a formal peer review. [rev. 7-09, ren. 7-10]

a. Composition of the Review Committee. The Review Committee shall consist of at least four (4) members, appointed as follows:
   (1) The faculty member may submit to the unit administrator a list of the names of three faculty members from within the unit and at least one faculty member from outside of the unit. If the faculty member is tenured or on the tenure track, faculty on the committee should be tenured faculty unless no tenured faculty are available. The unit administrator shall appoint the committee, including at least two names from the faculty member’s list.
   (2) The committee members shall select a chair.

b. Report and Timing. The committee report includes the review and possible recommendation(s), and shall be completed within sixty days of the annual evaluation.

c. The Review. The purpose of the review is to assess the level of performance of the faculty member, the reasonableness of the previous evaluations, and the appropriateness of the strategies put in place to assist the faculty member.

The faculty member and the unit administrator shall provide the following materials for the review period to the committee:
   (1) Updated Curriculum Vitae of the faculty member,
   (2) Position Descriptions,
   (3) Annual evaluation materials submitted by the faculty member,
   (4) Annual Evaluations of the faculty member by the unit administrator and the dean,
   (5) Student and peer evaluations (if any) of teaching,
   (6) A summary of the strategies put in place to assist the faculty member,
   (7) A self-assessment summary of each area of the faculty member’s responsibility and what the faculty member has learned and achieved during the review period, including contributions to the department, university, state, nation, and field (about 2 pages).

The faculty member may submit any additional information he or she desires, and the committee may request additional materials as it deems necessary.

d. Responses to Committee Report. The committee chair shall submit the report to the faculty member, unit administrator, and dean. Each recipient shall have fifteen days from the report’s date to submit written responses to the review committee. The committee chair shall send the report and all responses to the provost.

e. Provost. The provost shall be responsible for determining the appropriate resolution, which may include: [rev. 7-09]
   (1) continuing the status quo;
   (2) mentoring to address area(s) of concern;
   (3) termination for cause;
   (4) consideration of other recommended resolution(s). [1-4 add. 7-09]

B-6. Non-Tenured Faculty. Pursuant to Regent’s policy, non-tenured faculty do not have an expectation of contract renewal beyond that stated in FSH 3900 B-2, absent a specific written multi-year contract. The process set forth in FSH 3320 B does not require the University to renew a non-tenured faculty contract. The process set forth in FSH 3320 B shall not be required for a non-tenured faculty member who has been given notice of non-renewal.

C. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS. [ed. 7-09, ren. 7-10]
**Chapter III: EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION CONCERNING FACULTY AND STAFF**

**Section 3320: Annual Performance Evaluations of Faculty Members**

and Performance Evaluation of Academic Administrators

---

**C-1. EVALUATION BY FACULTY MEMBERS.** Opportunity is provided for an annual performance evaluation of college deans, assistant and associate deans, and administrators of academic departments and other intracollege units by the faculty members of the respective units. The provost sends each faculty member an appropriate number of copies of the form, “Annual Faculty Evaluation of Academic Administrators” [form 2 appended to this section] to be used for evaluation of the unit or center administrator, one to be used for evaluation of the dean, and one to be used for evaluation of each assistant or associate dean in the college. [ren. & ed. 7-10, 10-10]

**C-2. EVALUATION OF UNIT AND CENTER ADMINISTRATORS AND ASSISTANT AND ASSOCIATE DEANS.** The review and evaluation of unit and center administrators, and assistant and associate deans, require consideration of their responsibilities as faculty members and as administrators as defined by percentage allocations in the Annual Position Description. All administrators are entitled to a review and evaluation of their performance as faculty members. Further, all administrators are entitled to a review of their performance as administrators. (Forms to be used in the evaluation of administrators are found in Form 1 and 2. [rev. 7-99, ed. 3-07, rev. & ren. 7-10 (incorporated 1420 E-6 into this entire section C-2 through C-4)]

1. Evaluation as a Faculty Member.

   a. **Annual Evaluation.** The annual evaluation of an administrator’s performance as a faculty member shall be conducted by the dean of the college in accordance with the provisions of FSH 3320 A above.

   b. **Third Year Review.** If the administrator is untenured, there shall be a third-year review in accordance with the procedures outlined in FSH 3520 G-4.

2. Evaluation as an Administrator.

   a. **Annual Evaluation.** The dean shall conduct an annual evaluation of each administrator’s performance in accordance with the responsibilities specified in FSH 1420 E-1 and in the Annual Position Description. The dean and administrator will negotiate the administrator’s Annual Position Description on the basis of the unit’s needs, and make it available to the faculty for annual evaluation purposes. The administrator will present his or her annual goals for the unit at the beginning of the review year and report on his/her effectiveness in meeting last year’s goals. Annual goals should be based on the unit action plan, needs of the unit, and discussion with the dean. The dean will make a conscientious effort to solicit input from unit faculty through evaluation form 2. [rev. 7-99, ed. 6-09, 10-10]

   Unit faculty must send completed copies of form 2 directly to the dean. The dean furnishes the administrator a summary of the faculty evaluations in such a way that the confidentiality of individual evaluations is preserved. The dean may arrange a conference with the administrator to discuss the summary. After these steps have been completed, the dean shall destroy the individual faculty members’ evaluations and shall file the written summary in the dean’s office. The dean then submits a summary of conclusions and recommendations resulting from the review to the provost, who in turn makes his or her review and forwards recommendations to the president. The dean will then provide feedback to faculty who have submitted form 2, as appropriate. [ed. 10-10]

**C-3. EVALUATION OF DEANS.** The provost shall conduct an annual evaluation of each dean's performance in accordance with the dean’s responsibilities specified in FSH 1420 D-2 and in the Annual Position Description. The provost and dean will negotiate the Annual Position Description for the dean on the basis of the college’s needs and make it available to the faculty for annual evaluation purposes. The dean will present his or her annual goals for the college at the beginning of the review year and report on his or her effectiveness in meeting last year’s goals. Annual goals should be based on the college’s action plan, needs of the college, and discussion with the provost. The provost will make a conscientious effort to solicit input from college faculty through evaluation form 2. [ed. 10-10]
College faculty will send completed copies of form 2 directly to the provost. The provost will summarize the faculty responses and share that summary with the dean. In preparing and conveying that summary, the provost has the responsibility to ensure that faculty comments are confidential. This includes, but is not limited to, avoiding the use of any phrases that can identify the faculty member making the comments. The provost may arrange a conference with the dean to discuss the summary. After these steps have been completed, the provost shall destroy individual faculty members’ evaluations and file the written summary in the Office of Academic Affairs. The provost must then submit a summary of conclusions and recommendations resulting from the review to the president. The provost will then provide feedback to faculty who have submitted form 2, as appropriate. [ed. 10-10]

C-4. PERIODIC REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATORS. Each administrator is formally reviewed at least six months before the end of each appointment term, or, if there is not a fixed appointment term, at least every five years. The Provost appoints an ad hoc review committee to include faculty, department chairs, and experienced administrators of other units. The periodic review will be conducted at the request of the Provost and Executive Vice President and in accordance with the mechanisms of formal review, which must provide for the following:

1. Opportunity for the dean, center administrator, or unit administrator to prepare a report/portfolio summarizing his or her administrative achievements for the period, including annual reviews; [rev. and ren. 7-99]

2. Opportunity for all faculty and staff of the college/unit to participate in the review;

3. Solicitation of input by the committee from appropriate constituencies of the college/unit. Confidentiality of all individual evaluations will be ensured; [add. 7-99]

4. Preparation by the review committee of a written report summarizing the findings and recommendations of the review, which will be forwarded to the Provost and the dean/center or unit administrator; [ed. and ren. 7-99]

5. The provost will submit the written report along with any additional comments and recommendations to the president and provide appropriate feedback to the administrator. [rev. and ren. 7-99]

a. Additional Review. The provost and/or college dean may initiate a review at any time he or she determines a review is needed. The dean shall submit to the provost a summary of conclusions and recommendations resulting from this additional review. If the review is conducted by the provost, he or she shall submit a summary of conclusions and recommendations to the president.

The faculty of the unit may also initiate, by majority vote, a formal review (as outlined above) of the unit administrator. The tenured faculty of a college may also initiate, by majority vote, a formal review (as outlined above) of the college dean.

D. SEQUENCE OF EVALUATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS AND ADMINISTRATORS. The provost prepares the schedule for completion of steps in the performance evaluation and salary determination process each year. The schedule will ensure that faculty members’ evaluations of unit or center administrators and assistant and associate deans have been received by the dean before the administrators’ recommendations on salary, promotion, and tenure are made known to the faculty and, similarly, that faculty members’ evaluations of deans have been received by the provost before the deans’ recommendations on salary, promotion, and tenure are made known to the faculty. Likewise, the summaries of faculty evaluations of unit or center administrators, assistant and associate deans, and deans will be communicated to the persons evaluated after their recommendations on faculty salary, promotion, and tenure have been transmitted to the provost. [ren. & rev. 7-10]
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PREAMBLE: This section provides basic information about the UI Library. For further information, contact the library directly (208-885-6534).

A. INTRODUCTION. As Idaho's flagship research library, the University of Idaho Library (Library) connects our users with information, ideas, tools, and spaces; enriches formal and informal learning opportunities; supports and advances research, scholarly, and creative activity; builds partnerships through regional and national outreach; and preserves university, state, and regional historical archives. We champion the transformative power of ideas and learning, inspire our students to engage in a lifelong pursuit of intellectual development, and provide an essential foundation for innovation, research, and scholarship. The University Library supports the teaching, research, and service missions of the university. It is the regional depository in Idaho for U.S. Government documents repository and is a designated Earth Science Information Center and a U.S. Patent Depository. As a member of WLN and OCLC, it has access to the collections of other scholarly libraries within the region and the nation. The Library seeks to build and maintain mutually beneficial partnerships to ensure faculty, staff, and students have the broadest access to the Library collections, while providing services to citizens of the state and region.

B. SERVICES.

B-1. Loan Privileges.

a. Books in the general collection may be borrowed for four to six weeks. Loan periods for materials from the general collection are charged out at the loan desk located near the entrance on the first floor in other collections may be shorter. All materials are subject to recall after two weeks.

b. Faculty members are exempt from overdue charges, with the exceptions of fines associated with overdue interlibrary loan, consortial, or recalled materials; nevertheless, it is not in the overall university interest to have a faculty member borrow a large number of books and keep them for a long time. Highly specialized materials that are not in demand and are needed by faculty members for continuous close-at-hand use may be charged out loaned for an extended period as long as one semester.

c. Normally, the University Library does not lend indexes, abstracts, reference books, U.S. government documents, or periodicals for use outside the library because it is in the best interest of the UI community that they be available in the library and accessible to all. In exceptional cases, arrangements to check them out may be made through the librarian in charge.

B-2. Interlibrary Loans.

a. The Library's department administers an interlibrary-loan service and to facilitate borrowing on request, will obtain scholarly materials not available here from another library for use by faculty members, staff, and students engaged in serious research.

b. Interlibrary loans are agreements between libraries. The lending library establishes the conditions under which the loan is made, and the borrowing library must abide by these regulations and any special use conditions. Overdue Ample time should be allowed for securing the item desired, and any book that is in print and of value to the library should be ordered rather than borrowed. It is recommended that graduate-student research at UI not be undertaken in areas in which a large percentage of the needed library material must be borrowed through interlibrary loan are subject to fines as infractions may interrupt service to other library users.

c. The Library is a member of the Orbis Cascade Alliance, a consortium of academic libraries in the Pacific Northwest.
Northwest. UI faculty, staff and students can borrow materials located at member libraries, including Washington State University. In view of the fact that most research libraries limit the loan of periodicals, persons requesting periodical articles on interlibrary loan should expect to receive photocopies and should be prepared to pay the charges involved.

B-3. Electronic Resources.

a. The Library licenses and makes available electronic content for use by students, faculty, and staff currently affiliated with the UI. Use of licensed content is dictated by terms agreed to by both the Library and the content provider. These agreements typically prohibit excessive downloading of content, commercial use, and use by individuals not directly affiliated with the UI. If the Library is notified that a user is violating the terms of a license, appropriate action will be taken by the Library to address the violation in questions and, as necessary, to prevent further abuse.

b. Individuals not affiliated with the UI have limited use of most resources through public terminals in the Library.

B-3. Reciprocal-Use Agreement with WSU.

a. Washington State University and UI have an agreement under which faculty members and students of either institution have free use of the library resources and facilities of the other. Such use is subject, however, to the regulations of each institution.

b. UI faculty members and students must consider use of the WSU Library a privilege, not a right. They should not abuse or endanger this privilege by borrowing a large number of items at one time, items for class use here, materials in great demand, items this library should buy, or rare items; nor should they keep, or request to keep, materials they borrow longer than the normal loan period. Under certain circumstances, UI faculty members may be given a long-term or semester loan of certain UI library materials, but this is not true of WSU library materials.

B-4. Library Hours. The University Library is normally open about 100 hours a week. Changes in library hours for holidays and vacation periods are regularly published in the Idaho Register and posted at the main entrance of the library.


a. It is important that faculty members are encouraged to place books or related materials on course reserve before at least one week prior to making class assignments.

b. The library should be given Requests forms to create a reserve-book lists are available online or in the Library at least one week in advance.

c. Standard “Library Reserve Book” forms should be used and may be picked up at, or ordered by telephone from, the reserve desk. Faculty members are urged to check the card catalog to ascertain that the library has the needed books, to write the call numbers on the forms, and, if convenient, to take the books required for reserve directly to the reserve desk. Faculty members may place personal copies, as well as library books, on reserve for two-hour, one-day, or three-day loans at their discretion. Non-library materials should be properly identified with a mark of ownership and should be reclaimed after they are no longer needed on reserve.

d. If library materials are to be purchased for reserve, sufficient time should be allowed for their acquisition. “Purchase Request” forms marked “for reserve use—first (second) semester” will be given priority treatment.
B-657. Library-Use Lectures.

a. Upon request, librarians conduct Specialized lectures on the accessing and evaluating of information library resources available for upper-division and graduate classes.

b. The lectures are given by the subject librarians, and techniques of bibliographic searching are emphasized. Far from being stereotyped orientation talks, these presentations are intended to meet specific needs and may be adapted to stress any points that the instructor indicates. With this specialized instruction, followed by individual consultation with the subject librarian, students are able to make far better use of library resources. Instructors may make arrangements for the lectures through the appropriate subject librarian.

c. Students may consult individually with librarians after the lectures are given to gain additional insights about the research process in the library and at least one week’s notice should be given to avoid scheduling conflicts.


a. To order a book, a Faculty members are encouraged to work with their librarians to select materials that will serve the current and future needs of the UI. Fill out a “Purchase Request” form, listing all pertinent information. The order is forwarded to the library after obtaining approving signatures as required by the department or college. When the book is received and cataloged, the library notifies the requester. Faculty members who require specialized materials or continuous use in the office or laboratory are permitted to requisition them for purchase from their department (not library) funds, subject to approval of the departmental administrator or dean. New periodical subscriptions require the cancellation of an equivalent dollar amount of existing subscriptions. Faculty requests for new subscriptions to periodicals should be made to the appropriate subject specialist in the library.

b. New periodical subscription requests should be made through a librarian. Due to the cost of these materials, the Library is judicious in acquiring new titles without an evaluation of existing titles. When books disappear, the library normally delays ordering replacements for a year on the assumption that they may reappear on the shelves. Most of them do. If, however, a missing book is needed immediately (e.g., for reserve, as a reference book, or because it is in great demand), the library will order a replacement immediately. If faculty members wish to reorder missing books, they should indicate on the order form used for requesting books by inserting the statement “book missing—replace.” If this is not done, the library’s acquisitions section may find it listed in the catalog and return the request marked “duplicate.” Frequently the library does not find out that a book is missing until it is reported by students or faculty members.

c. Resources needed immediately (for reserve or because of demand) will be ordered and processed in an expedited fashion.

B-8. Library Publications. The Bookmark serves as a communication medium from the library to the faculty and staff. Its aim is to bring helpful information on books, library problems, and library goals to the faculty and staff.

B-79. Copying Use of Copyrighted Materials. The U.S. copyright law governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions, preparation of derivative works, distribution, performance, display, and transmission of copyrighted materials. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a
request for, or later use, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes outside the standards of “fair use” that user may be charged with copyright infringement. The University Library reserves the right to refuse to accept any request by a patron that, in its judgment, fulfilling the order would involve the Library acting in violation of U.S. copyright law.

B-810. Departmental Libraries. It is the policy of the UI University of Idaho to maintain a strong central library. Branch libraries are generally discouraged because: (a) they reduce the accessibility of materials of interest to several disciplines, (b) proper staffing increases overall library expenses, and (c) costly duplication of holdings is likely to result. Exceptions to this policy are considered on an individual basis. In view of the volume and special character of UI's library resources in the field of law, the College of Law maintains a library and a staff with specialized training in law librarianship [see 6925].

B-911. Additional Information.

a. For additional information about the University Library and its operations, see the University maintains a worldwide website at.

b. Faculty members who wish to suggest changes in library regulations or policies should feel free to make these suggestions known to the library staff or members of the Library Affairs Committee [see 1640.60].
Unit Strategic Plan
FY2019
Our Mission

As a unit within the division of Finance and Administration, and Facilities Services, Parking and Transportation Services (PTS) keeps the University of Idaho moving by facilitating a safe and efficient parking and transportation system. PTS strives for excellence in customer service and is committed to serving the University of Idaho by providing clear and informative communications, making sound financial decisions, and engaging with stakeholders as our campus adapts to changing needs and growth.

Our Vision

To become a campus where a personally owned vehicle is not required to meet commuter and campus resident mobility needs.

Our Values

We believe in a work environment and programs characterized by transparency, respect, integrity, fairness and consistency. We are problem solvers who believe in collaboration, teamwork, and personal commitment with focus on cost-effectiveness and fiscal responsibility, as we are financial stewards for our customers. We have respect and appreciation for the entire campus community and are dedicated to providing friendly, courteous, knowledgeable and specific customer service.
About our Department

WHO WE ARE – WHAT WE DO

Key activities of the PTS team include daily and long-term management and planning for the campus parking and transportation system. Our department involvement, investments, and operations are essential in keeping university functions moving smoothly each day of the year. Our services impact the experience of every person on the University of Idaho (UI) campus.

PTS annually administers parking for nearly 5,500 parking spaces, with parking lots making up approximately 44 acres of the campus footprint. Maintaining this critical university infrastructure for maximum safety and function for campus patrons is essential to fulfilling our mission of keeping UI moving. Our in-house maintenance program provides annual savings, as well as increased efficiencies and quality of work, with our team performing campus hardscape repairs including crack repair and seal-coating, parking lot striping, and thermal plastic application for crosswalks, and traffic and bike lanes.

The unit is comprised of two divisions, field and office operations, and includes 13 full-time positions, augmented with additional temporary staff. In addition to the key activities of the unit, and in keeping with the University’s commitment to ensuring equal access to all campus facilities, PTS manages the Vandal Access service, providing on-campus transportation to individuals with mobility impairments.

All PTS salaries, operating expenses, and parking lot maintenance are funded through permit, meter, event service, and enforcement income, with the exception of the Vandal Access service which is centrally funded. In keeping with our commitment to excellent customer service, our financial model is to generate needed funding from sources including permits, meters, and event services (approx. 85% of revenue), and not rely on a set amount of annual citation revenue. Parking enforcement, a key activity of the field division and a necessary tool for parking system management, generates roughly 15% of PTS revenue annually. While our unit’s financial model is to be self-supporting, and therefore the parking permit fee structure is set to align with that model, opportunities for mutual cost-sharing and cost-savings are afforded as a unit within Facilities Services. For PTS, these opportunities translate into savings for campus parkers and allow dollars saved to be directed towards other mission critical functions. Partnerships within the Facilities division that provide mutual benefit to units include campus snow removal, hardscape maintenance, and construction management programs. Additional Facilities partnerships can provide for supplemental financial support for major parking capital projects.

Alternative transportation options currently supported by PTS include ride-sharing and car-sharing programs, Zimride and Zipcar. Additionally, PTS supports cycling on campus by managing bike rack inventory, utilization, and adding new bike parking infrastructure when necessary. Aligning with our mission to keep UI moving, and working towards our vision of a campus where a personally owned vehicle is not required to meet mobility needs, PTS looks to increase support for alternative transportation by adding to, enhancing, and promoting mobility choices for faculty, staff, and students. As demand for vehicle parking on campus increases, new and enhanced mobility choices along with incentives for choosing an alternative mode will be essential.
Alignment with University Strategic Plan

As PTS focuses on our mission of keeping the University of Idaho moving, we align with the institutions strategic plan by supporting the university’s collaborative teaching, research, outreach, and engagement initiatives by providing ease of access and navigation for all campus patrons. As the University of Idaho grows and PTS narrows in on our vision of becoming a campus where a personally owned vehicle is not required to meet commuter and campus resident mobility needs, our efforts will increase the attractiveness of our Moscow campus for prospective students.

Specifically, the key activities and mission of PTS correlate with Goal 4 of the University of Idaho Strategic Plan, Cultivate: “improve efficiency, transparency and communication, and invest wisely in resources to enhance end user experiences.” Our contribution toward campus transportation infrastructure improvements and our plans for future expansion and enhancement of mobility choices outlined within this plan directly impact campus aesthetics and the first impression of visitors, a critical element in supporting our university mission and attracting new students to enroll at the University of Idaho.

Our Goals

1. **Customer Service: Transportation**
   a. **Public Transit & Shuttles**
      i. Increase service and convenience of public transit
      ii. Provide general campus shuttle service from perimeter to core lots
      iii. Provide evening shuttle service for on-campus residents
      iv. Provide shuttle to Moscow-Pullman airport
      v. Create program for off-campus park-n-ride (free or very minimal fee), with connection to local transit or shuttle to campus core
      vi. Expand vanpool use by employees
   b. **Bicycles**
      i. Provide bike share program
      ii. Maintain adequate supply of bicycle parking inventory commensurate with demand
   c. **Alternate Trip Incentive Programs**
      i. Provide incentives for choosing alternative transportation (walk, bike, transit)
      ii. Implement emergency ride home program
   d. **Promote & maintain pedestrian priority campus walkway**
      i. Develop campus walkway vehicle access policies
      ii. Make physical campus walkway entrance improvements to reduce vehicle entry
2. Customer Service: Parking
   a. Parking Space Availability
      i. Achieve and maintain 85% lot utilization in commuter lots
      ii. Achieve and maintain 95% lot utilization in residential lots
      iii. Increase availability of core campus parking for short-term use
   b. Permit Affordability
      i. Maintain and expand low-cost perimeter parking option ($64 or less)
   c. Technology
      i. Parking space availability apps
      ii. Mobile payment for meters
   b. Parking Lot Maintenance & Improvement
      i. Achieve and maintain a pavement condition index (PCI) rating of 55 or above for paved parking lots
      ii. Improve gravel parking lots: lot 35, lot 14, lot 38, lot 57
Proposed Changes to Parking System

FY19

FY19 Changes – SEEKING INPUT

1. Create new Orange permit zone, located and priced between Gold and Red ($250 for FY19)
2. Permit price increases:
   a. Gold: 4% or $13 increase ($325 to $338)
   b. Residential (Silver, Purple, Green): 14% or $24 ($172 to $196)
3. Transportation:
   a. Bike share program roll-out summer 2018
FY19 Proposals Detailed

1. Create new permit tier located and priced between Gold and Red

PTS Goal Alignment:

Parking Space Availability: achieve and maintain 85% lot utilization in commuter lots.

Overview: This proposal focuses on improved utilization and space availability in current Red commuter parking lots. The proposed action is to create a new permit color tier within the parking system, priced between the Gold and Red permit price at $250 for FY19, and convert eleven existing Red parking lots to new permit color – Orange (see Proposed 18-19 Campus Parking Map).

Existing Conditions:

- There are twenty-one parking lots on campus designated as Red permit parking (combination of on-street and surface parking lots), varying in size, and distance from the center of campus. Red permit lots provide an inventory of 1210 spaces. The common ratio of Red permits to spaces has been around 1.4 permits per space (or 40% oversell).
- Eleven of the Red permit lots are of high demand for parkers and experience utilization rates of 85-99% on a daily basis. This translates into most Red permit holders essentially utilizing a “hunting license” permit, as these lots fill quickly, with only a few spaces opening up throughout the day (see Red Lot Utilization Chart, next page).
- The remaining ten Red permit lots are of low demand and experience utilization rates of 17-84% on a daily basis. This translates into high numbers of spaces regularly unoccupied, even with a 40% oversell of Red permits (see Red Lot Utilization Chart, next page).

Goal: An optimal parking lot utilization rate is 85%. At 85% utilization it is expected that on average, 15% of spaces within a lot are unoccupied, allowing for improved customer satisfaction in the ability to find a place to park where their permit is valid. The goal we aim to achieve with this proposal is improved utilization (85%) of existing Red lots, providing improved space availability for parkers.

Proposed Actions:

- Convert eleven high demand Red lots to Orange permit lots:
  - Red lots: 1, 64B, 100, 6, 41, 41D, 43, 45, 24, 17, 88 (see Proposed 18-19 Parking Map)
  - Resulting inventory: 591 Red permit spaces, 619 Orange permit spaces
- Price Orange permit between Gold and Red at $250 for FY19
  - The high demand of lots proposed to be Orange drives the need for an increased price, as well as the closer proximity to the core and/or adjacency to Gold premium lots; the pricing goal is to keep Orange approximately $100 from price of Gold and Red permits.
- Cap sale of Orange and Red permits at 1.25 permits per space (or 25% oversell)* to ensure space availability while monitoring lot utilization.

*Note: Industry standard for permit oversell is 20-40%, oversell of permits is appropriate for commuter parking lots when not all parkers are on campus every day, all day long, or at the same times during the day.
### Red Lot Utilization FY18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot #</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Line &amp; 3rd Street</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64B</td>
<td>3rd &amp; Home Street</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>North of HR</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>South of HR</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Narrow Street</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>College Avenue</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Railroad Street</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Sweet at ECC</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Behind Mary Forney Hall</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Behind Music</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41D</td>
<td>South Deakin Ave</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>South Blake Ave</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>West Nez Perce Dr</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Upper West Kibbie</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>West Kibbie paved</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>West of Law</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Stadium &amp; 6th</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Stadium Dr</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87R</td>
<td>West 6th Street</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Engineering Annex</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>6th St South of Wallace</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Red Lot Utilization FY17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot #</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
<th>Fall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Line &amp; 3rd Street</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64B</td>
<td>3rd &amp; Home Street</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>North of HR</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50*</td>
<td>South of HR</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Narrow Street</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>College Avenue</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Railroad Street</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Sweet at ECC</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Behind Mary Forney Hall</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Behind Music</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41D</td>
<td>South Deakin Ave</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>South Blake Ave</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>West Nez Perce Dr</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Upper West Kibbie</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>West Kibbie paved</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>West of Law</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Stadium &amp; 6th</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Stadium Dr</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87R</td>
<td>West 6th Street</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Engineering Annex</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>6th St South of Wallace</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall** 74% 72%

* Purple permits were permitted to overflow into lot 50 during FY17, increasing utilization.
2. Permit Price increases: Gold & Residential

PTS Goal Alignment:

New permit revenue provides funding to support all PTS goals, as permit revenue is the primary source of funding for all parking and transportation operations. Further, an increase in permit prices aligns with customer service goals, specifically: Parking Space Availability.

Overview: Gold permits are proposed to increase from $325 to $338 for FY19, an increase of 4% or $13 for the year. Residential permits (Silver, Purple, and Green) are proposed to increase from $172 to $196 for FY19, an increase of 14% or $24 for the year.

Gold Permit Increase Justification:

- The Gold parking permit is the premium parking permit on campus; Gold lots are highest priority for maintenance including snow plowing and enforcement (to ensure space availability for permit holders), Gold allows full privilege parking (may park down to less premium commuter lots), and Gold lots are located in nearest proximity to the campus core.
- The Gold permit pricing goal is to keep Gold at least $100 above the next commuter permit, proposed to be Orange at $250 for FY19; a moderate 4% increase to the Gold permit price each year will allow for that difference in price to be achieved overtime. It is the intent that this pricing structure, along with caps on permit sales, aids in providing space availability for parkers, as it provides varying financial options to choose from based on personal needs.
- Gold permit price has remained static since FY12, with no increase in seven (7) years.
- The Gold permit price (as proposed) remains in line with employee permit prices at peer institutions, with eight of the 20 peers included having a premium employee permit above the proposed $338 for Gold (see Peer Institution Comparison).

Residential Permit Increase Justification:

- The residential parking permit (Silver, Purple, and Green) allows for 24/7 parking within close proximity of residences (and in some cases at the front door).
- The consistent uptick in demand of residential permits drives the need for an increase in price, as demand has exceeded supply in Silver and Purple parking areas. An affordable ($35) residential storage permit option is now available on the perimeter of campus. It is the intent that this pricing structure, along with caps on permit sales, aids in providing space availability for parkers, as it provides varying financial options to choose from based on personal needs.
- Silver, Purple, and Green parking permits are the premium student resident parking permits and need to align in price with the premium student commuter permit, proposed to be Orange; proposed annual increases to the residential permit will allow for that alignment overtime.
- The residential permit price has not increased in 3 years, since FY16.
- The proposed residential permit price remains in line with residential permit prices at peer institutions, with eleven of the 20 peers included having a premium student resident permit above the proposed $196 for Silver, Purple and Green (see Peer Institution Comparison).
# Peer Institution Comparison: Permit Prices & Spaces/Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Parking Spaces</th>
<th>Spaces per Student</th>
<th>Employee Permit</th>
<th>Campus Resident Permit</th>
<th>Student Commuter Permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State</td>
<td>31,904</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>$64 - $504</td>
<td>$98 - $336</td>
<td>$64 - $504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Washington</td>
<td>12,607</td>
<td>3,651</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>$149 - $336 (free remote)</td>
<td>$149</td>
<td>$149 - $336 (free remote)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise State</td>
<td>23,886</td>
<td>7,450</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>$170-$458</td>
<td>$278</td>
<td>$118-$411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Montana</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>4,702</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>$148 - $232</td>
<td>$232</td>
<td>$232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana State</td>
<td>16,703</td>
<td>6,866</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>$195</td>
<td>$40 (remote) - $195</td>
<td>$40 (remote) - $195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State</td>
<td>19,020</td>
<td>8,462</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>$140 - $273</td>
<td>$71 - $220</td>
<td>$55 - $248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>$155 - $205</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State</td>
<td>20,286</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>$125-$656</td>
<td>$125-$331</td>
<td>$125-$656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Arkansas</td>
<td>27,558</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>$0 (remote)</td>
<td>$645</td>
<td>$0 (remote) - $99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho State</td>
<td>12,643</td>
<td>6,136</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>$75 - $300</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$50 - $300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Idaho</td>
<td>11,316</td>
<td>5,537</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>$64 / $172 / $325</td>
<td>$35 (remote) - $172</td>
<td>$64-$172-$325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>32,304</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>$30 (remote) - $312</td>
<td>$399</td>
<td>$194 - $289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Wyoming</td>
<td>12,397</td>
<td>6,395</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>$196</td>
<td>Free (remote) - $130</td>
<td>$130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State</td>
<td>35,993</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>$107 - $533</td>
<td>$148</td>
<td>$107 - $533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>50,019</td>
<td>28,382</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>$510</td>
<td>$127 - $306 $127</td>
<td>$104 (remote)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of New Hampshire</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>8,823</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$375</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota State</td>
<td>14,358</td>
<td>8,948</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>$60 - $185</td>
<td>$185</td>
<td>$60 - $185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Nebraska</td>
<td>25,897</td>
<td>17,043</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>$276 - $1056</td>
<td>$276 - $405 $276</td>
<td>$276 - $648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson Univ</td>
<td>18,599</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>$24 - $250</td>
<td>$162</td>
<td>$162 (24 park-n-ride)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico State</td>
<td>14,432</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>$67 (remote) - $113</td>
<td>$59.50</td>
<td>$59.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State</td>
<td>31,616</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250 (remote, single lot) up to $582</td>
<td>$150 (remote) up to $628</td>
<td>$250 (remote) up to $536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*high end is above UI*

*high end is below UI*
# Long-Term Permit Pricing Plan

## Permit Projections FY19 - FY23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020</th>
<th>FY 2021</th>
<th>FY 2022</th>
<th>FY 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gold</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Permits: (16% oversell)</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Price:</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>$338</td>
<td>$352</td>
<td>$366</td>
<td>$380</td>
<td>$395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Revenue:</td>
<td>$297,375</td>
<td>$297,375</td>
<td>$309,351</td>
<td>$321,725</td>
<td>$334,594</td>
<td>$347,978</td>
<td>$361,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orange</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Permits: (25% oversell)</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Price:</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$260</td>
<td>$270</td>
<td>$281</td>
<td>$292</td>
<td>$292</td>
<td>$292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Red</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Permits: (25% oversell)</td>
<td>1,770</td>
<td>1,770</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Price:</td>
<td>$172</td>
<td>$172</td>
<td>$172</td>
<td>$179</td>
<td>$186</td>
<td>$193</td>
<td>$201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Revenue:</td>
<td>$304,440</td>
<td>$304,440</td>
<td>$268,320</td>
<td>$279,053</td>
<td>$290,215</td>
<td>$301,824</td>
<td>$301,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silver (Res)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Permits: (7% oversell)</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Price:</td>
<td>$172</td>
<td>$172</td>
<td>$196</td>
<td>$224</td>
<td>$255</td>
<td>$281</td>
<td>$292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purple (Res)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Permits: (7% oversell)</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Price:</td>
<td>$172</td>
<td>$172</td>
<td>$172</td>
<td>$172</td>
<td>$172</td>
<td>$172</td>
<td>$172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Revenue:</td>
<td>$288,108</td>
<td>$288,108</td>
<td>$300,446</td>
<td>$345,048</td>
<td>$394,755</td>
<td>$436,444</td>
<td>$454,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green (Res)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Permits:</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Price:</td>
<td>$172</td>
<td>$172</td>
<td>$196</td>
<td>$224</td>
<td>$255</td>
<td>$281</td>
<td>$292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economy (Res)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Permits:</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Price:</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$37</td>
<td>$39</td>
<td>$42</td>
<td>$42</td>
<td>$42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Revenue:</td>
<td>$5,250</td>
<td>$5,250</td>
<td>$5,565</td>
<td>$5,899</td>
<td>$6,253</td>
<td>$6,253</td>
<td>$6,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Permits:</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Price:</td>
<td>$64</td>
<td>$64</td>
<td>$64</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$37</td>
<td>$39</td>
<td>$42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Revenue:</td>
<td>$72,960</td>
<td>$72,960</td>
<td>$72,960</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$22,260</td>
<td>$23,596</td>
<td>$25,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Refund Factor (-3%)</td>
<td>$944,667</td>
<td>$944,667</td>
<td>$988,924</td>
<td>$1,132,250</td>
<td>$1,212,387</td>
<td>$1,286,049</td>
<td>$1,337,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Permits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Revenue (16% of total):</td>
<td>$151,147</td>
<td>$151,147</td>
<td>$158,228</td>
<td>$181,160</td>
<td>$193,982</td>
<td>$205,768</td>
<td>$214,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Projected Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$1,095,813</td>
<td>$1,095,813</td>
<td>$1,147,152</td>
<td>$1,313,410</td>
<td>$1,406,369</td>
<td>$1,491,817</td>
<td>$1,552,021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Changes to Parking System

FY20 Summary

FY20 Changes – SEEKING INPUT*

  1. Pave Gold lot 35 at Student Health: convert to hourly pay lot

* Only includes FY20 proposal involving a capital improvement, any additional proposed changes to the parking system for FY20 will be communicated during the 2018-19 academic year.
FY20 Proposals Detailed

1. Pave Lot 35 at Student Health: Convert to Hourly Pay Lot

PTS Goal Alignment:

- Parking Lot Maintenance & Improvement: improve gravel parking lot 35
- Parking Space Availability: increase availability of core campus parking for short-term use
- Promote & Maintain Pedestrian Priority Campus Walkway
- Public Transit & Shuttles: Increase service and convenience of public transit

Overview: This proposal describes a plan for paving gravel parking lot 35 located north of Student Health Center. The paving of this central campus lot initiates a series of improvements to parking and transportation activity in the area, including:

- Enhanced safety and aesthetics of parking areas in the campus core
- Improved ability to access the core for short-term university business, and passenger drop-offs
- Increased service and convenience of public transit (brings transit to the campus core)
- Reduction in unnecessary vehicle traffic entering the campus walkway and therefore prioritization of the campus walkway as a pedestrian only area

Existing Conditions:

- Lot 35 currently provides 22 Gold permit spaces, 5 reserved spaces, and 1 ADA space.
- The condition of the lot, particularly in the winter, provides a tremendous disservice to parkers, as the ability to effectively clear snow and ice in the heavily sloped and extremely small footprint parking lot is difficult to impossible at times. The winter conditions of the lot present a safety hazard with vehicles sliding and pedestrians slipping. Furthermore, the small lot proves difficult for any larger vehicle to circulate and park without being a hazard and these conditions create an unsightly parking lot located in the very core of campus.
- University Avenue is a west-bound one-way street from Deakin Avenue to Ash Street, with on-street Purple permit parking on one side.
- Vehicles can continue traveling west-bound on University Avenue to enter the campus walkway at the intersection of University Avenue and Ash Street as this walkway entry point is not designed to prohibit or discourage vehicle traffic and in fact is inviting to vehicles due to short-term parking (meters) being located immediately south of the Life Science building. Vehicles frequently enter this area to locate a short-term parking space or drop off a passenger, and many continue on through the campus walkway, adding unnecessary vehicle traffic into the core of campus mixing with pedestrians and bicycles.
- Ash Street is a north-bound one-way street with on-street parking including reserved spaces, service, ADA, and motorcycle parking.
- Idaho Avenue is an east-bound one-way street with on-street Purple permit parking on one side.
The parking meters located south of the Life Science building (lot 53) are the only available short-term parking spaces located in the campus core. These nine meters are of high demand.

The long-term overnight parking on both University and Idaho Avenue eliminates opportunity for curb-to-curb street cleaning (snow and general sweeping), which contributes to narrowed travel lanes and piling of snow and ice in the winter.

The campus walkway entry point at the intersection of Idaho Avenue and Ash Street is well-designed as opposed to the entry to the south at University Avenue and Ash Street. At Idaho Avenue, the walkway narrows, is lined with trees, and has decorative pavers for surface treatment. This caters to a pedestrian only environment, discouraging vehicles from entering to drop off passengers or otherwise shortcut through the campus walkway.

Moscow’s public transit service (SMART Transit) has stops located on only the periphery of campus currently – at the Intermodal Transit Center (ITC) on the corner of Railroad and Sweet Avenue, on Deakin Avenue at the Pitman Center, and a few stops along 6th Street. Service is not provided into the core of campus at this time.

**Proposed Actions:** (see Lot 35 & Street Changes Map, next page)

- Pave gravel parking lot 35.
- Convert parking lot 35 to an hourly pay lot, increasing short-term parking in the campus core for all university business needs (loss of 22 Gold permit spaces).
- Relocate Gold permit parking (previously in lot 35) to Idaho and University Avenue where currently residential Purple permit parking is located (loss of 36 Purple permit spaces, overall gain of 14 Gold spaces in area). Will allow for improved street cleaning with vehicles not stored overnight, supporting public transit circulation on these streets.
- Convert all parking meter spaces south of Life Science (lot 53) to special spaces (reserved, service, delivery, ADA), to reduce number of vehicles entering this area attempting to find short-term parking. Special spaces are to be relocated from Ash Street and parking lot 35, leaving no on-street parking spaces on Ash Street (see Lot 35 & Street Changes Map).
- Reverse direction of one-way streets Idaho Avenue, Ash Street and University Avenue. Action supports addition of bus stop on Ash Street placing the bus on the right side of the street and also discourages vehicle entry into campus walkway with drivers facing the narrow pedestrian designed walkway entry point at intersection of Idaho Avenue and Ash Street.
- Add SMART Transit bus stop on Ash Street east of Life Science.
- Add designated vehicle drop-off area on Ash Street behind bus stop.
- Add signage at entry to parking lot 53 indicating access restricted, permit required for entry. Plan for improved campus walkway entry features at this point in the future, further discouraging unnecessary vehicle entry.
Lot 35 & Street Changes Map

**Existing**

**Proposed**

**GOLD LOTS:** Gold or Visitor permits only, no other colored permit is valid in gold lots. Gold lots are enforced 6 a.m. to 5 p.m., year-round, unless posted otherwise. No parking is allowed between 2 a.m. and 6 a.m. without a Gold permit or an Overnight permit issued by Parking and Transportation Services.

**PURPLE LOTS:** Purple, Silver or Visitor permits only. Purple lots are for use by designated members of the Greek system who live IN HOUSE. Purple lots are enforced from 6 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday - Friday during the academic year when the university is open. Overnight parking is allowed.

**BLACK AREAS:** Motorcycle parking only, no motorcycle permit required.

**HATCH:** Flexible parking, visitor parking, pay-to-park areas, meters, and short term parking.

**CROSSHATCH:** Managed parking, special permit required.