I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes (Vote)
   - Minutes of the 2020-2021 Faculty Senate Meeting #4 (September 7, 2021) Attach. #1

III. Consent Agenda (Vote)

IV. Chair’s Report

V. Provost’s Report

VI. Committee Reports
   - Faculty Affairs (Vote)
   - Sabbatical Committee (Vote)
   - University Curriculum Committee (Vote)
   - Committee on Committees (Vote)

VII. Other Announcements and Communications
   - Campaign working group presentations (Scott Green, Torrey Lawrence, Chandra Ford, Mary Kay McFadden) Attach #2

VIII. Special Orders

IX. New Business

X. Adjournment
Attachments:

- **Attach. #1**: Minutes of the 2020-2021 Faculty Senate Meeting #4
- **Attach. #2**: Campaign working group presentations, Whitepaper
- **Attach. #3**: 
- **Attach. #4**: 
2021 – 2022 Faculty Senate – Pending Approval
Meeting # 4
Tuesday, September 7, 2021, 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm
Zoom only

Present: Ahmadzadeh, Becker, Bridges, Chapman, Fairley, Gauthier, Hickman, Hoffmann, Torrey Lawrence (w/o vote), Lee-Painter, McIntosh, Meeuf (Chair), Mittelstaedt, Ogborn, Paul, Quinnett, Rashed, Rinker, Roberson, Sammarruca (w/o vote), Schiele, Schwarzlaender, A. Smith (Vice Chair), R. Smith, Stroebel, Tenuto, Thorne, Wargo
Absent: Dahlquist, Rose

Guest Presenters: Diane Kelly-Riley, Blaine Eckles

Call to Order: Chair Meeuf called the meeting to order at 3:31pm.

Approval of Minutes (vote):
• Minutes of the 2021-22 Meeting #3 – Attach. #1.
  The minutes of the 2021-22 Meeting #3 were approved with the correction of a typographical error.

Chair’s Report:
• Alumni Award for Excellence.
  The Office of Alumni Relations is accepting nominations for the Alumni Award for Excellence. Nominations are open until Friday, Sept. 17. The Alumni Award for Excellence program recognizes U of I’s distinguished scholars. Each year, faculty, staff and administrators from colleges and departments nominate seniors at the undergraduate level, third-year College of Law students and graduate students who have outstanding academic and campus activity records. A committee, composed of faculty, staff and alumni, reviews the nominations and selects the final recipients based on academic achievements and campus citizenship. Contact Sandy Larsen with questions. Submit a nomination
• The Dean of Students Office is seeking donations from Faculty and Staff for Joe’s Closet, a free resource for students that provides professional clothing for job interviews or headshot photo sessions. If you have any clothing that you would like to donate, please take them to the Dean of Students office starting September 13th between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m. https://www.uidaho.edu/student-affairs/dean-of-students/services/joes-closet
• Reminders:
  o The first University Faculty Meeting of the 2021-22 academic year will be held tomorrow, Wednesday September 8th, from 2:30-4:00 pm, in the Pitman Center International Ballroom. Zoom option will also be available. The meeting will be followed by a reception outside of the Pitman Center.
  o Tomorrow is also the Athena Welcome Back Kickoff from 5-6:30 p.m. pm Sept. 8, at the Moscow Brewing Co., so there is time to attend that after the UFM! Please help us spread the word about upcoming deadlines by sharing with your colleagues.

Provost’s Report:
• COVID update: The status of the mask mandate will be re-evaluated around September 20.
The Provost reminded Senators to submit recommendations of people interested in serving on the committee for the search of a permanent Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives.

Academic Impressions: The Provost has been impressed by this company. It is an organization rich in resources for faculty, staff, and students. They offer career support, webinars, in-person conferences, and more. All faculty, staff and students have access through an institutional membership. (https://www.academicimpressions.com/uidaho/)

Discussion:
In response to a request of clarification, the Provost said that the mask mandate will be re-evaluated – not automatically removed – on September 20. The decision will depend on how the circumstances evolve.

A Senator asked whether COVID conditions in the surrounding areas, particularly the “hot spots” both in the south and the north of Moscow, will also be taken into account when making a decision. Provost Lawrence said that the University is communicating with the Health District, of which Lewiston – one of the hot spots – is a part. Hospitalization rates and hospital resource crises – one was declared today by the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare throughout northern Idaho – will be carefully considered, in consultation with public health officials.

Chair Meeuf inquired about the cost of testing for students. Typically, a $25 co-pay is charged to have a test ordered. The Provost responded that it depends on the insurance provider. He added that some people reported having been diverted out of town. This may be due to the fact that Gritman is only open for COVID testing only in the morning, so people were probably given options rather than diverted.

Dean of Students Blaine Eckles was invited by Chair Meeuf to join the conversation. He said that students who cannot afford the co-pay should reach out to the Dean of Students (DOS) Office for financial assistance (askjoe@uidaho.edu)

Chair Meeuf noted that other institutions of higher education have been able to offer free testing to students. Can any helpful process come from them? Dean Eckles replied that the money other institutions have invested in testing may come from centralized funds.

A Senator expressed concern that having COVID-related discussions with students is difficult, and yet very important. Dean Eckles encouraged faculty to direct students to DOS, if they think that’s the best way to help them, or file a CARE report at www.uidaho.edu/vandalcare.

A Senator was disappointed by the lack of a process for quick turnaround of test results. Students shouldn’t be charged a co-pay and potentially another co-pay for the appointment to obtain a doctor’s order. Dean Eckles did indicate that students can reach out to the Bruce and Kathy Pitman Fund for financial support if they are experiencing a financial hardship.

Chair Meeuf asked whether there is any update concerning classroom contact tracing. Blaine Eckles said that the university is in touch with the Public Health District and follows their lead and guidance. He will reach out to the Public Health District for more information to share.

Announcements and Communications:

• SBOE Academic Freedom and Diversity Policy discussion – Russ Meeuf. Attach. #2
Chair Meeuf, a member of the taskforce that worked on this project, explained that the draft policies in the attachment will be submitted to SBOE for their approval. They are being presented to Senate at this time for feedback and discussion and, potentially, a vote.

**Discussion:**

A Senator was concerned about the absence of representation or any mention of staff. It is understandable that these are faculty- and student-centric policies, but staff should not be completely omitted. Dean Eckles said that he did raise this aspect. However, SBOE did not see inclusion of staff as germane to this document, which is mostly about faculty and students in the instructional setting.

Vice Chair Smith inquired whether instructors and lecturers are included in these policies, to which Chair Meeuf and Provost Lawrence replied that anyone involved in classroom instruction is included – the definition of “faculty” is very broad, and embraces temporary instructors and lecturers, extension educators, and research faculty. U of I definitions of different faculty types can be found at https://www.uidaho.edu/governance/policy/policies/fsh/1/1565.

Chair Meeuf summarized the meaning and relevance of the attached document: it was crafted to be more detailed and specific about faculty and student freedom and responsibilities, and the areas where those are applicable.

Moving on to the diversity part of the policies, a Senator raised the question of whether the word “inclusion” conveys the right message – or, does it sound like being accepted/invited into a “pre-accepted” group? Another Senator proposed “equal representation” in place of “inclusion.” Dean Eckles encouraged the Senators to suggest alternative expressions. He also noted that the State Board is using federal terminology, but we can be additive and forward thinking. The draft policy defines inclusion as:

> Inclusion is the fostering of an environment in which the inherent worth and dignity of all individuals are recognized and valued, and where individuals have equitable opportunities to be included, engaged, and accepted with a sense of belonging.

A Senator asked whether the President’s Council on Diversity and Inclusion (PCDI) is aware of this work. Chair Meeuf was not sure, but he will be happy to forward it to PCDI.

A Senator was not yet comfortable supporting these policies, partially because of the current political climate. What is the motivation for doing this now, and how do these policies differ from existing (U of I and SBOE) policies? Chair Meeuf reiterated that this document was essentially developed from scratch, as a detailed, point-by-point, description. To put the project in a broader context: SBOE wants to be ready to respond to potential pressure to interfere with curriculum issues. This is a good-faith effort from SBOE to have a faculty-led process.

Senator Thorne, also a member of the Taskforce, described her very positive experience. The process was thorough, and thus challenging, with many people coming together. In the end, the committee was able to reach a consensus, in a climate full of energy, integrity, and mutual respect.

Dean Eckles agreed with Senator Thorne’s comments. It was impressive to see how everybody came together. Back to the earlier question about timing and motivations, he said that the purpose is to have a proactive process.
Provost Lawrence confirmed that the process was inspiring and the outcome by far better than what the committee started with.

As some Senators had indicated that they may need more time, Chair Meeuf proposed an informal vote to gauge the level of Senate support. The result of the straw poll was as follows:
- Academic freedom policy: 88% in favor, 4% against, 8% expressed no opinion.
- Diversity policy: 86% in favor, 9% against, 5% expressed no opinion.
There was a seconded motion (Thorne/Schwarzaender) to take an official vote. The result of the vote was as follows:
- 92% in favor, 0 against, 8% expressed no opinion.
Chair Meeuf will communicate with other institutions in the state and let them know that our Senate strongly supports the policies.

- Student complaint process – Diane Kelly-Riley and Blaine Eckles
  Vice Provost Kelly-Riley provided some background. People became concerned about this issue after House Bill 377 passed (which prohibits instructors from compelling students to adhere to certain ideas or beliefs (https://legislature.idaho.gov/wp-content/uploads/sessioninfo/2021/legislation/H0377.pdf). While we have no general policy in place at U of I, this presentation is meant to inform people of practices at U of I. As a guiding principle, we always try to resolve the complaint at the closest, most local level – typically the faculty or unit chair. Sometime it becomes necessary to involve the college dean or the dean of students. There are several university-level resources to address student complaints. The Vandal CARE Group receives Vandal CARE reports, which are routed to specific individuals who will try to resolve the situation. The Vandal Climate Education and Support Team, (former Bias Response Team), handles reports of bias, intolerance, or prejudice. The Threat Assessment Team addresses concerns which rise to the level of a threat. Finally, the Ombuds offers impartial and confidential support to help with conflict resolution.

Dean Eckels added that his office encourages students not to go from “top down” but rather take the opposite direction. The DOS Office can help to ensure that students feel heard. All concerns brought to DOS are taken seriously and handled in a balanced way.

Discussion
The Vice Chair had a question about the course content side of the matter. Say, a faculty member presents outdated material. What is the best avenue for handling this kind of situations? Vice Provost Kelly-Riley replied that there are several portals. Typically, the starting point is the unit chair – or the faculty member direct supervisor – and action is taken within the unit. The college dean may be involved, if necessary.

Following up on the previous exchange, another Senator emphasized that professional training for faculty to stay updated in their field should be mandatory, and more resources should be available to that end. Vice Provost Kelly-Riley noted that training sessions for unit chairs are being provided to help them navigate the process, including understanding of the relevant confidentiality issues.

The Secretary moved the conversation to a different aspect – namely, what is the best channel for a student complaint about parts of a course content which are relevant to the class, but they find offensive to their believes? The Vice Provost responded that, while we cannot “force”
students to believe or think in a certain way, it is not forbidden to teach controversial subject matters. Dean Eckles made clear that his office does not interfere with the content of a course. They can help getting people together and direct students to a place where they are comfortable having a discussion.

A Senator inquired about the role of the syllabus in this process. Dean Eckles stressed the importance of the syllabus as a “contract” between the faculty and the class. Student complaints are often due to the instructor deviating from what is announced in the syllabus (most frequently, assignments, due dates, etc.). Vice Provost Kelly-Riley agreed that the syllabus is an important outline of the course, through which students are made aware of expectations. Most complaints are about the instructor deviating from the expectations set forth in the syllabus. Faculty are encouraged to reach out to CETL for help with syllabi and other available resources.

- APM 05.08 University vehicle use policy – Attach. #3
- APM 70.02 University vehicle use policy – Attach. #4
These are informational items. Please check out the respective attachments and let us know if you have any questions or comments.

Adjournment:
The agenda being completed, Chair Meeuf adjourned the meeting at 4:57.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francesca Sammarruca
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Idaho is one of the top two fastest-growing states in the nation. That growth brings with it opportunities to improve the lives of Idahoans, particularly through increased economic activity and job growth. A growing population also brings its fair share of challenges in resource sustainability, agricultural output, information integrity, infrastructure and healthcare, among others.

Perhaps now more than ever, Idaho needs the meaningful insights, transformational solutions and well-educated workforce produced by its foremost research land-grant university.

The University of Idaho’s mission is to prepare students for careers and life; conduct research that benefits discovery, business and industry in Idaho and beyond; and engage in outreach that strengthens communities – rural and urban – and spurs economic prosperity. With strong leadership and key strategic projects already underway, U of I has established a firm foundation for future success. Now is the time to focus and amplify this forward momentum for the benefit of the state, nation and world.

Charge from President Green

President Scott Green formed the Campaign Working Group to develop and recommend a strategic approach for embarking on a successful comprehensive fundraising campaign. The components of the working group’s output include 1) the case for why a comprehensive campaign is strategically important now and how it will help shape and implement the long-term vision of the institution, 2) a description of the academic and communications processes required to develop and articulate that long-term vision and 3) support for the additional staffing and operations resources needed to plan and execute a successful campaign.

In addition, this whitepaper includes a recommendation for a phased approach to the public launch of the campaign, which reflects the unique opportunities available at this point in Idaho’s and U of I’s history.

A formal campaign plan – designed primarily for internal audiences – will be developed upon approval of the white paper and will include more detail about budget, staffing, timeline, etc. A formal campaign case statement – designed primarily for external audiences – will be developed in time for the public phase of the campaign.

Working Group Members and More

Comprised of dedicated alumni leaders (see Appendix A), donors and university leaders, the Campaign Working Group met several times to discuss the recommendations in this white paper, which is intended to serve as a road map for completion of a successful campaign that fuels a bold new vision for the University of Idaho.

In March 2021, the Campaign Working Group broke into subcommittees to tackle each component of the whitepaper listed above.

In parallel to the business of the Campaign Working Group, U of I embarked on a series of virtual Industry Summits with executive-level leaders from industries throughout Idaho. These leaders discussed their challenges, successes and aspirations for Idaho’s future, and how they might partner with the university to address them. Key components are incorporated in the white paper.
SECTION 1: THE CASE FOR A COMPREHENSIVE FUNDRAISING CAMPAIGN

What does a comprehensive fundraising campaign mean for the University of Idaho? A campaign is not simply a means for raising money; it is a tool for identifying and accomplishing bold, strategic goals that, as a result, serve all of U of I’s constituencies even better. A successful campaign engages a broader group of alumni and partners and inspires their support in all forms for decades yet to come.

The members of this subcommittee affirm that a successful campaign will result in rejuvenated audiences, deeper connections to and pride in U of I; renewed confidence in our mission; and expanded partnerships and greater brand awareness. In short, a campaign builds capacity for the institution to achieve its long-term goals, always focused on best serving the state that it calls home.

With unprecedented population growth, rapid economic growth and the many issues that accompany them, Idaho needs what its foremost research land-grant university can provide to meet today’s needs and solve tomorrow’s most complex problems.

For example, the lack of educated, workforce-ready employees – especially in the fields of cybersecurity, healthcare, software development, agriculture and engineering – stands to threaten Idaho’s robust economy. Across Idaho’s predominant industry sectors, there aren’t enough people locally to meet the demand for various skilled positions. In the Industry Summits conducted by U of I, leaders said they struggle to find and afford the workforce they need to conduct business. Some are even considering moving out of Idaho to places with a larger qualified workforce.

The lack of an educated workforce isn’t surprising, considering Idaho’s “go-on” rate (the rate at which high school graduates go on to pursue additional education and/or training) is the lowest in the country and still declining. From 2016 to 2019, the go-on rate declined from 49% to 45%. 2020 rates were even lower due to factors related to the pandemic.

Cost of higher education in the state is a primary factor. Families in Idaho continue to struggle to afford a college education for themselves and/or their children, due at least in part to the shift in support for higher education from the state to the student. In 1980, the state covered nearly 90% of an Idaho family’s cost of higher education. Today, the state covers only 50%, leaving families to pick up the rest. Adjusted for inflation, U of I tuition and fees increased from $1,441 to $8,304 during that time. Overall, today only one-third of U of I’s total budget comes from the state.

Making higher education accessible for all qualified Idaho students is a priority shared by the state and the University of Idaho for the many lifelong benefits of a college education. Statistics show college graduates are more likely to be involved in their communities, tend to live nine years longer and earn $1.2 million more on average over their lifetimes than those with only a high school diploma.

Clearly, Idaho benefits from having more college graduates in general, but our state also needs more college graduates with durable and specialized skills to advance the health of our industries and our communities.

Healthcare is just one area where the need for a specialized workforce is dire. Idaho ranks among the lowest in the U.S. in physicians per capita with an aging workforce of healthcare professionals. Just as cost is a barrier for those seeking a bachelor’s degree, Idaho’s aspiring doctors struggle to afford a medical education. Considering many medical school graduates have six-figure loan debts and the average pay for Idaho physicians is $60,000 less than other states, many Idaho-trained physicians leave Idaho to practice in neighboring states that pay higher wages.
Current and incoming students at all levels need more financial aid support than ever – a reality that can be mitigated by a successful comprehensive fundraising campaign.

**Advantages of a Public Launch Now**

No matter the conditions, U of I continues to demonstrate unwavering support for its students. A fall 2021 campaign launch focused on U of I's commitment to student success will build on its current momentum. Further, in the silent phase of the campaign (2015 to present), the university has raised over $259 million toward the overall goal of $500 million. This momentum demonstrates to potential donors that U of I, its students and its service to Idaho are a worthwhile investment.

As businesses and communities are opening back up, post-pandemic and economic activity is increasing and Idahoans are feeling a sense of renewal and hope. U of I is in an ideal position to pursue emerging opportunities and engage with its stakeholders in new ways. Consider:

- Alumni and industry confidence in President Scott Green
- Progress on strategic projects such as CAFE, Vandal Promise Scholarship initiative and expansion of the Parma Research and Extension Center
- Record-setting fundraising over the past four years
- Excitement for the Idaho Central Credit Union Arena grand opening in October 2021
- New one-on-one partnerships between U of I and industry stakeholders developing as a result of the Industry Summits with the potential for larger-scale partnerships on the horizon
- New university leaders’ enthusiasm and expertise
- U of I’s increasing financial health
- A return to in-person events and “normalcy” post-pandemic

At a time when other universities have delayed publicly launching their campaigns, the University of Idaho is ready to boldly announce what our impact will be on Idaho and the world. A comprehensive fundraising campaign of the magnitude proposed here – with an initial focus on student support – will give U of I significant resources to attract, retain and graduate more students who can meet industry demand for educated workers and make a difference in their communities.

Through discussions of current events, conditions and attitudes, the subcommittee feels strongly that launching the public phase of the campaign in fall 2021 offers opportunities and advantages that might not be available in a year or more. In addition, the campaign propels the university into processes that define, refine and articulate its long-term vision and set its strategic priorities.

*The Campaign Working Group supports and recommends launching the public phase of a comprehensive campaign in fall 2021.*

See “Section 4: Phased Public Launch” for additional details.
SECTION 2:
ARTICULATING A BRAVE AND BOLD VISION FOR THE FUTURE

What can we do through this campaign that, at its conclusion, will define what it means to be a land-grant university in the 21st century? How can we best meet the education and research needs of our growing and prosperous state? What will generate new and increased interest in U of I across broad audiences? How will we inspire greater engagement with and support of U of I through messaging and telling the stories of its impact?

These are the questions the subcommittee responsible for this section considered in making recommendations for developing and articulating a new, brave and bold vision for U of I. Established by the academic side of the house and articulated with clear, compelling communications and marketing, the vision will become the North Star for the campaign and for U of I well into the future.

Developing a Vision for the 21st Century

The university’s academic community is engaging in conversations about the possibilities and opportunities a campaign will afford individual faculty members, colleges and other units to combine forces to better serve the state. Discussion topics include:

• How does U of I leverage its traditional institutional strengths in new ways to address Idaho’s emerging issues and needs, such as water, energy, environmental resilience, health science and cybersecurity?
• How does U of I continue to deliver and enhance a transformational experience for students that produces the highly skilled, critical thinking, problem-solving workforce the state needs to prosper?

• How does U of I take maximum advantage of its statewide campus featuring some of the most unique outdoor “classrooms” in the world?

These ongoing conversations will help inform programmatic decisions as part of a rigorous process for defining those few strategic priorities that represent the intersection of the institution’s strengths, its potential and opportunities present in the larger world. Clear, focused priority setting is imperative to ensure the goals of the campaign are strategic, ambitious and achievable.

The Campaign Working Group supports and recommends:

• Continuing focused conversations with academic leaders to surface programmatic strengths and opportunities.
• Completing a rigorous vetting process to establish strategic priorities for the campaign and beyond.

Articulating the Vision, Telling our Story

The Campaign Vision subcommittee emphasized that campaign communications are a critical piece of campaign success and, in fact, U of I’s future success. They agreed that despite this University of Idaho’s distinguished history and proven areas of impact, too few stakeholders are aware of its profound influence on the state and region. With strong academic direction and vision, unified communications and a clear brand platform as a base, the campaign provides an excellent opportunity to increase the visibility of U of I’s message and inspire its communities to partner in striving toward an aspirational vision of the future on behalf of those the university serves.
President Green has made “telling our story” one of his top three priorities since assuming his position. He hired a chief marketing officer who already has taken steps to strengthen U of I’s communications and marketing capabilities and to maximize the impact of all communications and marketing. Given the timeline for public launch of the campaign, the new CMO and team will develop a robust campaign marketing and communications plan that advances strategic priorities toward an aspirational vision of the future.

The Campaign Working Group supports and recommends:

- **Engaging a visionary partner to help articulate an aspirational vision and pillars as part of the university’s brand framework.**
- **Developing message frameworks based on established college-level priorities.**
- **Defining a clear, organized process for announcing major gifts and leveraging fundraising successes to advance the university’s brand.**

### SECTION 3: CAMPAIGN OPERATIONS: INVESTING FOR SUCCESS

The University of Idaho’s comprehensive campaign is the most ambitious in the institution’s history and, as recommended by this Working Group, will launch publicly October 2021. The university has a working goal to raise $500 million for the students, faculty, programs, facilities, and research that serve as the University of Idaho’s foundation for excellence. This subcommittee evaluated the university’s prospective donor base and reviewed industry best practices to make prioritized recommendations for staffing and other resources needed to conduct a successful campaign.

**The Opportunity by the Numbers**

The University of Idaho has approximately 111,000 living alumni. The university’s statewide role with service to all 44 counties, plus the number of engaged individuals, corporations, and private foundations, expands the database to include nearly 500,000 records – each with some connection to U of I. To establish a strong, lasting culture of philanthropy, the campaign will focus on:

- Expanding systemic qualification, discovery, cultivation and solicitation efforts to build a robust pipeline for major, planned and principal gifts.
- Improving and expanding data analytics to personalize the donor experience and focus integrated marketing, communications, and engagement resources for fundraising success.
- Growing an actively involved Vandal community through strategic engagement activities with faculty, staff, alumni, friends, and corporate partners.
- Creating an excellent donor experience by enhancing timely stewardship and recognition and demonstrating the impact of philanthropic investments.

**Growing the Donor Base and Gift Pipeline**

The success of any multi-million-dollar campaign depends on qualifying, cultivating and securing major gifts (defined as $25,000 or more) from a pool of donors that grows smaller as the size of potential gifts increase. (See Appendix B.)

At present, 2,700 prospects are assigned to our 22 FTE frontline fundraisers. (That’s 123 assigned prospects per fundraiser portfolio.) However, the University of Idaho has 33,000 prospective donors rated to have the means to give a major gift, but who are currently not assigned to a development officer for engagement and cultivation.
Of those 33,000, more than 8,500 have a medium to high affinity for U of I with strong records of giving and engagement. A priority for the campaign will be strengthening relationships with these medium- and high-affinity individuals and organizations.

University Advancement has begun implementing cost-neutral strategies to optimize its workforce to focus on those relationships. These strategies are creating a solid foundation on which to grow fundraising capacity before and throughout the campaign.

To qualify, cultivate and solicit those additional 8,500 potential donors — while also advancing the 2,700 assigned prospective donors towards major planned and principal gifts — the university needs to invest additional resources in its fundraising program. (See Appendix C.)

By implementing a prioritized series of investments over time, U of I will significantly expand its capacity to reach many more prospective donors and secure many more resources for the university. These recommended investments will be described in the formal campaign plan.

These investments will produce a bold return on investment for U of I in terms of increased fundraising activity during the campaign and well after, providing the resources to meet university priorities and building an enduring culture of philanthropy throughout the Vandal Family.

**The Campaign Working Group supports and recommends phasing in additional investments in fundraising and support functions before the public launch and during the campaign.**

**SECTION 4: PHASED PUBLIC LAUNCH**

The traditional approach in higher education comprehensive campaigns is to launch the entire campaign at once, regardless of an institution’s unique challenges and opportunities. This “big bang” approach creates excitement initially, but typically results in a lull in activity and giving the following year.

Further, many institutions wait until the tail end of their campaigns to roll out student-success-focused messaging and fundraising priorities.

At the University of Idaho, students come first, always. With this perspective and relevant strategies from the private sector, leaders in Advancement and University Communications & Marketing have explored a strategic, smart and customized approach to launching U of I’s most ambitious, transformation campaign to date.

**A Purposeful, Phased Launch**

The University of Idaho is in a unique position to strengthen our commitment to students and the unparalleled experiences available to them.

A phased public rollout of the campaign (see Appendix D), beginning with a focus on students, will be a strategic advantage by ensuring opportunities for the next generation – something our donors and alumni tell us they are passionate about. A phased rollout will also enable the university to maintain momentum after the initial launch and take advantage of evolving reopening plans and increased travel activity, among other benefits.
The “Brave. Bold.” Campaign Phase 1

In October 2021, a student-focused campaign will launch, inviting alumni and donors to invest in scholarships, fellowships, experiential learning and more to benefit students in Idaho today and for generations to come.

This phase is designed to expand access to all of Idaho’s capable students who seek a college education. Expanded scholarships will attract and retain qualified students for whom a college education would otherwise be unaffordable.

It will also provide the resources to further enrich the student experience in areas such as undergraduate research and study abroad opportunities, which set the University of Idaho apart from its competitors and make our graduates highly sought-after in the workforce.

Throughout 2021-22, the university will continue to build up its industry relationships, galvanize campaign volunteers, define and refine a long-term shared vision and build anticipation for the next phase.

The “Unstoppable” Campaign Phase

In October 2022, the university will launch its vision – steeped in its land-grant roots and expanded to include emerging areas such as sustainability, information integrity, health and more. The vision statement will be crystal clear, helping to surface stories and opportunities to rally a variety of stakeholders around the difference U of I will make in Idaho and in the world as a result of the campaign.

Priorities for this phase will be established through focused conversations with academic leaders and a rigorous vetting process to ensure priorities are strategic, ambitious and achievable.

Both the “Brave and Bold” phase and the “Unstoppable” phase will run concurrently until the campaign goal of $500 million is reached, or possibly beyond.

The Campaign Working Group supports and recommends launching the campaign in two phases beginning with a focus on students, followed by a focus on academic priorities.
CONCLUSION

The University of Idaho is charged with a mission that is critical to the health and prosperity of the state: Enable students to confidently explore their dreams and reshape what’s possible, unlock the discoveries needed to make a difference for our state and world, and partner with statewide communities to improve the health, well-being and economic prosperity of all Idahoans.

By publicly launching a comprehensive fundraising campaign this fall, the University of Idaho will acquire the resources, partnerships and prominence necessary to achieve its long-term vision. In the process, U of I will create a lasting culture of philanthropy that generates ongoing financial resources for the university.

At the successful conclusion of the campaign, U of I will have redefined what it means to be a land-grant university in the 21st century, advancing our work in service to the citizens and industries of Idaho.

Summary of Campaign Working Group Recommendations

1. Launch the public phase of a comprehensive campaign in fall 2021.
2. Continue focused conversations with academic leaders to surface programmatic strengths and opportunities.
3. Complete a rigorous vetting process of academic and research priorities to help focus the campaign, guide the case for support and establish strategic priorities for the campaign and beyond.
4. Engage a visionary partner to help articulate an aspiration vision and pillars as part of the university’s brand framework.
5. Develop message frameworks based on established college-level priorities.
6. Define a clear, organized process for announcing major gifts and leverage fundraising successes to advance the university’s brand.
7. Make additional investments in prioritized fundraising and support functions before the public launch and during the campaign.
8. Launch the campaign in two phases beginning with a focus on students, followed by a focus on academic priorities.
APPENDIX A

Campaign Working Group Members

Chandra Zenner Ford, sponsor
Office of the President

Teresa Koeppel, co-chair
CMO, University Communications & Marketing

Mary Kay McFadden, co-chair
VP Advancement

University Representatives
Dennis Becker
Dean, College of Natural Resources

Toni Broyles
Office of the President

Randi Croyle
Director, Student Financial Aid Services

Joy Fisher
Executive Director, U of I Foundation

Bobbi Hughes
College of Engineering Development

Torrey Lawrence
Provost and EVP

Ben McLuen
AVP Development

Chris Nomura
VP, Research & Economic Development

Sean Quinlan
Dean, College of Letters, Arts & Social Sciences

Jen Root
College of Agricultural & Life Sciences Development

Jeff Seegmiller
Regional Dean, Idaho WWAMI Medical Program

External Representatives
Linda Davidson ‘73
U of I Foundation Board Director

Robert Furgason ‘56, ‘58, ’06 (HON)
Former Academic Vice President

Clint Marshall ‘97
Secretary, U of I Foundation Board

David Poe ‘70
Former U of I Foundation Board Director, Founding Member CLASS Advisory Board

Linda Copple Trout ’73, ‘77
Vice Chair, U of I Foundation Board
Analysis Summary:

- To the immediate left outside the pyramid is the number of current prospective donor by capacity. The bracketed number are currently under management. The middle pyramid is the donors needed at each individual gift level to successfully complete a $500 million campaign. On the outside right of the pyramid is the number of donors by giving band that have already contributed to the campaign.
- The opportunity is on the left outside of this pyramid. We currently have approximately 1,850 prospective donors under management with a current development officer. From a data perspective, that means there are 6,127 donors rated over $100,000 we know very little about. If you expand that down to those rated at our current major gift level of $25,000, that number jumps 33,775.
## University of Idaho Prospect Pyramid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>A&amp;A</th>
<th>ATH</th>
<th>CALS</th>
<th>CBE</th>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>CNR</th>
<th>EHHS</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>LAW</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>SCI</th>
<th>WWAMI</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$25,000,000 - $50,000,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000,000 - $24,999,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000,000 - $9,999,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500,000 - $4,999,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,000 - $2,499,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000 - $999,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000 - $499,999</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $249,999</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>1221</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>2065</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>9526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>2120</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>2111</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>2110</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>4328</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>17908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>923</td>
<td>4144</td>
<td>2805</td>
<td>2121</td>
<td>3782</td>
<td>1693</td>
<td>3409</td>
<td>3720</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>7736</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>33385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capacity by College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campaign Goal</th>
<th>$12,191,825*</th>
<th>$10,994,420*</th>
<th>$9,828,782*</th>
<th>$9,833,419*</th>
<th>$996,442*</th>
<th>$1,466,902*</th>
<th>$475,928*</th>
<th>$325,767*</th>
<th>$2,164,616*</th>
<th>$1,340,875*</th>
<th>$1,480,718*</th>
<th>$507,512,500*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Goal</td>
<td>$1,219,183*</td>
<td>$6,958,801*</td>
<td>$9,964,420*</td>
<td>$2,564,928*</td>
<td>$4,166,902*</td>
<td>$1,980,782*</td>
<td>$325,767*</td>
<td>$4,946,416*</td>
<td>$11,634,572*</td>
<td>$2,641,718*</td>
<td>$1,591,916*</td>
<td>$50,751,250*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Officers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*College goals calculated via prospect base capacity in combination with historical fundraising total trends

### Analysis Summary:

- Advancement has 18 major gift officers currently. This data-driven analysis highlights the need for 24 major gift officers during a $500 million campaign.
- Campaign-to-date: 7,382 unique prospects have been contacted by development officers out of a 33,385 total major gift prospect base.
- U of I major gifts officers raise on average $1.2 million each year. Six additional major gift officers would raise an additional $7.2 million annually.
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