I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes (Vote)
   • Minutes of the 2019-21 Meeting #30 – Attach. #1
   • Minutes of the 2020-21 Meeting #1 – Attach. #2 & Meeting #2 – Attach. #3

III. Consent Agenda (Vote)
   • Summer Committee Appointments – Attach. #4

IV. Chair’s Report

V. Provost’s Report

VI. Committee Reports/Voting Items
   • COVID 19 Committee (update) - David Lee Painter
   • Ubuntu (update) - Jan Johnson and Sarah VanGundy - Attach. #5
   • FSH 6990 Communicable Disease Emergency Response (vote); Jodie Nicotra - Attach. #6

VII. Other Announcements and Communications
   • Placing of senators on committees (Vandal Star, Campus Planning Advisory Committee, Faculty and Staff Policy Group)
   • Remove FSH 1120 Origins and Growth of the UI (non-voting) – Attach. #7
   • Remove FSH 4320 Board Policy on Intercollegiate Athletics (non-voting) – Attach. #8
   • Remove FSH 1140 Mission and Scope of Higher Ed in Idaho (non-voting) - Attach. #9
   • Remove FSH 1220 Institutions of Higher Ed in Idaho (non-voting) - Attach. #10
   • Discuss FSH 4325 UI Organization of Intercollegiate Athletics – Attach. #11

VIII. New Business

IX. Adjournment
Attachments:

- **Attach. #1** Minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting #30 (5.5.20)
- **Attach. #2** Minutes of the 2020-2021 Faculty Senate Meeting #1 (4.28.20)
- **Attach. #3** Minutes of the 2020-21 Faculty Senate Meeting #2 (5.5.20)
- **Attach. #4** Summer Committee Appointments
- **Attach. #5** Ubuntu
- **Attach. #6** FSH 6990 Communicable Disease Emergency Response
- **Attach. #7** FSH 1120 Origins and Growth of the UI
- **Attach. #8** FSH 4320 Board Policy on Intercollegiate Athletics
- **Attach. #9** FSH 1140 Mission and Scope of Higher Ed in Idaho
- **Attach. #10** FSH 1220 Institutions of Higher Ed in Idaho
- **Attach. #11** FSH 4325 UI Organization of Intercollegiate Athletics
Call to Order: Chair Grieb called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.

Approval of Minutes (vote by 2019-2020 Senators):
There was a motion (Tibbals/Lee-Painter) to approve the minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting #29 (April 28, 2020). A friendly amendment was proposed by Secretary Sammarruca to add Penny Tenuto to the list of Senators who were present at Meeting #29. The motion to approve the minutes carried.

Chair’s Report:

Chair Grieb welcomed the new senators and thanked the retiring senators for their diligent service: Allan Caplan (CALS), who served two terms; Anne Kern (CDA); Joe DeAngelis (CLASS); Barb Cosens (LAW); Alistair Smith (CNR); Krishnan Raja (COE); and Clinton Jeffery (COE). Thanks also to Jerry Fairley (COS) and Ben Bridges (Staff Council) who are completing their terms and retuning in the fall for new terms. In addition, thanks to Dean Marc Chopin who has served as the Dean’s representative for the last two years.

At this point, Vice-Chair Kirchmeier expressed gratitude to Terry Grieb for his 3 years of service at the Senate and great leadership during this past year.

Because President Green needs to leave around 4:00pm, next we will move to the “Special Orders” part of the agenda and come back to the Provost’s Report afterword.


Chair Grieb welcomed Scott Green, Brian Foisy, and Chandra Ford. He began summarizing the charge that was given to the SFMWG. While working on the budget shortfall, at the same time the group had a different, long-range charge, namely, to find different ways to allocate budget dollars every year. The university fiscal year runs from July 1 to June 30. As we enter each fiscal year, the two goals are to (1) balance the budget and (2) build positive cash balance.
The SFMWG consisted of 20 participants, including internal representation from faculty, students, staff, and administration, as well as external representatives. They met a number of times during Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 and focused on 4 general themes as guiding principles: mission alignment, transparency, agility and adaptability, and incentive based. The group looked at four different models to try and achieve these goals: incremental, activity-based, performance-based, and responsibility-centered management (RCM). The group was unanimously opposed to continuing with the current incremental model. With the latter, areas received the same amount of funding whether or not they were increasing enrollment or performing at high level. The SFMWG saw the need for a blended/hybrid model, with a mix of incremental and performance-based. A detailed description of the recommended model is provided in the attached White Paper.

The next steps will include decisions on details of implementation. The group will meet again in the Fall. The White Paper puts us in the position where discussion can be shared with the public for general input and comments, and we will use that feedback to complete the final steps.

President Green joined the discussion and commented on the great summary provided by Chair Grieb. President Green explained that the SFMWG met its challenge. The proposed model would take us from the current incremental one – which has led to bizarre things, such as colleges with lowest enrollment having the highest reserves, something we don’t want to encourage – to one which provides stronger incentives.

President Green emphasized that the White Paper is a really good framework but still many details remain to be worked out. It will not be easy to define metrics. Considerable time has been spent on enrollment and we shouldn’t try and “recreate that wheel.” Right now, we are at about 50/50 split between credit hours and degree enrollment. Many other issues also need to be considered, such as: 6-year graduation rate, amount of collaborations, efficiency. (President Green made reference to page 6 of the White Paper.) Transparency is key for people to understand how those dollars are being allocated. Ultimately, more funding will be provided to colleges that are growing enrollment or those which are growing their research. This provides the right incentives. President Green said we are heading in the right direction, consistent with our mission as a land grant institution.

The next steps will include putting together a team that will carefully look into the metrics. Checks and balances will be in place each year. We need ways to ensure that the model is doing what we intended it to do and that there are no unintended consequences. An important question, to consider carefully, is whether we can really get to 50% of this model being performance based. We also don’t want to unintentionally harm colleges. There will always be some base funding, whether it is 50% or 70%. Last year we were already at 30% incentive (70% base funding) influenced by enrollment. That was the program that John Wiencek established. We may need to wait until Fall for the next steps. We will seek comments and the process will go through next year. By next spring, we hope that the budgeting model will be ready to be implemented in fiscal year 2022.

President Green asked if there were any questions. A Senator requested clarifications about the meaning of “performance-based” metrics. Will funds be distributed at the college level? Or at the level of specific units and programs? President Green responded that he does not want to micromanage within the colleges by imposing how much should go to specific programs. The distribution should be for the deans to manage.

A Senator said he appreciated the effort that went into this process but was worried that there was not enough time for departments to follow the unexpected pivoting of the metrics. Several departments were working toward some metrics which now have pivoted, but there was no time for them to pivot.
when they were hit with unexpected metrics. The Senator expressed concern that there may not be time to prepare for upcoming new metrics. He suggested that more time is needed to understand what the metrics are before they are applied. President Green thanked the Senator for his good feedback. President Green explained that there has been a lot of discussion about this matter. Experts at Deloitte or Simplot want it to be done quickly, but we as a public institution are uncomfortable with that approach. We will take it year by year, making adjustments if we feel they are necessary. The President’s view is to start out at 30% performance-based, which would not shock the system because that is where we are now. But we will need to model this out, and people should have expectations of what the metrics are and there should be no changes year to year after that. Metrics will be transparent. If changes are required and we want to pivot, we will talk again about metrics and allocations.

A Senator who served on the Academic Program Prioritization Taskforce (APPT) this year noted that there were many recommended changes for how to move forward. The only “overlap” between APPT and the Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Committee (IPEC) is the Provost, who is leaving U of I. The Senator suggested conversations to ensure alignment of the respective metrics within the budget process. The Senator recalled that the deans found it difficult to allocate money in the way it was done this year. President Green appreciated the comment and agreed with the Senator on the importance of such alignment.

The same Senator pointed out that the cost per student is different depending on the discipline, as she learned during the prioritization process. Examples are Law and Engineering. She asked whether that was taken into account with regard to performance-based standards. President Green replied that this aspect was indeed taken into account. Engineering does well with enrollment but at the same time is a high-cost discipline. We need to continue investing in that college going forward. To the extent they can continue to drive research and enrollment, they will benefit. Engineering is part of our land grant mission. We will evaluate every year.

The Senator had an additional question: during program prioritization she noticed that current metrics do not account for cross-college interdisciplinary work. Is there a way to track and credit such effort? She is concerned about this aspect because cross-college collaborations really speak to some of the major challenges that society faces right now (in terms of both research and teaching). President Green responded that, on the research side, we have collaboration metric. But it is a difficult metric to define, and the resulting evaluation is likely to be subjective. With regard to teaching, one can look at credit hours. Sometimes metrics can overlap. Recently this point was raised by a faculty from the School of Business. For example, one can argue that 6-year graduation rate and job placement might build on each other and overcompensate. This is something we need to look at.

A Senator asked how base budgets will be determined. He hopes that it will be done through a thoughtful process and not using existing budgets. President Green confirmed that we need to have a thoughtful process in place. We do not want to move forward to the next year all adjustments we are making during this fiscal year. Hopefully COVID-impacted budgets are not what we will deal with next year. Certain colleges, as well as some non-academic areas, were impacted more than others.

President Green had to leave the meeting but encouraged everyone to send him any additional questions.

Chair Grieb noted that Brian Foisy and Chandra Ford are present. He asked if there were further questions on the budget model. There were none. The discussion turned to the next steps within the process.
Chandra Ford explained that they are going through the process of gathering feedback from Senate, Provost Council, Staff Council, which will be posted online, including some good FAQs and answers. In the next step, we will assemble a group to examine and define metrics – which will take some time, as metrics are difficult to define perfectly. This step may need to wait until early Fall. Over the course of next year, once metrics are decided upon, we will proceed to modeling. People will be able to insert the metrics for their college or department – based on their own historical numbers – and do some internal “experimentation” to see their areas of strengths/weaknesses so they can adjust accordingly. We want people to have enough time to do that.

Brian Foisy said he will not add much as Chandra Ford’s comments were exhaustive. The White Paper is just a framework. Details remain to be worked out, and this will happen during a full year of conversations on metrics, implementation, timeline, and transition issues. Chandra Ford thanked Chair Grieb for participating in the process. Terry Grieb said he appreciated being part of the conversation. The next steps will go across the summer and into the fall.

Provost’s Report:

- Provost Lawrence gave an update on the CARE funding. The rules have changed in the last few weeks, but we are moving forward quickly to make this happens before the semester ends. We can award funds to Spring 2020 students who qualify for federal financial assistance. Will get $500 or so through checks or direct deposit. Some money is reserved for summer (about $300). Payments should go out in mid-July. It is a relatively simple system, based on need.

- Reopening plan: a memo was circulated last Friday. The University plan is to roughly follow the Governor’s four-stage Idaho plan. We are now in Stage 1. We continue to work from home and teach classes online. Each time the state moves to a new stage, we will evaluate whether or not to move to that stage, based on a variety of factors. We work closely with Public Health and the State Board of Education. We will follow up with communication to campus every two weeks and each time there is a change. As we plan for Fall, we all are trying to navigate new situations with multiple variables. Many people are working on the various aspects of the situation: HR facilities, the Registrar’s Office, the deans, and more. We are looking at many options that meet faculty and student needs and give flexibility to people in different scenarios. As the recent President’s memo indicated, the starting plan is to open as usual, but we will adapt as needed. More classes will be offered online in case the situation changes. GenEd courses are high priority. We all need to be ready to go back fully online if necessary. It is hard to plan for such a broad spectrum, but it is a possibility. We are also looking at options for high-risk faculty who might not want to teach in person as well as considering the impact of social distancing in the classroom. Limits in space, enrollment, and technology are among the challenges we face. We will need to assess classroom technology capabilities and faculty technology needs, keeping in mind that different departments have different needs. ITS is being a great partner in these efforts. CETL offers summer opportunities and support to faculty who need help with their class development. We are working through HR about personnel processes (such as, high-risk individuals). Beyond classroom space, we need to identify safe solutions for dorms and Greek houses. We are working on procurement of materials (personal protection equipment, sanitizers, thermo scanners). All of this is ongoing. On the academic side, we continue to work with deans to finalize parameters around the Fall and possible changes to the class schedule. The deans will then work with departments and faculty to put together the “puzzle” for each unit. The same solution will not work for everyone. We hope to have soon a better idea of Fall class schedules so that faculty can prepare, and students know their options when registering.
• P&T training: 181 people attended the promotion-and-tenure training on Friday. One more session will be offered tomorrow via Zoom. All materials on the website have been updated according to the new policy. We will add to the website new materials that came out of the training sessions.

• Provost Lawrence thanked Terry Grieb for serving as Senate Vice-Chair (2018-19) and Chair (2019-20), and Barb Kirchmeier for her service as Senate Vice-Chair. Thanks were extended to Francesca Sammaruca for her first year of service as the Secretary of the University Faculty.

Discussion:
A Senator noted that faculty are getting concerned about not receiving much communication from the upper administration concerning the Fall. In particular, research faculty look at May 15 as the date when they are off contract. They effectively disappear to focus on their research. They would like some clear communication from the administration before the end of their contracts. Provost Lawrence replied that they are making every effort to provide those communications as soon as possible.

Chair Grieb commented on the several discussions which took place over the last few days – to the list of things to consider for Fall, he added contingency plans for faculty members who may become ill and cannot complete the semester. For some courses, plans will be easier than others.

A Senator pointed out that there is a very low number of COVID-19 cases in the Moscow area at this time – potentially attributable to decisions that university made in not bringing back students from Spring Break. Clearly, there are serious concerns regarding what may happen in the Fall. She asked whether any consideration was given – in the best interest of the community as well as the university/staff/students – to asking students to quarantine before attending live classes. Provost Lawrence replied that the question did come up and it is on the list of things to think about. The question will be better answered as we get into the summer and we see how things are going with certain states opening up. Washington will not open up as quickly as Idaho. We need to look at stages and rules. We will rely on public health for guidance. In the morning, there was a wrap up meeting/analysis on the last few months. The District Health Director was on call for two hours and gave positive feedback to the university’s actions. The Senator’s question has significant implications for students’ schedules. It would not be possible to have students arrive two weeks early, so this idea would result in the first two weeks in the fall would be online.

A Senator emphasized the importance of encouraging faculty to talk to the students. We have one or two weeks left and we should collect feedback regarding how online teaching is going. We can use such feedback to project a good impression of the university. If students are unhappy, we need to know that as well. Provost Lawrence replied that a survey was actually just completed. There were versions for students, faculty, and staff. The student version ended on Friday. The survey was comprehensive regarding how the university responded, what worked, what didn’t. A preliminary analysis indicates that feedback was very positive, with many good suggestions. Students are understanding of what we have been through. The survey will be very valuable, and responses will be distributed to faculty so that people can use it to make plans for the Fall. Response to the faculty survey was encouraged. Chair Grieb followed up on this point: a few other surveys have gone out, but some have not had as good of a response rate.

A Senator inquired about efforts to have coordinated and systematic COVID-19 testing. Provost Lawrence noted that we are ahead of most states on that aspect. The university is talking to Gritman officials. At the moment, we cannot make promises as there are many legal issues still to be dealt with, but we are working on it.
In response to the question whether students will be given the option to attend online or in person, Provost Lawrence said that one of the models being proposed is a “hi-flex” model, where students can attend in person or via Zoom. This way, students can still participate if they are sick, or if exposed and in isolation. Also, students in the high-risk population who wish to spend the semester away from campus, can participate. This is being considered but there are challenges, such as technology in the classrooms (not all classrooms can handle this high-flex mode). We need to identify higher priority classes. IT is ordering equipment to do some upgrades to classes and is planning to expand those efforts during the summer. Another aspect of the high-flex model could be: for Monday/Wednesday/Friday classes, some people may attend in person one day, and attend from home on other days. This model would give all students the opportunity of some personal interaction.

**Committee Reports:** None

**New Business:** None

One final reminder of the University Faculty Meeting (*via* Zoom) on Wednesday, May 6, 2020, 2:30pm (PT).

**Adjournment:** There was a motion to adjourn (A. Smith/Fairley). The meeting was adjourned at 4:30pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francesca Sammarruca  
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate
2020 – 2021 Faculty Senate – Pending Approval

Meeting # 1

Tuesday, April 28, 2020, 4:30 pm – 5:00 pm

Zoom only

Present (only 2020-21 Senators are included): Ahmadzadeh, Bridges, Carter, Cohn, Dezzani, Fairley, Hickman, Keim, Kirchmeier, Lee-Painter, McIntosh, McKellar, Meeuf, Paul, Quinnett, Raja, Sammarruca (w/o vote), Schwarzlaender, R. Smith, Tenuto, Tibbals, Torrey Lawrence (w/o vote), Wargo

Absent: Chopin, Hanigan, Hill, Rashed, Rinker

Provost Designate Lawrence called the meeting to order at 4:32 pm.

The only agenda item for this meeting is to collect nominations for the positions of 2020-21 Senate Chair and Vice-Chair. The 2020-21 Senators will then have the opportunity to think about the nominations and will cast their votes next week.

A survey was placed by Joana Espinoza in the Zoom “chat” function. Up to three nominations are allowed per ballot. After it was noted that responses had stopped coming in, Provost Designate Lawrence asked if there was a motion to close the nomination process. So moved by Tibbals, seconded by Lee-Painter. Motion to close the nominations carried.

The nominees for the position of Chair were read:

- Barb Kirchmeier
- David Lee-Painter
- Delphine Keim
- Mark Schwarzlaender
- Ray Dezzani
- Ben Bridges
- Jerry Fairley
- Robert Rinker
- David Paul

Barb Kirchmeier accepted the nomination and all other nominees declined. Robert Rinker was absent.

The nominees for the position of Vice-Chair were read:

- Jerry Fairley
- David Paul
- Charles Tibbals
- Delphine Keim
- David Lee-Painter
- Russ Meeuf
- Ben Bridges
David Paul and Russ Meeuf accepted the nomination. Rashed and Rinker were absent. They will be asked whether they accept the nomination after Secretary Sammarruca has checked that first-year senators are eligible to be officers.

**Adjournment:** There was a motion to adjourn (Lee-Painter/Fairley). The meeting was adjourned at 4:44 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francesca Sammarruca
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate
2020 – 2021 Faculty Senate – Pending Approval

Meeting # 2 (open to 2020-21 Senators)
Tuesday, May 5, 2020, 4:30 pm – 5:00 pm
Zoom only

Present: Bridges, Carter, Chapman, Dezzani, Fairley, Hickman, Kirchmeier, Lee-Painter, McIntosh, McKellar, Meeuf, Paul, Quinnett, Raja, Rashed, Rinker, Sammarruca (w/o vote), Schwarzlaender, R. Smith, Tenuto, Tibbals, Torrey Lawrence (w/o vote), Wargo
Absent: Chopin, Ahmadzadeh, Cohn

Provost Lawrence called the meeting to order at 4:36pm.

Approval of Minutes (vote by 2020-21 Senators):
There was a motion (Schwarzlaender/Tibbals) to approve the minutes of the 2020-21 Faculty Senate Meeting #1 (April 28, 2020). The motion carried.

The only other agenda item for this meeting is to collect additional nominations, if any, for the positions of 2020-21 Senate Chair and Vice-Chair and then proceed to the elections. There were no additional nominations. The nominees are:

- Barb Kirchmeier (for the position of Chair)

  and, for the position of Vice-Chair:

- Russ Meeuf
- David Paul

Provost Lawrence invited the candidates to say a few words.

Barb Kirchmeier: Barb came to U of I in 1996 as an undergraduate student. She then became a temporary lecturer and later a senior instructor in the English Department. Barb said that she learned a lot this year at Senate and would be honored to work for shared governance as the next Senate Chair.

David Paul: David is a professor of Exercise Physiology. He has been at the U of I since 2007, the longest he has been anywhere in his adult life.

Russ Meeuf: Russ is in the School of Journalism and Mass Media. He has been at the U of I since 2010. He enjoyed serving as a Senator and would welcome the opportunity to work with shared governance.

Barb Kirchmeier received unanimous votes for the position of 2020-21 Senate Chair.
Russ Meeuf received a majority of the votes for the position of 2020-21 Senate Vice-Chair.

Congratulations to the new Senate Officers!
Adjournment: There was a motion to adjourn (Fairley/Lee-Painter). The meeting was adjourned at 4:43pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francesca Sammarruca
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate
Summer 2020 Committee on Committee Appointments

Kristina Running put on the Academic Petitions Committee
Marta Boris Tarre put on the Administrative hearing
Tom Williams and Elizabeth Fortunato put on Radiation Safety Committee
Luigi Boschetti and Leotina Hormel – Scientific Misconduct Committee
Dana Brolley put on Ubuntu
Karin Hatheway-Dial put on UCGE
Darren Kearney put on the Student Conduct Board
Michael McCollough put on Honors Program Committee
Amy Skibiel put on the Campus Planning Advisory Committee
Helen Brown put on the Borah Foundation Committee
Lisette Waits put on the Intellectual Property Committee
Title: Resolution on Diversity  
Author: Ubuntu Committee  

WHEREAS Diversity and inclusion are core guiding principles of the UI community;¹

WHEREAS The University of Idaho “values people of diverse cultures, classes, races, ethnicities, sexes, gender identities, mental and/or physical abilities, citizenship, nationalities, sexual orientations, religious backgrounds, ages, epistemologies, academic disciplines, veteran status, life experiences, and identities”;²

WHEREAS Society is strengthened when all members obtain an education;

WHEREAS Institutions of higher education committed to diversity must work toward fostering an equitable and inclusive educational environment that supports those who in the past were excluded;

WHEREAS The perspectives of people from different life experiences enrich the educational experience for all;

WHEREAS Diversity promotes personal growth and a healthy society for all people by challenging stereotypes, encouraging critical thinking, and fostering better communication with people of varied backgrounds;

WHEREAS Diversity strengthens communities and the workplace;

WHEREAS Education within a diverse setting prepares students to become good citizens in an increasingly complex, pluralistic society; it fosters mutual respect and teamwork; and it helps build community;

WHEREAS Sustaining the nation’s prosperity (economic, scientific, social, and cultural) in the 21st century requires us to recognize the talents and abilities of all, especially those from diverse backgrounds and cultures;

WHEREAS Diversity is crucial for increasing recruitment, enrollment and retention of students, faculty, and staff at the University;

¹ https://www.uidaho.edu/diversity
² https://www.uidaho.edu/diversity
WHEREAS Diversity programs at Idaho universities are being challenged by members of the Idaho legislature who argue that “[the] drive to create a diversified and inclusive culture becomes divisive and exclusionary because it separates and segregates students”;  

WHEREAS this argument reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of the efficacy and importance of diversity programs with respect to attracting, supporting and educating all students to improve the quality of life for individuals, families, and communities in Idaho and beyond;

BE IT RESOLVED that the University of Idaho reaffirms its commitment to supporting diversity and inclusion not only through its policies and procedures, but through its campus and institutional culture. Having diverse bodies in an academic setting is only enriching for all students if the institution they contribute to and learn and grow within is committed to protecting those people by providing robust institutional support to ensure that protection;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that as part of this commitment we remain dedicated to recognizing the importance of students, faculty, and staff from historically marginalized communities as they overcome obstacles to thrive. We further vow to ensure an equitable environment at the University of Idaho. Our vision of diversity is inclusive and includes people who are minoritized because of their gender identity, race, ethnicity, religion, sexuality, nation of origin, size, age, veteran status, family status, diverse abilities, and other unique and important identities;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that as a university community, we remain committed to providing, expanding, and funding appropriate and thoughtful partnerships with current programming offices and maintaining and extending support to such programs that are devoted to increasing equity and diversity on campus such as the Office of Diversity and Equity, the LBGTQA Office and the Green Dot program— but not limited to – areas such as recruitment and retention, student success, academic programming, instructor training, curriculum development, advising, and extracurricular opportunities. We also affirm a renewed commitment to ensuring the mental and physical safety – and a provision of needed support – for students, faculty and staff from historically marginalized backgrounds as they navigate their experience at the University of Idaho. Finally, we affirm a commitment to maintain, fund, and expand academic programs focused on diversity and inclusion on campus (e.g. Africana Studies; American Indian Studies; Certificate in Diversity and Inclusion, Latin American Studies; Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies).

---
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1. **Policy/Procedure Statement:** Briefly explain the reason for the proposed addition, revision, and/or deletion.

Temporary emergency policy FSH 6990 COVID-19 Emergency Response was adopted 3/20/2020, allowing the University to depart from existing policy to the extent necessary to implement its response to the COVID-19 pandemic. That policy will expire 9/16/2020. In order to provide for the University’s continuing response to COVID-19, and to provide for University’s response to future communicable disease emergencies, an ad hoc committee was convened to draft this FSH 6990 Communicable Disease Emergency Response.

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

None in itself, although actions taken pursuant to it may have fiscal impacts.

3. **Related Policies/Procedures:** Describe other UI policies or procedures related or similar to this proposed change, or that will be impacted by it.

Temporary emergency policy FSH 6990 COVID-19 Emergency Response. Actions taken pursuant to the temporary policy may be viewed on the Emergency Action Items page of the UI COVID-19 site.

4. **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.

To be effective as of the date of final approval.
A. Scope. This policy applies to all University of Idaho students and employees.

B. Purpose. The purpose of this policy is to ensure that the University is able to respond quickly and effectively to protect the UI community and the interests of the institution in the event of a public health emergency caused by a communicable disease outbreak.

C. Definitions

1. Communicable disease: A disease which may be transmitted from one person or an animal to another person either by direct contact or through an intermediate host, vector, inanimate object, or other means which may result in infection, illness, disability or death.


3. Public health emergency: For the purposes of this policy, a communicable disease outbreak is determined to be a public health emergency by local, state, or federal health authorities.

D. Policy

1. Applicability. In the event of a communicable disease outbreak, the president will consult with local, state, or federal health authorities as appropriate. If the outbreak is determined by public health authorities to be a public health emergency, the president may take action under the provisions of D-2. In the absence of a declaration of public health emergency, and if necessary to protect the UI community and the interests of the institution, the president may, after consultation with public health authorities, and with the consent of Faculty Senate leadership and Staff Council leadership, take action under the provisions of D-2.

2. Temporary policies and procedures. To the extent necessary to implement or enforce the University’s response to a public health emergency caused by a communicable disease outbreak, the University may establish temporary policies and procedures which may be inconsistent with existing policies and procedures. Prior to final implementation, the administration shall seek the input of affected constituencies, Staff Council, and Faculty Senate as appropriate and reasonable under the circumstances. Any such policy or procedure must be approved by the president or designee and published online, with a notice published in the Register as soon as reasonably practical.

3. Termination. If there is a declaration of public health emergency by local, state, or federal authorities, temporary actions under this policy will remain in effect only for so long as the declaration of public health emergency remains in effect. In the absence of a declaration of public health emergency, the president, Faculty Senate leadership, and Staff Council leadership, in consultation with public health authorities, shall periodically assess the situation and determine whether actions taken under this policy shall be terminated.


Commented [WD(2)]: Definition drawn from https://healthandwelfare.idaho.gov/Portals/0/Health/Epi/Disease%20Summaries/Rules%20Regulations.pdf; committee concerned about ambiguity but will address possible amendment to definition at later date.

Commented [WD(3)]: Board policy I.E.2.a. states that “[f]or the higher education institutions, the Board expects the Presidents to obtain the necessary input from the faculty, classified and exempt employees, and students, but it holds the Presidents ultimately responsible for the well-being of the institutions, and final decisions at the institutional level rest with the Presidents.”
E. **Effective date.** This policy shall be effective as of the date of final approval.
For instructions on policy creation and change, please see https://sitecore.uidaho.edu/governance/policy.

All policies must be reviewed, approved, and returned by the policy sponsor, with a cover sheet attached, to ui-policy@uidaho.edu.
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Reviewed by General Counsel  X Yes  ____No  Name & Date:  Jim Craig, 8/28/20

1. **Policy/Procedure Statement:** Briefly explain the reason for the proposed addition, revision, and/or deletion to the Faculty Staff Handbook or the Administrative Procedures Manual.

   FSH 1120 is not policy, but rather a historical description of the University. The material will continue to be available in the UI Library special collection “Campus History,” available online at https://www.lib.uidaho.edu/special-collections/.

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

   None.

3. **Related Policies/Procedures:** Describe other UI policies or procedures related or similar to this proposed change, or that will be impacted by it.

   Referenced in FSH 1220, also proposed for deletion, and in FSH 1520.

4. **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.

   Effective immediately.

If not a minor amendment forward to: ______________________________
ORIGINS AND GROWTH OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO

PREAMBLE: This section sketches a very brief history of the University of Idaho. Fuller information can be found in Statutes and Decisions Relating to the University of Idaho by Harrison Dale, former president of the university (Boise, 1944) [see the Appendix], Beacon for Mountain and Plain: Story of the University of Idaho by Rafe Gibbs (Moscow, University of Idaho Press, 1962), This Crested Hill: An Illustrated History of the University of Idaho by Keith C. Peterson (Moscow, University of Idaho Press, 1987). This section was written by the Faculty Secretary’s Office for the 1979 edition of the Handbook and has been updated so as to maintain currency of information from time to time since. Unless otherwise noted, the text is as of July 1996. [ed./rev. 7-98]

CONTENTS:
A. Origins
B. The University Today

A. ORIGINS. [See also Appendix I.]

A-1. Recognizing that education was vital to the development of Idaho, the legislature set as a major objective the establishment of an institution that would offer to all the people of the territory, on equal terms, higher education that would excel not only in the arts, letters, and sciences, but also in the agricultural and mechanic arts. The federal government’s extensive land grants, particularly under the Morrill Act of 1862, provided substantial assistance in this undertaking. Subsequent federal legislation provided further for the teaching function of the institution and for programs of research and extension. In all, approximately 240,000 acres were allocated to the support of Idaho’s land-grant institution.

A-2. After selecting Moscow as the site for the new university, in part because Moscow was located in the “center of one of the richest and most populous agricultural sections in the entire Northwest” and the surrounding area was not subject to the “vicissitudes of booms, excitement, or speculation,” the University of Idaho was founded January 30, 1889, by an act of the 15th and last territorial legislature. That act, commonly known as the university’s charter, became a part of Idaho’s organic law by virtue of its confirmation under article IX, section 10, of the state constitution when Idaho was admitted to the union. As the constitution of 1890 provides, “The location of the University of Idaho, as established by existing laws, is hereby confirmed. All the rights, immunities, franchises, and endowments heretofore granted thereto by the territory of Idaho are hereby perpetuated unto the said university. The regents shall have the general supervision of the university and the control and direction of all the funds of, and appropriations to, the university, under such regulations as may be prescribed by law.” Under these provisions, the University of Idaho was given status as a constitutional entity. Though the university is to be governed under regulations as may be prescribed by law, the regents were specifically given control of the funds and conditions of employment. Thus, the Board of Regents (designated in the territorial act as a body corporate and named “The Regents of the University of Idaho”) has wide-ranging authority not inherent in the governing boardof the other institutions in Idaho’s state system of higher education.

A-3. The regents were also empowered to appoint the university president to administer the institution and serve as president of the university faculty and of the constituent and associated faculties. As provided in the territorial act, the president is the “executive head of the instructional force” and gives “general direction to the instruction and scientific investigation of the university.” The act also entrusted the immediate government of the University of Idaho to the faculty. The tradition that the faculty, the president, and the regents are jointly responsible for governing this university has continued to the present.
Chapter I: HISTORY, MISSION, GENERAL ORGANIZATION, AND GOVERNANCE

Section 1120: Origins and Growth of the University of Idaho

July 2006


A-5. The university catalog for 1893 states that the “college or department of arts,” “the college or department of letters,” and “the college or department of agriculture” offered five “collegiate courses”: “the classical; the scientific; the mechanic arts and civil engineering; the agriculture; the English.” The College of Letters and Science was formally established in 1900. Colleges established later, though not necessarily under their current names, are: Agriculture (1901), Engineering (1907), Law (1909), Mines and Earth Resources (1917), Forestry, Wildlife and Range Sciences (1917), Education (1920), Business and Economics (1925), and Art and Architecture (1981). Graduate work has been under the supervision of the College of Graduate Studies since it was created in 1925. The Lionel Hampton School of Music (1969) and the School of Communication (1972) function within the College of Letters and Science, and the Margaret Ritchie School of Family and Consumer Sciences (1974) functions within the College of Agriculture. At UI, schools are not independent academic units.

B. THE UNIVERSITY TODAY.

B-1. The University of Idaho serves as the flagship research and land-grant institution of the state, is a Carnegie Doctoral/Research-Extensive institution, is a principal center for professional education, and is the state’s preeminent center for comprehensive and research-oriented graduate programs. [ed. 7-06]

B-2. UI is a member of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. It is accredited by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities and accredited or approved for specific programs by the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, American Bar Association, American Chemical Society, American Dietetics Association, American Society of Landscape Architects, Association of American Law Schools, Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs, National Architectural Accrediting Board, National Association of Schools of Art and Design, National Association of School Psychologists, National Association of Schools of Music, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, and Society of American Foresters. [ed. 7-06]

B-3. As noted in A-1, substantial federal land grants were made available during the territorial days and allocated to the university; the income from these properties still contributes to its support. Nevertheless, the institution’s main support is from annual legislative appropriations and, primarily, for auxiliary services, from student fees. The university also receives gifts, grants, and endowments for scholarships, teaching, research, and development from many sources, both public and private, in part through the UI Foundation and the Idaho Research Foundation.

B-4. Since its small beginning, the student body has grown to over 13,000 undergraduate, graduate and professional students and is made up largely of full-time students who live on-campus or within easy commuting distance. Though most of the students come from Idaho, every state in the union and approximately 85 foreign countries are represented. There are more than 750 full-time faculty members in teaching, research, and service and approximately 1500 staff and professional personnel. In addition, the university operates instructional/outreach and research centers and stations around the state, offers a wide variety of high school and college courses by correspondence, conducts general extension services and continuing education programs in many localities, and participates in numerous interinstitutional programs. The main campus alone now covers over 300 acres and is the site of more than 50 major buildings. Other university lands, including the nearby university farms and experimental forest, exceed 8,000 acres. [ed. 7-06]
B-5. Following deliberations and recommendations from the specially appointed University Vision and Resources Task Force (summer 2004) and subsequent open commentary period, the sixteenth president of the University, Timothy P. White, developed the Plan for Renewal of People, Programs and Place (February 2005). The Plan is crafted around our identity as a student-centered, research-extensive and engaged learning community. The plan may be viewed on the web at: http://www.president.uidaho.edu/documents/Strategic%20Directions2-11-05.pdf&pid=78760&doc=1 [rev. 7-05, 7-06]
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Originator: Diane Whitney, University Policy and Compliance Coordinator

Policy Sponsor, if different from Originator:

Reviewed by General Counsel  [x] Yes  ___No  Name & Date: Jim Craig, 8/24/20

1. **Policy/Procedure Statement:** Briefly explain the reason for the proposed addition, revision, and/or deletion.

   FSH 4320 merely restates SBOE policy and therefore is outside the UI’s policymaking authority.

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

   None.

3. **Related Policies/Procedures:** Describe other UI policies or procedures related or similar to this proposed change, or that will be impacted by it.

   FSH 4325 UI Organization of Intercollegiate Athletics.

4. **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.
BOARD POLICY ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

PREAMBLE: This section outlines the Board of Regents’ policy on intercollegiate athletics. A previous version appeared in the 1979 Handbook. This section was rewritten in July of 1987 to reflect changes in the Regents’ policy. For further information, contact the President’s Office (208-885-6365).

A. DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY. The regents have delegated to the president authority for the conduct of UI’s intercollegiate athletic program [see 4325 for a description of the program]. The board requires that the program be administered in conformity with its policies and those of the organizations and conferences with which UI is affiliated. The board’s basic policy is contained below.

B. POLICY.

——B-1. The board reaffirms the role of intercollegiate athletics as a legitimate and significant component of institutional activity. The responsibility for and control of institutional activities in this area rest with the board.

——B-2. In the area of intercollegiate athletics, the board seeks to establish programs which provide opportunities for student athletes to attend college and participate in athletic programs while pursuing and completing academic degrees, reflect accurately the priorities and academic character of its institutions, and serve the needs of the institutions as they seek, through their athletic programs, to establish fruitful and sustaining relationships with their constituencies throughout the state and nation.

——B-3. Given these goals, the board has a continuing concern and interest in the academic success of student athletes, the scope and level of competition, and the cost of athletic programs administered by its institutions. Consequently, the board will, from time to time, in the context of this policy statement, promulgate, as necessary, regulations governing the conduct of athletic programs at its institutions.
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Originator: Diane Whitney, University Policy and Compliance Coordinator

Policy Sponsor, if different from Originator:

Reviewed by General Counsel  X Yes ___No  Name & Date: Kent Nelson 5/15/20

1. Policy/Procedure Statement: Briefly explain the reason for the proposed addition, revision, and/or deletion.

   FSH 1140 is purely duplicative of SBOE policy. Its subject matter lies squarely within the purview of the SBOE and is in fact pre-empted by SBOE policy.

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

   None.

3. Related Policies/Procedures: Describe other UI policies or procedures related or similar to this proposed change, or that will be impacted by it.

   Cross-referenced in preamble to FSH 1320.

4. 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.
MISSION AND SCOPE OF PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN IDAHO

PREAMBLE: The following statement of the mission and scope of public postsecondary education in Idaho was adopted on March 3, 1983, by the State Board of Education and Board of Regents of the University of Idaho. A section of the statement, dealing with the mission and scope of postsecondary vocational-technical education, is not reproduced here. See also 1240, 1320, and 1340. [ed. 7-97]

CONTENTS:
A. Introduction  
B. The Roles of Postsecondary Education  
C. Principles Governing Instructional Programs

A. INTRODUCTION.

A-1. The state of Idaho has the responsibility to provide educational opportunities for its citizens. To this end the state supports a system of postsecondary education, governed by the State Board of Education, made up of its postsecondary schools, colleges, and universities. The institutions’ programs include a wide range of postsecondary offerings. Thus the system, through its institutions, is capable of awarding certificates and degrees at the associate, baccalaureate, master’s, and doctoral levels.

A-2. Institutional role and mission statements [see 1240], together with this description of the system’s mission and scope, form the basic planning document to guide future decisions about public postsecondary education in Idaho. This planning document will allow the board to encourage diversity among the state’s institutions by two different means: (a) by authorizing programs that are compatible with the institutions’ role and mission statements and with that of the system of postsecondary education and (b) by supporting the different emphases and specialized programs on the several campuses.

A-3. The scope and mission of postsecondary education will inevitably change. Therefore, the principles stated in this document must be reviewed and either reaffirmed or revised on a regular basis.

B. THE ROLES OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION. The mission and scope of public postsecondary education in Idaho must reflect the state’s economy, geography, demography, and culture. The relevance of these must be stated in order to articulate the system’s general aims and the principles for achieving them.

B-1. If Idaho is to develop and sustain a strong economic, cultural, and technological base, and if its citizens are to be equipped to lead satisfying and responsible lives, its educational institutions must provide quality instruction in the liberal arts, technology, professional careers, and basic and applied sciences.

B-2. The needs of Idaho are changing, and the educational institutions must be capable of changing to meet new needs.

B-3. Idaho, because of its widely dispersed population, cannot realistically provide complete geographic “equality” of access to all educational programs in all regions of the state.

B-4. The long distances within the state, its diversified topography, and the locations of its existing institutions require that each one provide access to general education programs.

B-5. While granting that all institutions have regional missions, and that all, therefore, will provide essential courses for regional clienteles, a number of programs offered by the institutions must serve a primarily statewide mission.
B-6. The discovery of new knowledge through research is an essential component in developing quality instruction. The knowledge gained through research also forms the cornerstone of many of the public services that the educational institutions provide the state’s citizens.

B-7. Public service is an important responsibility of the institutions.

C. Principles Governing Instructional Programs. The principles to guide policy-making for instructional programs may conveniently be sorted into three classes: [C-1] those governing existing programs; [C-2] those governing new programs, and [C-3] those governing review of existing programs. The principles governing existing programs may usefully be further divided into two subclasses: [C-1-a] principles relevant to programs that must be made available in all regions of the state, and [C-1-b] principles relevant to programs offered by single institutions.

C-1. Principles Governing Existing Instructional Programs.

a. Programs Made Available in All Regions of the State.

(1) Recognizing our citizens’ needs for an understanding of human institutions and values, for an appreciation of their physical world and the things in it, and for basic skills in communication, mathematical calculations, and problem-solving, access to a broad core of studies in the liberal arts and sciences must be provided in all of the state’s institutions. Such studies are fundamental to all academic programs.

(2) Certain professional and specialized programs widely needed by citizens and industries throughout the state (e.g., programs in education and business) may be made available in each region by the appropriate colleges and universities as consistent with their roles and missions.

(3) Duplication of certain programs is not only permissible, but is essential to the overall mission of postsecondary education.

(4) Given the limitations of resources available to postsecondary education, institutions are encouraged to take maximum advantage of articulation, consortia, or other cooperative arrangements with other postsecondary institutions to deliver their educational services.

b. Programs Not Uniformly Available at Institutions.

(1) Programs of statewide significance (hereafter designated “statewide programs”) shall be assigned as the responsibility of an appropriate institution. (a) Such programs shall be delivered by institutions capable of providing them at a high level of quality. (b) The offering of such programs carries with it the responsibility for meeting statewide rather than just regional needs. Institutions offering them must have adequate resources, and must be prepared through their budgetary processes to meet needs outside their regions by any of a variety of delivery methods. (c) Duplication of statewide programs can rarely be considered as justifiable.

(2) The Board recognizes the need to provide a number of programs—usually technical or vocational in their aims—to meet the specific industrial or economic activities of a given region. (a) Such programs are usually offered by a SINGLE regional institution. (b) Because such programs are highly subject to changing economic and industrial needs, they may be created, altered, or eliminated on a very brief timetable.

C-2. Principles Governing the Establishment of New Programs.

a. The development of new programs will be initiated when there is a clear need for them.
b. The need for new programs will be assessed by the Academic Affairs Council. New program areas, once identified, will be assigned by the board to the appropriate institution for the purposes of planning.

e. The board shall establish incentives to encourage the internal reallocation of resources as the primary method for funding new programs.

d. Student exchange programs, resource sharing, and tuition reciprocity are encouraged as means for providing access to essential programs not available in the state.

C-3. Principles Governing the Review of Existing Programs. Over future years, the roles and missions of institutions will change. Because the demand and funding for programs fluctuates, and the need for them may change radically over time, the board requires that all programs be subject to systematic review.

a. The number of people served by postsecondary education will be determined by the level of funding.

b. Institutions will be encouraged to shift resources internally to meet changing needs whenever possible.

c. The board and its institutions shall strictly scrutinize all programs for continuing need and current levels of effectiveness, especially high-cost programs.

d. The board and its institutions will consider alternative ways of supplementing funding for high-cost, low-enrollment programs.
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Originator: Diane Whitney, University Policy and Compliance Coordinator
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Reviewed by General Counsel   X Yes ___No   Name & Date: Kent Nelson 4/27/20

1. Policy/Procedure Statement: Briefly explain the reason for the proposed addition, revision, and/or deletion.

   FSH 1220 is purely descriptive, not policy, and to the extent that it deals with other institutions is outside the scope of the UI’s policymaking authority.

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

   None.

3. Related Policies/Procedures: Describe other UI policies or procedures related or similar to this proposed change, or that will be impacted by it.

   Referenced in FSH 1240.

4. 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.
PREAMBLE: This section enumerates and briefly describes the various institutions of higher education found in the state of Idaho, both public and private ones. It was first introduced to the Handbook in December of 1980 and has been revised from time to time since so as to maintain currency of information.

CONTENTS:

A. State System of Higher Education
B. Private Institutions

A. STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION. The major components of the state system of higher education in Idaho include the State Board of Education and Board of Regents of the University of Idaho (a single body) and the public institutions of higher education. A basic objective is to provide a coordinated system in which the individuality of each institution is maintained, the students are afforded an education of high quality, and the Idaho taxpayers are assured of maximum efficiency and economy.

A-1. STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO. The board is responsible, in varying degrees, for the following institutions and agencies in Idaho: the state institutions of higher education, the public-school system, the community colleges, the State Department of Education, the Divisions of Vocational Education and Vocational Rehabilitation, the State School for the Deaf and the Blind, the Eastern Idaho Vocational-Technical School, the State Library, the State Historical Society, and the Idaho Educational Public Broadcasting System. [See also 1120 A-2 and 1520 I-1.] The staff in the Office of the State Board of Education, located at Boise, assists the board in all matters pertaining to its constitutional and statutory responsibilities.

A-2. UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO. UI’s history is outlined in 1120, its role and mission in 1240 B, and its particular functions and objectives in 1320. [ed. 7-97]

A-3. LEWIS-CLARK STATE COLLEGE. LCSC was established as Lewiston State Normal School in 1893. In 1947 the name was changed to North Idaho College of Education and changed again in 1955 to Lewis-Clark Normal School. The legislature restored its four-year status in 1965 and gave the college its present name in 1971. For the statement of LCSC’s role and mission, see 1240 B-2 e. [ed. 7-97, 12-13]

A-4. IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY. Located in Pocatello, ISU was established as the Academy of Idaho in 1901, renamed the Idaho Technical Institute in 1915, reorganized as UI’s Southern Branch in 1927, designated as Idaho State College in 1947, and granted university status in 1963. For the statement of ISU’s role and mission, see 1240 B-4. [ed. 7-97, 12-13]...
Twin Falls has served the Magic Valley area of southern Idaho since 1964. Its primary function is to provide the first two years of college-level instruction, vocational-technical preparation, and adult education programs; it confers associate degrees in arts, sciences, and applied science.

A. EASTERN IDAHO TECHNICAL COLLEGE. EITC was established by the legislature in 1970 to provide postsecondary vocational-technical programs in eastern Idaho. The school is located at Idaho Falls and its primary responsibility is to students of the 10 counties that constitute Junior College District Six.

B. PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS. In addition to the public institutions described above, there are four private institutions of higher education in Idaho. Though these are not supported by the state and, therefore, are not under the aegis of the state board, they contribute significantly to higher education in Idaho, complementing the programs of the publicly supported institutions.

B-1. RICKS COLLEGE. Ricks College was founded in Rexburg in 1888 by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints as the Bannock Stake Academy. When it was recognized by the Idaho State Board of Education in 1917, the name was changed to Ricks Normal College. Its present name dates from 1923. Ricks College provides a comprehensive program for freshmen and sophomores both in vocational-technical fields and in the arts and sciences. It confers associate degrees and one-year certificates.

B-2. ALBERTSON’S COLLEGE OF IDAHO. Located in Caldwell and founded in 1891 as the College of Idaho, this four-year institution is church-related (Presbyterian) but nonsectarian in instruction. It offers baccalaureate degrees in 30 major fields and master’s degrees in education.

B-3. NORTHWEST NAZARENE COLLEGE. Located in Nampa and founded in 1913, Northwest Nazarene College is affiliated with the Church of the Nazarene. This four-year, liberal arts college has a balanced program in the humanities, natural sciences, social sciences, and fine arts. NNC grants associate and baccalaureate degrees; it also offers master’s degrees in education.

B-4. COLLEGE OF ST. GERTRUDE. Operated by the Sisters of St. Benedict at Cottonwood and incorporated in 1956 to offer junior college work, the College of St. Gertrude is a small school offering the degree of Associate in Arts. Its courses are offered in an evening program only and have been accepted for transfer to UI.
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1. **Policy/Procedure Statement:** Briefly explain the reason for the proposed addition, revision, and/or deletion.

   FSH 4325 is proposed for deletion because it is mostly descriptive and doesn’t serve any policy function (e.g., to guide decisionmaking, mandate or constrain actions, mitigate institutional risk, etc.).

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

   None.

3. **Related Policies/Procedures:** Describe other UI policies or procedures related or similar to this proposed change, or that will be impacted by it.

   FSH 4320 Board Policy on Intercollegiate Athletics, which is also proposed for deletion.

4. **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.
UI ORGANIZATION OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

PREAMBLE: This section outlines the organization of intercollegiate athletics at UI, including a statement of philosophy. The original avatar of this section was a part of the 1979 Handbook. It was rewritten in February of 1980 to reflect the consolidation of men’s and women’s sports into a single athletic program. Since that time it has been revised to mark the dropping of men’s baseball and women’s field hockey (June, 1981) and men’s swimming (November, 1986), and the addition of women’s soccer, swimming, and golf (July, 2006). In July of 1996 it was revised to take note of the shift to the Big West athletic conference and in July of 2006 a shift to the Western Athletic Conference. For further information, contact Athletic Department (208-885-0200). See also 4320.

CONTENTS:
A. Athletic Department
B. Statement of Philosophy
C. Competitive Structure
D. Sports Information

A. ATHLETIC DEPARTMENT. The intercollegiate athletic program is administered by the Athletic Department. The department consists of the director of athletics, assistant director/senior women’s administrator, senior associate athletic director, assistant director for development, and the staff, coaches, and trainers for seven men’s and nine women’s teams. Approximately 330 students participate in intercollegiate athletics. [rev. 7-06]

B. STATEMENT OF PHILOSOPHY.

B-1. The Athletic Department adheres to the belief that intercollegiate athletics is an integral part of the educational framework of the university. The athletic program for men and women serves as a method of education by which a significant contribution may be made to the total development of the student-athlete.

B-2. The athletic program serves to inspire the pursuit of excellence through the honest effort and personal integrity of all concerned and through the provision of coaching, facilities, and equipment to enable student-athletes to realize their potential. In this way, the athletic program can be a source of pride for all associated with the university.

B-3. The primary objective of the athletic program is to provide a quality competitive intercollegiate program for UI student-athletes that will enrich their lives, enhance the image of the institution, and be complementary to the academic mission of UI.

C. COMPETITIVE STRUCTURE. UI belongs to both regional and national athletic associations. Any full-time undergraduate student who meets the standards for eligibility of the governing association is eligible to participate in intercollegiate athletics. For men’s and women’s athletics, membership is held in the Western Athletic Conference and in Division I of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). UI fields teams for men in football, basketball, cross country, indoor track and field, outdoor track and field, tennis, and golf. Women’s teams compete in volleyball, basketball, indoor track and field, outdoor track and field, tennis, cross country, soccer, swimming, and golf. [rev. 7-06]

D. SPORTS INFORMATION. The director of sports information is responsible for publicity, promotion, and public relations for the intercollegiate athletic program. The duties of the director’s office include preparation of publications and news releases, relations with sports news media, and coordination of press box arrangements. [ed. 7-97]