2022 – 2023 Faculty Senate – Pending Approval
Meeting # 4
Tuesday, September 13, 2022, 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm
Zoom only

Present: Ahmadzadeh, Chapman (Vice Chair), Fairley, Fuerst, Gauthier, Haltinner, Hickman, Hoffmann, Hunter, Justwan, Kolok, Torrey Lawrence (w/o vote), Long, Mittelstaedt, Murphy, Pfeifer, Quinnett (Chair), Raney, Rinker, Roberson, Sammarruca (w/o vote), Schiele, Schwarzlaender, Silsby, Thorne, Tibble, Wargo, Walsh, Webb
Absent: Kindall

Guests/Speakers: Ann Abbott, Diane Kelly-Riley, Barb Kirchmeier, Brian Smentkowski

Call to Order: Chair Quinnett called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.

Approval of Minutes (vote):
Minutes of the 2022-23 Meeting #3 September 6, 2022 – Attach. #1
The cited date of September 1 for the opening of the Employee Training may not be accurate. If so, the correct date will be included in the Talking Points.
Secretary Sammarruca detected and will correct an error in the list of attending senators.

Chair’s Report:
• Chair Quinnett turned the floor over to Vice Chair Chapman regarding vacant senator seats at university-level committees and Paid Parental Leave (PPL).
  o The following committees have openings to be filled by senators: University Budget and Finance Committee (UBHC); Campus Planning Advisory Committee; Faculty and Staff Policy Group; Grievance Committee for Student Employees. Senators are encouraged to volunteer and seek interested faculty from their colleges. (Senator Long volunteered to take the open seat at UBFC. Thanks, Jerry!)
  o PPL: Vice Chair Chapman summarized the status of the PPL policy. The policy is currently with General Counsel with whom Brandi Terwilliger will meet on Friday to review. From there it will go to Vice President Foisy and then Diane Whitney, followed by reviews from all stakeholders and interested groups. At that point, it will be forwarded to Faculty Senate and Staff Council. The timeline is tight if the target date for implementation of January 1, 2023, is to be met.
• “Our Shared Success Stories” first honored Senator is Amin Ahmadzadeh, from Animal Veterinary and Food Sciences. Amin has a minute to share and then will pick the senator for next week. Amin’s position was established by Idaho legislators in 1999 for the purpose of developing a dairy science program. Like every success, it was a team effort. Currently, the dairy science program is nationally competitive – they won the first place five times, and twice the second place, in a national competition in dairy management where over 30 universities compete. The students in the program are very successful in the dairy industry. The next senator to share a success story will be Jerry Fairley.
• The concern raised at the last meeting about the fact that international travel insurance cannot be purchased via budgets has been sent to the Faculty and Staff Policy Group. The chair, Scott Nash, will take this on with the committee.
• Follow up to Dr. Freeman and Mr. Mario Pile’s visit. We are brainstorming on ways that units can require implicit bias training for hiring, 3rd year review, and T/P committees. Perhaps this can happen via unit bylaws or revising FSH 1620. Erin Chapman, Brian Smentkowski and Chair Quinnett are researching trainings to test and then make available to units. All this is in progress, and there is more to come.

• Update on the APM 30.16 implementation. FSL have tasked the ITS Committee to research this issue so that we can better understand all concerns. Eric Mittelstaedt and Jerry Fairley are helping with this. Eric has created questions to send out to constituents for polling.

• A survey shared by Vice President Dan Ewart on Nov 29, 2021, asking for feedback on ways that ITS could improve support, did not gather enough feedback. Vice President Ewart is already working on another survey with Institutional Research, which we he would send directly to us to share with our constituents. Addressing a question, Chair Quinnett clarified that the survey from IT and the one from Faculty Senate are two distinct surveys and the latter will originate from Senate.

• Senators will receive a link to the draft of the White Paper on Sustainability for discussion next Tuesday. Please read this in order to have a good discussion with the team, including President Green. Addressing a request from a senator, Chair provided some context for the White Paper, which is presently in the phase of collecting feedback. Provost Lawrence will address the question in the Provost’s report.

Provost’s Report:

Sustainability: Last Fall, the President assembled a large working group with broad participation (internal, external, faculty, staff, industry partners), led by Dennis Becker, Dean of the College of Natural Resources, and Lee Espey, Director of Finance and Administration. The paper is very broad and there will be a call for broad feedback. After changes and revisions, the group will finalize it and send it to Scott Green. In response to a question, Provost Lawrence said that there is no specific date yet for the start of recycling.

• Most recently, the Magic Valley Working Group (chaired by deans Parrella and Quinlan) was launched to explore possibilities for a property in the Twin Falls / Rupert area, originally part of the CAFÉ project.

• Concerns raised last week about students being dropped from classes for non-attendance: those individual circumstances have been clarified. The Registrar’s Office has added additional language to the directions on the webpage.

• U of I ranking by US News and World Reports is improving! We are number 176 nationally (from 179 last year) and number 26 in best value schools in the nation – number two in best value public universities and number one in the West. The university has also received recognition for working with veterans, social mobility, engineering, and business.

• The keynote address of the four-day event Remembering Hiroshima is Wednesday, September 14, at 4 p.m., International Ballroom, Pitman Center.

• Katy Benoit Campus Safety Awareness keynote address: Thursday, September 15, at 7 p.m., Pitman Center.

• Oktoberfest Tap the Keg event: Dan O’Brien Track and Field Complex, Friday, September 16, at 3:30 – 8:30 p.m.

• Saturday: First Home Game!

• UFM #1: Monday, September 19, in person. Zoom option available for off-campus participants. Reception will follow. Please remember to RSVP.
Other Policy Business:

- FSH 4990 Academic Regalia (vote) – Lindsey Brown, Attach. #2
  This is being removed from FSH because it is not a policy by the standards set in FSH 1460.
  Moved/seconded (Ahmadzadeh /Long) to approve this change.
  Vote: 22/22 in favor; 0/22 against. Motion passes.

- APM 45.02 Sponsored Projects Proposal Preparation and Authorization.
  Although APM policies are an informational item that do not require Senate approval, they typically come to Senate for feedback and discussion. Concerns were raised about the Limited Submissions section of the policy. FSL is reaching out to Sarah Martonick to talk about the senators’ concerns.

Other Announcements and Communications:

- Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Instructor Support Panel/Open Forum – Ann Abbott (Program Director, Mathematics & Statistical Science), Diane Kelly-Riley (Vice Provost for Faculty), Barb Kirchmeier (Senior Instructor, English), Brian Smentkowski (Director, Center for Excellence in Teaching & Learning).

  Barb and Ann shared their experience and challenges as non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty. Those include: a relatively low pay, roles which do not align with the prescriptions FSH 1565 D-1, concerns about being active in shared governance without protection from tenure. In some units, the number of instructors, senior instructors, and lecturers, is larger than what is allowed in FSH 1565. When moved from temporary lecturer to an instructor line, they were given no credit towards tenure and promotion from past services.

  Generally, the NTT panelists said they do not feel appropriately valued as members of the institution. For instance, even though qualified, they are not eligible to be on graduate committees. A panelist described the insecurity of being on a year-by-year contract, not knowing whether they will be teaching the curriculum they have worked hard to develop.

  Brian Smentkowski acknowledged with gratitude the invisible labor from our NTT faculty and instructors, which must be brought to the surface. When working with Ann, Barb, and other NTT faculty, he heard great ideas and innovation. Although most commonly associated with teaching and learning, CETL is a comprehensive faculty development and mentoring center. Brian proceeded to emphasize the paramount importance of mentoring in the context of these conversations. We need to work towards changing the culture – moving to a more inclusive language is an important part of the process. The stories shared by our colleagues are unsettling, but we must focus on the potential for action. Brian’s role includes helping people become better mentors. Engaging in relationships is key to meaningful mentoring. ‘Mentoring constellations’ and in-group support help create a sense of community and communicate effectively across differences. We must respect and support the diversity and accomplishments of all faculty, regardless of rank and position definitions in order to establish a broad academic community.

  Vice Provost for faculty Kelly-Riley started with a review of FSH 1565 D, https://www.uidaho.edu/governance/policy/policies/fsh/1/1565#d, where eight categories of faculty are listed, many of which are of NTT nature but all of which provide similar protection.
She noted that there are language issues in FSH, as some definitions are different than those adopted by most universities in the country. An example is FSH 1565 F, which defines adjunct and affiliate faculty. Temporary faculty (FSH 1565 G) have short-term appointments, typically renewable. This category is further subdivided in four groups. There is protection for all tenure-track and NTT faculty, see https://www.uidaho.edu/governance/policy/policies/fsh/3/3900.

The same notification timeline, when a position is not renewed, applies to all. NTT faculty play a significant role at the institution – delivering instruction, developing curriculum through service work, participating in extension or outreach programs, and more. We are trying to support all faculty, for instance through CETL. The U of I has an institutional subscription to Academic Impressions, an online platform that promotes professional development. Also, faculty who are not eligible for tenure may be eligible for promotion, a process through which their contribution is recognized, https://www.uidaho.edu/governance/policy/policies/fsh/3/3500.

**Discussion:**
Short-term appointments are problematic, especially for units who hire regularly on a short-term basis. Temporary instructors in between contracts lose access to all university systems and facilities as well as health insurance. About ten years ago policy changes were made to address multiple temporary appointments by allowing them for no more than three semesters.

A Senator brought up the need for more clarity in policy. If people are academically qualified to serve on a graduate committee, they should be allowed to. Regrouping categories of faculty as currently done in FSH does not differentiate by their degrees or academic credentials. Furthermore, some disciplines do not have a doctoral degree.

Vice Provost Kelly-Riley noted that positions are configured by a department or college based on their needs. The people who end up in those positions may have additional qualifications, but that doesn’t change the scope of the position. She agrees that better definitions/distinctions may be helpful.

Vice Chair Chapman: Faculty Senate supports fostering of a better sense of community for everyone.

**New Business:**
- A Senator pointed out that preferred names do not necessarily transfer from system to system and wondered whether this problem can be fixed. Registrar Lindsey Brown will look into it.

**Adjournment:**
The agenda being completed, Chair Quinnett adjourned the meeting at 5:05pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francesca Sammarruca
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate
University of Idaho  
2022 – 2023 Faculty Senate Agenda  
Meeting #4  

Tuesday, September 13, 2022, at 3:30 pm  
Zoom Only

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes (Vote)  
   • Minutes of the 2022-2023 Faculty Senate Meeting #3 September 6, 2022, Attach #1

III. Consent Agenda (Vote)  
   • Approval of University committee appointments

IV. Chair’s Report

V. Provost’s Report

VI. Other Policy Business  
   • FSH 4990 Academic Regalia (vote); Lindsey Brown Attach #2  
   • *APM 45.02 Sponsored Projects Proposal Preparation and Authorization Attach #3

VII. Other Announcements and Communications  
   • Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Instructor Support Panel/Open Forum – Ann Abbott (Program Director, Mathematics & Statistical Science), Diane Kelly-Riley (Vice Provost for Faculty), Barb Kirchmeier (Senior Instructor, English), Brian Smentkowski (Director, Center for Excellence in Teaching & Learning)

VIII. New Business

IX. Adjournment

Attachments:  
   • Attach #1: Mtg #3 Minutes  
   • Attach #2: FSH 4990  
   • Attach #3: APM 45.02

*Changes to the Administrative Procedures Manual (APM): Please forward any questions or comments directly to both the policy coordinator at ui-policy@uidaho.edu and to the policy originator (listed on the cover sheet) within five working days of the senate meeting at which the APM item is presented.
2022 – 2023 Faculty Senate – Pending Approval
Meeting # 3
Tuesday, September 6, 2022, 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm
Zoom only

Present: Ahmadzadeh, Chapman (Vice Chair), Dahlquist, Fairley, Feeney, Fuerst, Gauthier, Haltinner, Hickman, Hoffmann, Hunter, Justwan, Torrey Lawrence (w/o vote), Long, Mittelstaedt, Murphy, Pfeifer, Quinnett (Chair), Raney, Rinker, Roberson, Sammarruca (w/o vote), Schiele, Schwarzlaender, Silsby, Thorne, Wargo, Walsh
Absent: Kolok (excused), Dahlquist, Feeney

Guests: Brandi Terwilliger, Sydney Freeman, Jr., Mario Pile

Call to Order: Chair Quinnett called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.

Approval of Minutes (vote):
Minutes of the 2022-23 Meeting #2 May 3, 2022 – Attach. #1
The minutes of 2022-23 Meeting #2 were approved as distributed.
Minutes of the 2022-23 Meeting #1 April 26, 2022 – Attach. #2
The minutes of 2022-23 Meeting #1 were approved as distributed.
Minutes of the 2021-22 Meeting #28 April 26, 2022 – Attach. #3
The minutes of 2022-23 Meeting #28 were approved as distributed.

Consent Agenda:
- Sabbatical Leave Committee Recommendations – Attach #4
  There were no requests for discussion. The Sabbatical Leave Committee Recommendations were approved by unanimous consent.

Chair’s Report:
- Senators were invited to add preferred names and pronouns, if desired, and the college they represent.
- A new practice during 2022-23 Senate meetings called “Our shared success stories.” Every Tuesday, one senator will take 1 minute to share and celebrate a success story about themselves or other members of their department/college. Senator Amin Ahmadzadeh was asked to share at the next meeting. Perhaps people can take this practice to their programs or classes.
- 2022-23 Senate priorities: Kristin Haltinner kindly shared a very good list from CLASS which was discussed and prioritized at the recent Senate Retreat. The top priorities are: non-tenure-track faculty and instructor compensation and support; faculty retention and recruiting; faculty contracts, with a special focus on spread pay. More information will be brought to senate concerning plans for tackling some of these important needs/issues.
- The first university faculty meeting will take place on 9/19 at 3pm – International Ballroom, Pitman Center, and via zoom. A reception will follow at the Pitman Center.
- Updates on the Anti-Bullying Policy. This is still in its middle phase. Although it was noticed that the proposed policy is covered in FSH 3910,3920, 3940, there are gaps regarding a pathway for reporting. A vandal care report about an employee’s conduct could be a possible solution. More
to come on this from Vice Provost Kelly-Riley. Thanks to Kristin Haltinner for taking the lead on this important issue and its advocacy, and to Diane Kelly-Riley.

- **Annual Employee Training** – due November 18 – opened September 1. Graduate students need to complete the training as well.
- **Vice Chair Erin Chapman** was asked to provide updates on Paid Parental Leave (PPL), Student Feedback on Teaching Effectiveness (SFTE) – currently Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) – and more.
  - PPL is moving along. A draft from Brandi Terwilliger should be ready soon.
  - SFTE: Phase 1 is wrapping up – the policy and related forms are ready to go. The proposal encountered a hurdle with the new committee in FSH 1640 to handle faculty appeals regarding SFTE. More to come. Phase 2 will address how SFTE is used in promotion and tenure.
- The Department of Family and Consumer Science (FCS) is celebrating its 120th Anniversary with events on September 16 and 17. [https://www.uidaho.edu/cals/family-and-consumer-sciences/news/120-year](https://www.uidaho.edu/cals/family-and-consumer-sciences/news/120-year)
- The Women Center is celebrating its 50th anniversary! It is one of the oldest in the country that’s in existence. [https://www.uidaho.edu/womens-center/events/50th-anniversary](https://www.uidaho.edu/womens-center/events/50th-anniversary)
- In recognition of Suicide Awareness Day: *Every Brilliant Thing* in collaboration with the UI Recreation and Well Being, Sept 10, 7:30 in the Forge Theatre uidaho.edu/theatretix
- A Hiroshima survivor, author and activist is the keynote of a four-day event to better understand the broad implications of atomic warfare, hosted by the University of Idaho. [Remembering Hiroshima](https://www.uidaho.edu/law/news/upcoming-events/bellwood) is Monday to Thursday, Sept. 12-15, on the Moscow campus and features a variety of speakers and events, all free and open to the public.

**Provost’s Report:**
- Enrollment update: At the 10th day, numbers were up by 2.7% overall. This is great news.
- Financial health of the institution: See email from September 2 from President Green and Vice President Foisy.
- The legislature met on September 1 for a one-day special session. Nothing is certain at this point on how the extra funds will be allocated. Hundreds of million dollars will go towards education, with a large part to K-12. More information will come as it becomes available, but there won’t be much to report until the legislature meets again in January or February.
- Following up on an initial conversation at the Senate retreat, Provost Lawrence gathered some history on “spread pay.” More to come.

**Discussion:**
There was a brief follow-up discussion on the enrollment update. Provost Lawrence confirmed that the 2.7% increase is an overall increase compared to the same point in time last year. This number is likely to change quickly, especially when dual-credit data come in.

**Committee Reports:**
- FSH 6440 Persons with Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) (vote) – Brandi Terwilliger, Attach. #5
This proposal is part of a broader review of HR policies. External health consultant and our legal team have recommended to remove this policy. Like for any infectious disease, we will follow CDC guidelines. Our infectious disease response team is ready to act should this become a bigger issue. In summary, the recommendation is that the policy should be removed and handled more broadly.

Discussion:
In response to a question about procedures moving forward, Brandi reiterated that the university will follow the Health Department and CDC guidelines. Should there be an outbreak in this area, we will adopt the same processes as for any infectious disease.

Vote: 22/22 in favor; 0/22 against. Motion passes.

Other Announcements and Communications:
- Mario Pile, Director of the Black/African American Cultural Center, Office of Equity and Diversity.
  Mario gave a brief overview of his background and expertise. He then proceeded to talk about efforts and available resources directed at retention of Black and African American students, who drop at the alarming rate of 65% to 75%.
  Discussion:
  There was a question about the level of support provided by SEM. Mario noted that, at this time, he is the only one at the Center, thus collaboration is essential to his work. Mario reaches out to those students whose names he receives and tries to get them to visit the Center. When doing so, it is important to apply sensitivity.
  In response to a question, Mario clarified that, at this time, only undergraduate students are included in the population the Center hopes to reach out to, but that can evolve to include graduate students as well.
  Senators expressed appreciation for Mario’s work and look forward to collaborations to help create pathways for students to become acquainted with Mario’s role. Mario Pile can be contacted at mpile@uidaho.edu.

- Enabling Mid-Career Faculty to Thrive – Presentation by Sydney Freeman, Jr., Professor, College of Education, Health & Human Sciences, Attach #6
  After providing some information about himself and his professional background, Sidney proceeded to a presentation (slides attached to the Binder for this meeting) focused on mid-career faculty experience. He addressed the importance of equitable and just promotion policies and required bias training for promotion committees.
  Discussion:
  The follow-up discussion indicated support for Sydney’s ideas and the need to make some changes, including a mental shift, and required training for all evaluating committees. Provost Lawrence, although supportive of the idea, noted that it would be very hard to implement. Suggestion from the Secretary: perhaps these training sessions could be offered regularly so that faculty have some flexibility on when to take them. Certificates would be awarded to employees who have completed the training.

New Business:
• A senator heard that students were disenrolled in large enrollment courses by the Registrar for not attending, apparently without warning or notification. The Provost was not aware of this potential issue. Registrar Lindsey Brown noted that there is a policy that allows instructors to drop students for non-attendance within a specified time at the beginning of a semester. She is happy to address any problems which may arise.

• APM 30.16: On behalf of their constituents, a senator brought up the APM 30.16 Hardware Purchasing Policy recently communicated to all employees. Some faculty view it as a violation of the new SBOE policy on Academic Freedom. Another concern about the same policy is that the costs are not competitive. A senator reported that they could have purchased the same system for half the cost charged by IT. This is a significant budget hit.

• International Travel: Insurance coverage for international travel is recommended but it has to come out of the traveler's pocket. We should be allowed to use our budgets to cover this insurance.

Discussion on the above issues will continue.

Adjournment:
The agenda being completed, Chair Quinnett adjourned the meeting at 5:00pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francesca Sammarruca
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate
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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1. **Policy/Procedure Statement:** Briefly explain the reason for the proposed addition, revision, and/or deletion.

   Policy does not meet FSH 1460 criteria for university-wide policy. Content will be maintained on Academic Regalia Section of the Registrar’s website.

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.

   None.

4. **Effective Date:** This policy shall be effective on July 1, or January 1, whichever arrives first after final approval (see FSH 1460 H) unless otherwise specified.
A. ORIGIN. The colorful and distinctive garb conspicuous at commencement ceremonies had its origin in the High Middle Ages, 12th and 13th centuries, when the university itself came into being. The nascent universities grew up in the shadow of the church—they obtained papal charters, most of the knowledge they disseminated was theological or ecclesiastical, and their scholars and pupils were largely clerks, i.e., clerics or aspiring clerics. It should not be surprising, therefore, that the cap, gown, and hood grew out of the clerical dress of that period.

B. THE GOWN.

B-1. Standardization. Our academic gown can be traced back to the Council of Oxford in 1222. There Stephen Langton, perhaps England’s greatest medieval archbishop, decreed that all clergy within his jurisdiction should wear the *cappa clausa*, a closed, flowing gown then in lay fashion. He wanted to bring some conformity to the Province of Canterbury. Because Oxford and Cambridge were within the province, the clerks at both institutions complied with the decree. Over the years English clergy turned to other styles, but the clerks, compelled by stringent statutes, held to the *cappa clausa*, and it eventually became exclusively academic.

B-2. American Practice. The *cappa clausa*, only slightly modified, crossed the Atlantic with the colonists and served as the norm at Harvard, William and Mary, and all American colleges and universities founded in the two centuries thereafter. During the latter part of the 19th century, however, the styles of academic gowns proliferated, prompting representative trustees from interested institutions to convene in 1895 at Columbia University. They repeated the role of Archbishop Langton and issued formal standards that have stood with little change to the present.

B-3. The Intercollegiate Bureau’s Code. An outgrowth of the conference was the establishment of a body that, in 1902, came to be known as the Intercollegiate Bureau of Academic Costume. The bureau’s standards, somewhat revised with the cooperation of the American Council on Education in 1932 and subsequently, provided that all caps and gowns were black. The intercollegiate code also standardized, on the basis of practice at Oxford and Cambridge, the cut of the various kinds of gowns—bachelor’s, master’s, and doctor’s.

- A bachelor’s gown falls in a straight line and has full bias-cut, pointed sleeves.
- A master’s gown is similar to a bachelor’s, except that it has long closed sleeves with the opening at the wrist.
(the extended portions of the sleeves used to be handy receptacles for handkerchiefs, snacks, and the like). Until recently, the long sleeves on a master’s gown had the opening at the elbow.

e. A doctor’s gown has bell-shaped sleeves, velvet panels down the front and around the neck of the gown, and three velvet bars on each sleeve.

B. UNIQUE DOCTORAL GOWNS.

a. During its first century, UI followed the intercollegiate code exactly, but not all schools in the United States and Canada did so, particularly when it came to doctoral gowns. For instance, instead of black, the doctoral robe proper to the University of Chicago is maroon (with black velvet); Harvard’s is crimson (also with black velvet); Yale’s is blue; Princeton’s is black with orange; and those of Columbia and the University of British Columbia are different shades of light purple.

b. UI has adopted a doctoral gown of its own, which was worn for the first time at the centennial commencement (1989). It is silver, and the panels and sleeve bars are of black velvet outlined in antique gold.

C. THE CAP. In comparison to the gown, the mortarboard is relatively young. It descends from a favorite headdress of the medieval laity, the pileus, a close-fitting felt cap that was adopted by the Church in 1311 and became typical at the universities.

C-1. Two varieties of the pileus survive: Cambridge and Oxford versions. The Cambridge tradition results in a beret-like “softcap” that probably gives a better idea of the 14th-century pileus than its more common rival, the Oxford cap or mortarboard, notorious for its intractability in any kind of breeze.

C-2. Foreign universities, however, may sport even more exotic and less practical caps: a French graduate’s cap looks something like a chef’s hat, and in Spain a woman graduate wears headgear resembling a Tiffany lampshade, a blue satin bowl covered with tiny glass beads.

C-3. The Tassel. The intercollegiate code does not specify the position of the tassel fastened to the middle of the top the mortarboard. However, numerous institutions have adopted the practice, during commencement ceremonies, of having candidates for degrees wear the tassels on the right front side before degrees are conferred and shift them to the left at the moment when degrees are awarded to them. This custom is in some respects a substitute for individual hooding. At UI, candidates do not move their tassels from right to left in unison during the ceremony, but it is generally recognized here that degree recipients wear the tassel on the front left side after the degrees are conferred. The code specifies that the tassel is black or the color of the wearer’s branch of learning; a doctor’s tassel may have gold threads.

D. THE HOOD.

D-1. Style and Sizes. The most colorful and distinctive element of academic garb is the hood (see figure 1 on page 5). Another medieval relic, it descended from cowls worn by monks to ward off cold drafts in English monasteries. (They would, therefore, not be without use on occasion in northern Idaho.) The cowl, worn over a short cape or scarf, tippet, had a “tail,” liripipe. One pulled the hood over the head and then wrapped the tail around the neck to secure the hood. At some point the tippet and hood merged into a single unit while the liripipe evolved into the funnel-shaped ending of the hood. The shorter, three-foot bachelor’s hood is rarely seen today; master’s hoods are three and one-half feet; and doctoral hoods are four feet and have panels at the side.

D-2. Significance of Colors. The intercollegiate code provides that a hood should be lined with the official colors of the institution conferring the degree, and the lining is worn exposed; hence, UI hoods are lined with silver and gold. The same code provides that the hood should be trimmed—bound or edged—with the color indicating the branch of learning to which the degree pertains. The trim is two inches, three inches, and five inches wide for the bachelor’s, master’s, and doctor’s degrees, respectively. The colors associated with the different subjects are: Agriculture, Maize; Family and Consumer Sciences, Maroon; Architecture, Violet; Journalism, Crimson; Arts, Letters, Humanities, White; Law, Purple; Business, Drab; Library, Science, Lemon; Dentistry, Lilac; Medicine, Green;
E. THE MACE.

E-1. The mace in medieval times was a weapon, a heavy staff or club made wholly or partly from metal and used for breaking armor. Particularly in France in the 13th century when the king’s bodyguard carried it, the mace acquired a ceremonial function as a symbol of all kinds of secular authority.

E-2. The Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, the British Parliament, and many other governmental and academic bodies have ceremonial maces. In the U.S. Congress, its symbolism is strong enough that merely placing it in front of the offending member brings order to the chamber. It even worked in 1890 when a hotheaded representative from Georgia pulled a knife on a fellow congressman.

E-3. It is the custom at some universities for the mace bearer to lead the procession on ceremonial occasions. Where there is no such tradition, the mace—the ensign of authority—may be carried by the chief marshal, who organizes the procession; however, instead of the mace, the marshal customarily carries a baton.

E-4. UI’s mace, also used for the first time at the centennial commencement, is 32 inches long, made of walnut, and encircled with bands of Idaho gold and silver in which Idaho garnets and opals have been set. The head is embellished with silver and gold representations of camas plants and syringa flowers (see figure 2 on page 5). The chair of UI’s Faculty Senate, the marshal of the academic procession, carries the mace in the American tradition, at a 45-degree angle across the chest (in England the bearer carries it over the shoulder).

F. THE MEDALLION. UI’s medallion (see figure 3 on page 5) was created by Idaho artists George and Macky Roberts. Its base is a three-and-a-half-inch disc of pure Idaho silver. Mounted on the base is a disc of native jasper, and on that is a sterling silver sunburst. Inside the sunburst is a modification of the Chinese character meaning “mountain,” which features three upward-pointing prongs. Over the center prong is a gold inlay—thus symbolizing “Light on the Mountain.” The heavy medallion is worn suspended from a collar woven of Idaho wool, some of which is dyed with dahlia flowers to match the jasper and some of which is from a black sheep; between wearings it is kept in a cedar box. It was first used in 1965 at the inauguration of Ernest Hartung, UI’s 12th president, and is now a regular element of the president’s academic attire.

G. HONOR CORDS. Reminiscent of the cleric’s stole, UI students graduating with honors wear colored cords around the neck and hanging loosely down the front. The gold cord identifies those graduating summa cum laude (with highest distinction); silver, magna cum laude (with great distinction); and bronze, cum laude (with distinction). The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi provides these cords. Students wear honor cords only at the commencement at which the honors are awarded; the cords are not a permanent part of their academic regalia.

H. ACADEMIC COSTUME NOW WORN INFREQUENTLY.

H-1. In the United States before the Civil War, most professors and students wore caps and gowns daily to classes. In England, the faculty and students wore gowns until well after the Second World War. Faculty members in England still lecture in gowns, and students wear them for their final examinations and in certain other formal situations. In America, however, during the latter half of the 19th century, the custom of daily wear disappeared.

H-2. At the University of Idaho, with the exception of graduates being commissioned in the Armed Forces, participants in the procession at commencement wear academic garb. It is also de rigueur at presidential inaugurations and other ceremonial events. The centuries-old pageantry and the display of these ancient and colorful symbols make us aware of the heritage this university shares with its sister institutions and of UI’s common bond with them—dedication to freedom of inquiry and to exploring and expanding the frontiers of knowledge.
Amended August 2010. Updated language, other minor editorial changes.
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1. **Policy/Procedure Statement**: Briefly explain the reason for the proposed addition, revision, and/or deletion.
   Updated references for our modified ERA systems (EIPRS to VERAS and Cayuse to VERAS) and added limited submission competition information from Research and Faculty Development team. Comprehensive policy review.

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.
   None – this is the only UI policy on proposal submission.

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.
A. Purpose. The purpose of this policy is to ensure the orderly administration of sponsored project proposals and compliance with applicable laws and regulations. The policy contains the procedure applicable to sponsored project proposals.

B. Scope. This policy applies to all UI employees anyone submitting sponsored project proposals that would be awarded to the university if funded.

AC. Definitions

AC-1. Principal Investigator. The person taking primary responsibility and oversight of a sponsored project is known as the Principal Investigator (PI). Before submitting a proposal or accepting an award, the PI should review the Roles and Responsibilities Page for an understanding of the responsibilities associated with being a PI. (See APM 45.22 for University eligibility requirements for Principal Investigators.)

AC-2. Grant Administrator (GA). Each unit has a person designated as a grant administrator, who may also work with the PI on proposal preparation. In particular, a GA often assists PIs with the preparation of salary and fringe benefit calculations, and determining budget estimates.

BD. Policy. A sponsored project proposal is a written presentation of the research, scholarly or creative activity proposed to be accomplished during a given time period and that is being requested to be potentially funded by an entity external to the University of Idaho (the sponsor). At a minimum, a proposal should include an outline of the scope of work to be performed or the tasks to be accomplished, and a budget breakdown explaining how the requested funding will be spent towards accomplishing the scope of work. The Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP), or her/his designated representative, is the only person authorized to accept external funding on behalf of the University, and is also the final approver prior to submission of the proposal to the sponsor.

BD-1. Authorized Organizational Representatives and Signatures Approvals Required. All personnel associated with specific grants, contracts and agreements to the University of Idaho need to have an understanding of their respective roles and responsibilities. Before submitting a proposal or accepting an award, please review the Roles and Responsibilities Page and contact OSP if you have questions about any of the items listed. All proposals shall be reviewed and approved in the University of Idaho Electronic Research Administration (ERA) system by the unit administrator, college dean, and Director of OSP prior to submission to the sponsoring agency.

CE. Processes and Procedures.

CE-1. Funding Opportunities. The Research and Faculty Development (RFD) team helps University of Idaho faculty find funding for their research and scholarly activities. RFD provides resources and services to find and enhance the competitiveness of proposals across all disciplines. Web links to funding opportunities may be found at the Office of Research and Economic Development (ORED) website. Additional assistance may be found on the OSP website in the FAQ page links found under the “Submit a Proposal” tab. Granting agencies usually have specific grant application instructions, identifying required information and/or application formats to be used. Such instructions may be labeled as Request for Proposal (RFP), Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA), Broad Agency Announcement (BAA), Request for Quote (RFQ), or Grant Proposal Guide (GPG), etc.
CE-1.a. Limited Submissions. For some funding opportunities, the funding agency restricts the number of applications an institution is allowed to submit. These are referred to as limited submission (LS) funding opportunities. The Research and Faculty Development (RFD) LS team has established processes for selecting the proposal(s) that will be submitted by the University of Idaho in response to these opportunities. The process typically includes a two-step submission process to the RFD team, as follows: The first step is for a PI to submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) to indicate interest in the program, followed by the submission of a Concept Paper, which will undergo internal review when the number of NOIs exceeds the number of submissions allowed by the sponsor or to enhance proposal competitiveness for strategic funding opportunities. The internal review committee will be comprised of faculty, administrators, and/or staff, as appropriate, who are familiar with the sponsor or the LS program. PIs will then be notified of the outcome of this internal review process, and whether or not they have been awarded the approval to submit a full proposal to the external sponsor. Once approved to move forward, LS submissions are prepared, approved, and submitted through VERAS as per the Proposal Preparation guidance below.

CE-2. Proposal Preparation. Once a funding source has been identified, the PI prepares a proposal (following specific sponsor guidelines, if provided) in the University’s Electronic Research Administration (eERA) system. The PI develops a scope of work, a budget sufficient to accomplish the proposed work, and a budget narrative. Additional items to be considered during proposal development may include:

- The involvement of human subjects or experimental animals (see FSH 5200 and FSH 1640.54, APM 45.01)
- The use of biohazards/recombinant DNA/radiation/select agents/toxins (see FSH 1640.14, APM 35.11)
- Conflict of interest and financial disclosure (see FSH 6240, 5600, and 3170)
- Cost share/matching (see APM 45.08)
- Foreign researchers and consultants (see APM 45.18)
- Export controls (see APM 45.19)
- Intellectual property (see FSH 5300 & FSH 5400)
- Program income (see APM 45.13)
- Publication restrictions
- Capital projects

Information concerning these topics and links to other useful sites may be found on the OSP Website. Note that some sub-sets of pre-proposals (white paper, preliminary proposal, etc.) may also require input to the eERA system for review and approval.
**CE-3. Budget Development** The PI creates a list of the personnel, equipment, travel, subcontract, participant support and other direct cost needs for the entire project, including costs to be covered by mandatory cost share and any anticipated program income, e.g., conference fees revenue. Appropriate facilities and administrative (F&A) costs (see FSH 5100 J and APM 45.10) are then added to arrive at the total project costs. OSP has developed a budget template with built-in calculations to assist the PI that can be found at [www.uidaho.edu/research/faculty/resourcesosp/forms](http://www.uidaho.edu/research/faculty/resourcesosp/forms).

**CE-4. Facilities and Administrative (F&A) Costs** The University negotiates different rates for F&A cost reimbursement based on a variety of factors including, but not limited to, whether the sponsoring agency is a Federal agency, the type of work being done (research, instruction, public service/outreach/other), the location of the work being performed (at on- or off-campus facilities), and whether the sponsor is an industry partner (the university cannot accept limited rates from industry partners). The federal government and the University negotiate different rates for F&A cost reimbursement based on both the type of work being done (research, instruction, public service/outreach/other) and where the majority of the work is being performed (at on- or off-campus facilities), as well as the type of sponsor (the university cannot accept limited rates from industry partners). Limitations imposed by the sponsoring agency to established F&A rates must be part of their published policy and provided in writing prior to proposal submission (see FSH 5100 J-1).

If no formal sponsor policy exists, only the Vice President for Research and Economic Development (VPRED), or his or her delegate, may grant a waiver for a reduction in the F&A rate charged. Information concerning F&A costs and links to other useful sites including current F&A rates can be found in the Indirect (F&A) Costs FAQ, APM 45.10, and FSH 5100.

**CE-5. Cost Sharing** When the University bears a portion of the cost of a sponsored project, it is considered cost sharing or matching. These costs must be included in the budget development process. Cost sharing may be mandatory (required by the sponsor) or voluntary (where no such requirement exists). Because cost sharing has programmatic, administrative, and financial consequences for the University, it is typically not allowed unless required by the sponsor. Special circumstances may exist in which a waiver may be obtained from the VPRED (or his/her delegate). See APM 45.08 and the Proposal Considerations FAQ for more information.

**CE-6. Electronic Proposal** OSP has entered into an agreement for the use of Cayuse424 proposal development software, which a PI may use to download and develop most Grants.gov and NSF Fastlane proposal opportunities. This system-to-system submission portal greatly reduces the chance of Grants.gov proposals being rejected due to missing information, forms, or fields. A link to Cayuse424, as well as instructions and training, can be found off the OSP home page and/or at [www.uidaho.edu/osp/training](http://www.uidaho.edu/osp/training).

**CE-67. Electronic Internal Proposal Routing System (EIPRS/VERAS)** All proposals must be reviewed and approved at a minimum by the PI’s unit administrator, college dean, and OSP prior to submission to the agency. The University’s electronic routing system for approvals, EIPRS/VERAS, allows the PI to provide all of the documentation necessary for review by the appropriate University personnel. The EIPRS-VERAS login link can be found on the OSP home page. An OSP Sponsored Programs Administrator (SPA) can assist with general questions, or FAQs and a link to training can be found on the OSP website. All proposals must be present in the eERA system and any agency submission portal (when applicable) and in final form at least four full business days prior to the submission deadline. See the OSP website for details.
**Proposal Submission**

If a proposal is being mailed, emailed, or transmitted to the agency in a manner that does not require a secure login from an Authorized Organizational Representative, it is considered a hardcopy submission and proposal submission is the responsibility of the PI after all necessary approvals have been obtained.

For proposals submitted through an external electronic system, such as NSF FastLane, Research.gov, eRA Commons, or NASA NSPIRES, etc., the PI is responsible for uploading proposal materials for OSP review. The PI is also responsible for completing and uploading any attachments to Grants.gov files (including Cayuse424) in VERAS. Once all files have been uploaded, the information in EPRS-VERAS is complete, and all internal approvals have been received, the PI works with an SPA for final submission to the sponsor. OSP is responsible for final submission of proposals that require an Authorized Organizational Representative login. See the Completing Proposal FAQ on the OSP website for further information.

**Contact Information**

For information and help in preparing and submitting proposals to external funding agencies please contact the Office of Sponsored Programs at 208-885-6651, or osp@uidaho.edu, or http://www.uidaho.edu/osp.