Present: Chapman (Vice Chair), Fairley, Fuerst, Gauthier, Haltinner, Hickman, Hoffmann, Hunter, Justwan, Kindall (absent), Kolok, Long, Torrey Lawrence (w/o vote), Mittelstaedt, Murphy, Quinnett (Chair), Raney, Rinker, Roberson, Sammarruca (w/o vote), Schiele, Schwarzlaender, Silsby, Walsh
Absent: Wargo (excused), Ahmadzadeh (excused), Tibbals (excused), Pfeifer (excused), Thorne (excused), Webb.
Also present: Pedram Rezamand (proxy for Ahmadzadeh)

Guests/Speakers: Shauna Corry, Omni Francetich

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

Approval of Minutes (vote):
Minutes of the 2022-23 Meeting #14 November 29, 2022 – Attach. #1
The minutes of the 2022-23 Meeting #14 November 29, 2022 were approved as distributed.

Chair’s Report:
- Giving Tree: the Recreation and Wellbeing giving tree will have tags for gift items to local children. You can help by taking a tag from the tree and bringing back your gift to the SRC Information Desk by the morning of Friday, Dec. 9. Contact Kristin Strong at 208-885-9747 or kstrong@uidaho.edu
- As of 1/1/23, University of Idaho will have a new Workers Compensation service provider, Corvel. Effective 1/1/23, employees can report work injuries or incidents through a 24/7 reporting line: 844.213.2099.
- Last speaker of the Black Lives Matter Speaker Series: Nisha Newton, December 7 at 12:30pm. Webinar registration link: https://tinyurl.com/BLSSNN
- Update from the “Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Support” taskforce: the committee is gathering specific policy concerns and developing a climate survey to be launched in January.
- Update on “Spread Pay.” Kelly, Erin, and Francesca have been meeting weekly with Brian Foisy. Deb and Kristin are working on a survey to faculty. The goal is to develop a proposal for a spread pay implementation plan to present to President Green. Target date for implementation is July 2024.
- Chair Quinnett and Vice Chair Chapman expressed deep appreciation to all for their work, support, and strength under unimaginable circumstances.

Committee Reports (vote):
- UCC 70: Department of Architecture – Shauna Corry, Dean, College of Art and Architecture. Attach. #2
  CAA proposes restructuring from the existing one-department model to a three-department model. Objectives: greater efficiency within the university system; more leadership opportunities untenured faculty; CAA budget reduction (reducing total leadership costs by $10,708). UCC 70 is the development of the Department of Architecture.
• UCC 71: Department of Art and Design – Shauna Corry, Dean, College of Art and Architecture. Attach. #3
  This is to develop the Department of Art and Design. Goals as stated above for UCC 70.
• UCC 72: Change the name of the Department of Art and Architecture to the Department of Environment and Design – Shauna Corry, Dean, College of Art and Architecture. Attach. #4
  Following the CAA organizational structural change from a one-department (five program) model to a three-department model, this proposal is to change the name of the one department from Art and Architecture to Department of Environment and Design consisting of three programs.

Vote (on UCC 70, 71, 72 as a group): 20/21 in favor; 1/21 against. Motion passes.

Provost Report:
• Commencement: Saturday, December 10, in the ICCU arena, 9:30 am and 2:00 pm.
• Spring 2023 instruction: Discussions are going on about spring options, ranging from extreme flexibility to making no changes. Those discussions seem to converge to the same conclusion: accommodate the students who will not return to campus by proactively adding remote sections, if feasible.

Discussion:
  Points of discussion among Senators, the Provost, and the Dean of Students included:
  o Student reactions have been very different in different units and colleges. In some classes, nearly everyone chose not to return after the tragedy; in others, almost everyone stayed. Things could be similar in January, but the time element is unpredictable.
  o Some Senators reported that, after they provided a zoom link to a few students who didn’t return, almost everyone else was on Zoom, even if they were in town. This creates problems.
  o How to best serve the needs of our students in times of disruption? Some think that allowing students to stay home when and for how long they choose is not in their best interest, not only academically but also for the healing process.
  o Spring policy has to be clear, for faculty and for students. There should be a clear process that cannot be misinterpreted and thus misused, accidentally or unintentionally.
  o The WWAMI program may not be able to offer flexible options. Clinical learning experience cannot be delivered remotely.
  o Our university is known for hands-on experiential learning. Online learning can be a great experience if the class is designed for that purpose.
  o For classes that cannot be offered online (studio, lab, clinical, etc.) most people are leaning towards a case-by-case flexibility. Students should not be allowed to jump back and forth between options.
  o A senator inquired whether the web fee will be suspended. The Provost recommends making no changes, to avoid complications. Web fees are another reason to have clear options while sticking with one of several choices.
  o There is concern about the clarity of the outgoing communication and the potential to create mass confusion. There should be some kind of centralized process. The Provost agrees: students will be directed to their instructor to work out a solution on a case-by-case
basis. The standard and first option is the class offered as in the catalog. If a student needs to be remote, they should follow a process to be clarified beforehand.

- Some senators inquired about parents’ feedback. Dean of Students Blain Eckles responded that they haven’t heard much recently, although some parents said they hope the university remains open.

Other Policy Business (non-voting items):

- *APM 90.38 ID cards for Non-UI Affiliates. Attach. #5
- *APM 90.40 UI Business Technology Incubator. Attach. #6

Other Announcements and Communications:

- Staff Compensation Committee (SCC) Recommendation – Omni Francetich, Chair of Staff Compensation Committee and Office Manager, UI Women’s Center. Attach. #7
  Omni provided some background on the history of the SCC. She then presented the recommendations on the distribution of the CEC, which were unanimously voted by the committee on November 9, 2022. The SCC asks for Senate support of their recommendations, which are detailed in Attach. #7. They also suggest the creation of a faculty compensation committee to work together with SCC on issues of common concern. A single compensation committee for employees would be inefficient.

  Faculty Senate supports continuing conversations with the Staff Compensation Committee concerning their CEC allocation recommendations. No formal action was taken.

Adjournment:
Chair Quinnett called for a motion to adjourn. So moved and seconded (Chapman, Fairley). Meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

Meeting # 15

Tuesday, December 6, 2022 at 3:30 pm
Zoom Only

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes (Vote)
   • Minutes of the 2022-2023 Faculty Senate Meeting #14 (November 29, 2022) Attach. #1

III. Chair’s Report
   • Giving Tree

IV. Committee Reports
   • University Curriculum Committee (Vote)
     o UCC 70: Department of Architecture – Shauna Corry, Dean, College of Art and Architecture Attach. #2
     o UCC 71: Department of Art and Design – Shauna Corry, Dean, College of Art and Architecture Attach. #3
     o UCC 72: Change the name of the Department of Art and Architecture to the Department of Design – Shauna Corry, Dean, College of Art and Architecture Attach. #4

V. Provost’s Report

VI. Other Policy Business
   • *APM 90.38 ID cards for Non-UI Affiliates Attach. #5
   • *APM 90.40 UI Business Technology Incubator Attach. #6

VII. Other Announcements and Communications
   • Staff Compensation Committee Recommendation – Omni Francetich, Chair of Staff Compensation Committee and Office Manager, UI Women’s Center Attach. #7

VIII. New Business

IX. Adjournment

Attachments:

   • Attach. #1 Minutes of the 2022-2023 Faculty Senate Meeting #14 (November 29, 2022)
   • Attach. #2 UCC 70
   • Attach. #3 UCC 71
   • Attach. #4 UCC 72
   • Attach. #5 APM 90.38
   • Attach. #6 APM 90.40
   • Attach. #7 Staff Compensation Committee Recommendation

*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 # 14
Tuesday, November 29, 2022, 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm
Zoom only

Present: Chapman (Vice Chair), Fairley, Haltinner, Hickman, Hoffmann, Hunter, Justwan, Kindall, Kolok, Long, Mittelstaedt, Murphy, Pfeifer, Quinnett (Chair), Raney, Rinker, Roberson, Sammarruca (w/o vote), Schiele, Schwarzlaender, Silsby, Thorne, Tibbals, Webb
Absent: Ahmadzadeh (excused), Fuerst, Gauthier, Kindall, Walsh, Wargo
Also present: Matt Powell (proxy for Ahmadzadeh)

Guests/Speakers: John Shovic, Alistair Smith, Brian Smentkowski

Call to Order: Chair Quinnett called the meeting to order at 3:32 pm.

Chair Quinnett asked for a moment of silence to honor the memory of Ethan Chapin, Kaylee Goncalves, Xana Kernodle, and Madison Mogen, who tragically lost their lives on November 13.

Approval of Minutes (vote):
Minutes of the 2022-23 Meeting #12 November 8, 2022 – Attach. #1
The minutes of the 2022-23 Meeting #12 November 8, 2022, were approved as distributed.

Chair’s Report:
• Our shared success stories: moved to a later date.
• The candlelight vigil to honor the lives of Ethan Chapin, Kaylee Goncalves, Xana Kernodle, and Madison Mogen will take place Wednesday, November 30, 5pm (PST) at the Kibbie Dome.

Committee Reports (vote):
  Recipients of this certificate will have a deep understanding of the Robotics stack from the lower-level motors and controllers, through PLC controllers and into higher level cognitive processes including using modern artificial intelligence techniques.
  Vote: 23/23 in favor. Motion passes.
• UCC 471: Graduate Certificate in Climate Change – Alistair Smith, Department Chair, Earth and Spatial Sciences, Attach. #3
  The department has always provided leadership at the University of Idaho in climate change, particularly through the existing climate change undergraduate academic certificate. This proposal is to meet the needs of graduate students who, over the years, have expressed growing interest in a graduate version of the certificate.
  Vote: 22/22 in favor. Motion passes.
• UCC 474: M.S. Geographic Information Science – Alistair Smith, Department Chair, Earth and Spatial Sciences, Attach. #4
  Across the State of Idaho, demand has increased for advanced workforce skills in the spatial analysis of decision support data, as well as the acquisition and processing of new forms of sensors and data from drones and other sensor data. There is a clear need that is aligned with
and critical to the land grant mission of the University of Idaho. To meet the demands of a dynamic and mobile State of Idaho workforce, we propose to offer two options for this degree: 1) an online M.S. non-thesis degree targeted at existing employees of state agencies and industries, where they can learn addition skills while remaining at their employment locations, and 2) as an on-campus M.S. thesis degree targeted at not-yet employed persons who are seeking competitive advantages prior to entering the workforce or are seeking retraining to change careers.

Vote: 21/21 in favor. Motion passes.

- **UCC 475: Earth and Spatial Sciences (BS)** – Alistair, Department Chair, Earth and Spatial Sciences, Attach. #5
  The main reason for this change is consistency with the recent change of the department name.
  Vote: 22/22 in favor. Motion passes.
- **UCC 476: Environmental Hydrogeology Academic Certificate** – Alistair Smith, Department Chair, Earth and Spatial Sciences, Attach. #6
  This was an option for the Geological Sciences degree. With the merging of Geological Sciences with the Department of Geography, we have combined our undergraduate majors and have decided that this would be best offered as a certificate instead of an option.
  Vote: 21/21 in favor. Motion passes.

Other Policy Business (non-voting items):
- ***APM 01.01 Office of General Counsel, Attach. #7**
  This policy outlines the function and authority of the office of General Counsel.

Other Announcements and Communications:
- **Guide to Teaching and Learning in Times of Crisis** – Brian Smentkowski, Director, Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, Attach. #8
  Brian Smentkowski went over the guidance document in Attach. #8, which offers suggestions for teaching and learning strategies in times of crisis. The document also contains information on additional resources for students and faculty.
  Please see attachment #8 in this meeting binder and visit:

Provost’s Report:
- **Brief overview of where we are and what is ahead concerning the tragedy:**
  - We meet with law enforcement twice per day. After the vigil, we may shift to once a day, to be respectful of their time. The Moscow Police Department, with the assistance of FBI investigators and Idaho State Patrol, oversees the investigation.
  - We have held three press conferences so far. They can be viewed at the university YouTube webpage.
  - There will be increased security presence on campus for the foreseeable future. Some are campus security officers, others from security companies which we have contracted, such as Hells Canyon Security. Additional officers from Idaho State Patrol have been assigned to campus. Safe Walk and Safe Ride programs are available.
  - Academics through the end of the semester: Everyone’s efforts to remain flexible is appreciated by students and families. Many thanks to Brian Smentkowski and the CETL team for their work in helping us manage this terrible situation.
No plans for the spring semester have been made yet. Senators are encouraged to share feedback and ideas. The provost will meet the deans on Monday to discuss options. The goal is to have a plan before the winter break.

Commencement: two smaller ceremonies, in the secure environment of the ICCU Arena, will take place as planned. We will remember the victims and then proceed to celebrate our December graduates.

Media presence is likely to increase. Some members of the press are being quite persistent in asking for interviews. If you do not wish to be interviewed, say so firmly. If you feel uncomfortable, security is there to help. If you do talk to the press, make sure you are talking as a private individual and not as a representative of the university.

Accuracy of information: few details have been made available, in order not to compromise an active investigation. Unfortunately, this prompted some people/groups, such as social media, to speculate. Please ignore speculations and stop them if you have the opportunity.

Messages of support and sympathy continue to come.

At tonight’s vigil, members of the victims’ families may be present. We expect considerable presence from the Moscow community.

Discussion:
The was a brief follow-up on the additional security presence on campus. It was clarified that security people wear uniforms and Safe Ride vehicles are branded.

Dean Blaine Eckles had words of appreciation for all faculty who are working hard to meet the needs of our students and help them find a path forward.

A Senator noted that, when opening a web browser with a classroom computer, the page that shows up has local news with photos of the four students who lost their lives. Provost Lawrence agreed that this is a concern and will contact OIT immediately.

Some Senators expressed gratitude to Blaine Eckles, Torrey Lawrence and everyone who is managing the situation and representing the university in the aftermath of this terrible tragedy. Provost Lawrence acknowledged Blaine Eckles and his team for their amazing work, which includes the heart-wrenching task of talking to the families of victims as well as their Greek chapters. Chair Quinnett joined those Senators in expressing deepest appreciation.

New Business:
There was none.

Adjournment:
The agenda being completed, Chair Quinnett adjourned the meeting at 4:30pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francesca Sammarruca
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate
70: DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE

In Workflow
1. 09 Curriculum Committee Chair (stacyi@uidaho.edu)
2. Registrar's Office (none)
3. Provost's Office (kudas@uidaho.edu; mstout@uidaho.edu; jvalkovic@uidaho.edu; gwen@uidaho.edu)
4. SEM Review (dkahler@uidaho.edu)
5. Ready for UCC (disable)
6. UCC (none)
7. Faculty Senate Chair (mstout@uidaho.edu; jvalkovic@uidaho.edu; cari@uidaho.edu)
8. Provost's Office (kudas@uidaho.edu; mstout@uidaho.edu; jvalkovic@uidaho.edu; gwen@uidaho.edu)
9. State Approval (mstout@uidaho.edu; jvalkovic@uidaho.edu; lindalundgren@uidaho.edu)
10. NWCCU (sara@uidaho.edu; mstout@uidaho.edu)
11. Catalog Update (sstubbs@uidaho.edu)

Approval Path
1. Tue, 18 Oct 2022 17:12:09 GMT
   Stacy Isenbarger (stacyi): Approved for 09 Curriculum Committee Chair
2. Tue, 18 Oct 2022 17:16:59 GMT
   Steve Stubbs (sstubbs): Approved for Registrar's Office
3. Tue, 18 Oct 2022 22:20:22 GMT
   Gwen Gorzelsky (gwen): Approved for Provost's Office
   Dean Kahler (dkahler): Approved for SEM Review
5. Wed, 02 Nov 2022 17:49:00 GMT
   Theodore Unzicker (tunzicker): Approved for Ready for UCC
6. Tue, 08 Nov 2022 22:54:30 GMT
   Theodore Unzicker (tunzicker): Approved for UCC

New Proposal
Date Submitted: Fri, 07 Oct 2022 06:21:38 GMT
Viewing: Department of Architecture
Last edit: Tue, 08 Nov 2022 22:54:26 GMT
Changes proposed by: Shauna Corry

Faculty Contact
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Name</th>
<th>Faculty Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shauna Corry</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scorry@uidaho.edu">scorry@uidaho.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Request Type
Add/Drop a Department/School/Unit/College

Effective Catalog Year
2023-2024

Title
Department of Architecture

Request Details
CAA proposes restructuring from the existing one department model to a three-department model. This information is to develop the Department of Architecture.

Attach State Form
CAA Restructure Instructional_Administrative_Unit-Form Architecture FINAL Oct 6 22.doc

Supporting Documents
CAA Restructure Faculty List With Courses FINAL OCT 6 22.xlsx
CAA Org Chart Fall 2022 FINAL.pdf
CAAOrgChart_New3DepartmentStructure_OCT_14_2022.pdf
CAA Restructure Faculty Participation Information Final.docx
Reviewer Comments

Theodore Unzicker (tunzicker) (Tue, 08 Nov 2022 22:54:26 GMT): Per UCC, proposal shouldn't be forwarded to Faculty Senate until final names are determined.

Key: 70
# PROPOSAL FORM

**Instructional and Administrative Units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Proposal Submission:</th>
<th>February 16, 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution Submitting Proposal:</td>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of College, School, or Division:</td>
<td>College of Art and Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Department(s) or Area(s):</td>
<td>Architecture Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Proposed Unit</td>
<td>Department of Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Implementation Date:</td>
<td>July 1, 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicate whether this request is either of the following:**

- [X] New Administrative Unit
- [ ] New Instructional Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Dean</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Research (as applicable)</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Dean (as applicable)</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSBE Program Manager/IDCTE Director, Program Services</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FVP/Chief Fiscal Officer</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Administrator, IDCTE</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost/VP for Instruction</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Financial Officer, OSBE</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Academic Officer, OSBE</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SBOE/Executive Director or Designee Approval | Date

---

Page 1

Revised November 24, 2021
1. What are the goals and objectives for the new unit?

The College of Art and Architecture (CAA) has a unique organizational structure within the context of the University: it is composed of one department (Department of Art and Architecture) that includes five programs (Architecture, Art + Design, Interior Architecture and Design, Landscape Architecture, and Virtual Technology and Design). This organization was implemented in 2012 to encourage collaboration and integration; however, this structure has not been efficient for important University procedures and processes, such as those initiated by the Registrar’s Office, Enrollment Management, the Provost’s Office, and Institutional Assessment. In order to address these inefficiencies and initiate a governance structure that dovetails with the University structure overall (aligning the units of CAA with the rest of the units across campus) and to address the budget reduction implemented in 2020, CAA proposes restructuring from one broad department (Department of Art and Architecture) into three focused departments.

Proposed Structure:
1. Department of Art and Architecture (existing, name change submitted)
2. Department of Architecture (new department)
   Architecture program
3. Department of Art + Design (new department)
   Art + Design program

In addition to increasing alignment and efficiency with university and college processes additional goals for the restructuring include: 1) relieve faculty from small units (3 and 5 persons) from numerous service commitments and allow an increased focus on teaching and scholarship, 2) increase leadership opportunities within programs and departments, and 3) reduce administrative costs (the five-program model was supported with five program head stipends equivalent to department chair stipends).

The three-department model requires three department chair stipends along with two modest program director stipends resulting in a savings of approximately $10,708 (from the original stipend of 15% of base salary per program head for a total of $61,292 in FY 2021. The savings amount is factored on the current base salary plus a 15% administrative stipend, which would be $65,708). Our new three-department model will cost an estimated $55,000.

This proposal is to create the Department of Architecture. The department will have 12 faculty (11 instructional and 1 research scientist). Administrative support is centrally provided by the college office.

Objectives are:
1. Greater efficiencies within the university system. Currently as one large department, university systems including Banner do not always acknowledge individual programs and data is not readily available. An attempt was made over three years ago to address this issue with various administrative offices on campus including the Registrar’s and Institutional Assessment. However, with the current operating systems it was not feasible to support CAA’s unique
2. With smaller faculty size leadership opportunities are limited to tenured faculty, and this change allows for a tenured faculty member to serve as a Department Chair (taking on the responsibility of university processes including Promotion and Tenure and Annual Evaluations) while an untenured faculty may serve as a Program Director and focus on curriculum design, content, and accreditation requirements.

3. Support CAA budget reduction (reducing total leadership costs by $10,708).

2. What is the relationship of the unit to the university’s mission and priorities? Is the unit involved in instruction and if so, to what extent?

Architecture is cited as a land grant mission of the University of Idaho. The BS Arch, the only four-year architecture degree in the state, prepares students to enter UI’s professional M.Arch degree. The M.Arch, the only NAAB-accredited architecture degree in Idaho, provides graduates with credentials to take the national Architecture Registration Exam to become licensed architects. The integrated, seamless BS Arch/M Arch curriculum addresses complex problems in a rapidly changing world, delivers a cutting-edge, socially conscious, and sustainable design education in the fastest growing state in the nation, and produces qualified designers and researchers who contribute to the built environment of Idaho, the Northwest, and the world.

The Department of Architecture also supports the university’s vision through expanding the institution’s vision for community engagement, economic impact, and in providing access to qualified students of all backgrounds.

The department is also integral to CAA’s Vision and Mission:

Vision:
The College of Art and Architecture strives to empower the next generation of artists and designers to positively impact a rapidly changing world and one of the fastest growing states in the nation. We design with communities and industry partners, we conduct hands-on research, and we infuse our work with empathy, storytelling, placemaking and the utmost creativity.

Mission
Delivering on the university’s land-grant mission, the College of Art and Architecture contributes to the well-being of statewide and global communities through innovative design education that safeguards sustainability, economic resiliency, cultural vibrancy and the common good. Our faculty and graduates’ leading-edge work emerges from an arts foundation and strong commitment to design integration — and results in built, cultural, natural, and virtual environments that enrich our communities and our world.

3. What is the demand for the unit’s services? What population will the unit serve?

The unit serves the Architecture Engineering and Construction Industry (AEC) within the state of Idaho and region. Graduates are in high demand to support the growth economy and state population increase. The Pacific Northwest and Intermountain West are also growing economies and graduates secure jobs in major population centers, including Boise, Spokane/Coeur d’Alene, Seattle, Portland, and Salt Lake City.
The programs within the proposed department have experienced a combined 61% increase in the past five years and include.

- Bachelor of Science in Architecture (B.S. Arch)
  Approximately 221 students
- Master of Architecture (M.Arch, the NAAB-accredited professional degree.)
  Approximately 89 students
- Master of Integrated Architecture and Design (MSIAD)
  Approximately 6 students
- Minor in Architecture (18 credits)

4. Describe the proposed unit’s organizational structure.

The unit will reside in the College of Art and Architecture and have department chair (and program directors as needed and supported by department operations funding or identified as a service component). *

*See attached CAA organizational chart.

5. What targets have been set to assess the proposed unit’s success in achieving objectives?

1. Institutional data sets from all areas including assessment, enrollment management, provost’s office, etc. will mirror other colleges in the university allowing for accurate comparisons.

2. Increased leadership opportunities and enhanced responsibilities with the department and program.


4. Budget reduction (reducing college leadership costs).

6. Briefly describe the processes that will demonstrate the quality of the unit.

- Development of student work that fulfills the standards of NAAB accreditation assessment criteria
- Winning regional, national, and international architecture and design awards
- Signature program—Design-Build, Idaho Architecture Collaborative—visibility and community impact
- Faculty success with the promotion and tenure process
- Faculty recognized for scholarship/research products
- Continued research impacts at the IDL in supporting business and industry in the state.
• Successful percentage of graduates completing the NCARB exam

7. **Indicate the number of students, businesses, industries, and/or other clients to be served by this unit. Include a description of faculty participation and student involvement in the unit if applicable.**

Architecture is a growing program at the University with over 300 students. The department will continue the statewide mission of the program to positively impact communities through service-learning/community outreach projects focusing on enhancing life quality through design; it will prepare, and graduate students poised to enter a thriving and competitive architectural job market.

Faculty are an integral part this preparation, offering rigorous lessons in thinking and making architecture in the design studio and classroom, developing transformative “real-world” learning experiences to students, and engaging in research focused on: developing sustainable building materials and more efficient building practices, the importance of cultural and environmental awareness, behavioral considerations of the built environment, the health, welfare, and safety of building users, and enhanced thermal performance of buildings.

Students will continue to not only hone their own architectural abilities as defined and delivered through the professional curriculum, but also remain active participants in departmental research projects and entrepreneurial endeavors.

8. **Financial Impact: Using the budget template, provide a narrative budget summarizing the needs and requirements for implementing the new unit.**

This new unit will support increased efficiency, streamline university and college processes and result in a savings of $10,708 for the college (factored on the formula of 15% of program head base salary which today would equal $65,708). CAA chose to restructure based on academic needs, but also as part of our budget reduction plan in 2020.

Department Chair Stipends: 3 at $15,000 ea. = $45,000

Program Director Stipends for 3-unit department: 2 at $5,000 ea. = $10,000

Total Stipend Cost: $55,000

Previous program head stipends were 15% of the base faculty salaries of those serving in the positions for a total of $61,292 in FY21.

Refer to budget template for department and program budgets. Note: Fringe benefit costs are included in the attached budget template, but not included in the example above. A modest increase is included for each fiscal year represented.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT 1 - ARCHITECTURE</th>
<th>Orgn</th>
<th>Orgn Title</th>
<th>Vandal ID</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>894 Architecture</td>
<td>V01212971</td>
<td>Teal, Randall</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Arch 151 Arch 361 Arch 423 Arch 499 Arch 520 Arch 574</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>894 Architecture</td>
<td>V01106760</td>
<td>Brehm, Matthew</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Arch 154 Arch 362 Arch 430 Arch 500 Arch 521 Arch 575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>894 Architecture</td>
<td>V00646028</td>
<td>Carver, Dwayne</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Arch 200 Arch 385 Arch 431 Arch 501 Arch 522 Arch 580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>894 Architecture</td>
<td>V00007073</td>
<td>Haglund, Bruce</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Distinguished Professor</td>
<td>Arch 203 Arch 386 Arch 454 Arch 502 Arch 523 Arch 585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>894 Architecture</td>
<td>V00808605</td>
<td>Hu, Xiao</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Arch 204 Arch 388 Arch 461 Arch 503 Arch 552 Arch 598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>894 Architecture</td>
<td>V00633386</td>
<td>Lawrence, Scott</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Arch 243 Arch 400 Arch 463 Arch 504 Arch 553 Arch 599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>894 Architecture</td>
<td>V00487886</td>
<td>Manrique Hoyos, Carolina</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Arch 253 Arch 403 Arch 460 Arch 505 Arch 554</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>894 Architecture</td>
<td>V00570103</td>
<td>Marshall, Anne</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Arch 254 Arch 410 Arch 464 Arch 510 Arch 556</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>894 Architecture</td>
<td>V00888543</td>
<td>Mead, Phillip</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Arch 257 Arch 411 Arch 464 Arch 511 Arch 558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>894 Architecture</td>
<td>V00883746</td>
<td>Rakich, Amy</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Arch 266 Arch 416 Arch 475 Arch 514 Arch 568</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>894 Architecture</td>
<td>V00708592</td>
<td>Barakat, Hala</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Arch 353 Arch 421 Arch 483 Arch 516 Arch 570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATED DESIGN LAB/Architecture</td>
<td>849 AA Integrated Design Lab</td>
<td>V01130929</td>
<td>Woods, Lindsay</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Arch 354 Arch 422 Arch 498 Arch 517 Arch 571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT 2 - ART &amp; DESIGN</th>
<th>Orgn</th>
<th>Orgn Title</th>
<th>Vandal ID</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART &amp; DESIGN</td>
<td>863 Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00571516</td>
<td>Keim, Delphine</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Art 100 Art 205 Art 251 Art 322 Art 400 Art 495 Art 505 Art 598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART &amp; DESIGN</td>
<td>863 Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V0003062</td>
<td>Carter, Val</td>
<td>Instructor Faculty</td>
<td>Senior Instructor</td>
<td>Art 110 Art 211 Art 261 Art 323 Art 403 Art 497 Art 507 Art 599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART &amp; DESIGN</td>
<td>863 Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00405940</td>
<td>Doyle, Joe</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Art 111 Art 213 Art 271 Art 330 Art 404 Art 498 Art 508</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART &amp; DESIGN</td>
<td>863 Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00659850</td>
<td>Gosse, Johanna</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Art 112 Art 216 Art 272 Art 340 Art 405 Art 499 Art 513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART &amp; DESIGN</td>
<td>863 Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00533273</td>
<td>Gottwald, David</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Art 121 Art 217 Art 280 Art 350 Art 407 Art 500 Art 515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART &amp; DESIGN</td>
<td>863 Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00404557</td>
<td>Isenbarger, Stacy</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Art 122 Art 221 Art 299 Art 360 Art 409 Art 501 Art 516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART &amp; DESIGN</td>
<td>863 Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00864511</td>
<td>Johnson, Aaron</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Art 200 Art 222 Art 302 Art 370 Art 410 Art 502 Art 521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART &amp; DESIGN</td>
<td>863 Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00468642</td>
<td>Sonnichsen, Michael</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Art 203 Art 231 Art 303 Art 373 Art 488 Art 503 Art 590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART &amp; DESIGN</td>
<td>863 Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V01066717</td>
<td>Turner-Rahman, Gregory</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Art 204 Art 241 Art 321 Art 380 Art 490 Art 504 Art 597</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART &amp; DESIGN</td>
<td>863 Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00437001</td>
<td>McClear, Lauren</td>
<td>Clinical Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Art 205 Art 252 Art 301 Art 372 Art 489 Art 506 Art 598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT 3 - Department of Design</th>
<th>Orgn</th>
<th>Orgn Title</th>
<th>Vandal ID</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERIOR ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN</td>
<td>867 Interior Architecture and Design</td>
<td>V00099906</td>
<td>Awwad-Kafferty, Rula</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>IAD 151 IAD 231 IAD 299 IAD 368 IAD 415 IAD 498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERIOR ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN</td>
<td>867 Interior Architecture and Design</td>
<td>V00761104</td>
<td>De Silva, Tharique</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>IAD 152 IAD 244 IAD 332 IAD 400 IAD 417 IAD 499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERIOR ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN</td>
<td>867 Interior Architecture and Design</td>
<td>V00000446</td>
<td>Anderson, Miranda</td>
<td>Clinical Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>IAD 200 IAD 254 IAD 344 IAD 403 IAD 443</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERIOR ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN</td>
<td>867 Interior Architecture and Design</td>
<td>V00864244</td>
<td>Corry, Shauna</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>IAD 203 IAD 281 IAD 351 IAD 404 IAD 451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>899 Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>V00554501</td>
<td>Sini, Raffaella</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Larc 150 Larc 253 Larc 353 Larc 390 Larc 463 Larc 499 Larc 548 Larc 597</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>899 Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>V00908462</td>
<td>Alessa, Lilian</td>
<td>Research Faculty</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Larc 151 Larc 254 Larc 355 Larc 395 Larc 465 Larc 500 Larc 549 Larc 598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>899 Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>V00430930</td>
<td>Klikskey, Andrew</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Larc 154 Larc 288 Larc 358 Larc 400 Larc 480 Larc 501 Larc 554 Larc 599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>899 Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Larc 200 Larc 289 Larc 363 Larc 403 Larc 481 Larc 502 Larc 555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>899 Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>From TT</td>
<td>Clinical Faculty</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Larc 203 Larc 298 Larc 364 Larc 404 Larc 488 Larc 503 Larc 556 Larc 599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>899 Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>From TT</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Larc 204 Larc 299 Larc 365 Larc 440 Larc 489 Larc 504 Larc 558 Larc 599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>899 Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>From TT</td>
<td>Clinical Faculty</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Larc 210 Larc 310 Larc 380 Larc 441 Larc 491 Larc 510 Larc 562 Larc 599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRTUAL TECHNOLOGY AND DESIGN 790</td>
<td>V00553017</td>
<td>Virtual Technology and Design</td>
<td>Gauthier, Jean-Marc</td>
<td>Program Director, Associate Professor</td>
<td>VTD 101 VTD 154 VTD 253 VTD 367 VTD 457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRTUAL TECHNOLOGY AND DESIGN 790</td>
<td>V00008716</td>
<td>Virtual Technology and Design</td>
<td>Cleveley, C.</td>
<td>Instructor, Senior Instructor</td>
<td>VTD 151 VTD 154L VTD 254 VTD 372 VTD 458</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRTUAL TECHNOLOGY AND DESIGN 790</td>
<td>V000031245</td>
<td>Virtual Technology and Design</td>
<td>Anderson, John</td>
<td>Regular Faculty, Professor</td>
<td>VTD 151L VTD 200 VTD 271 VTD 380 VTD 497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRTUAL TECHNOLOGY AND DESIGN 790</td>
<td>V00896441</td>
<td>Virtual Technology and Design</td>
<td>Kuri, Yumna</td>
<td>Regular Faculty, Assistant Professor</td>
<td>VTD 152 VTD 201 VTD 298 VTD 398 VTD 499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRTUAL TECHNOLOGY AND DESIGN 790</td>
<td>V00776745</td>
<td>Virtual Technology and Design</td>
<td>Bird, Rayce</td>
<td>Clinical Faculty, Associate Professor</td>
<td>VTD 152L VTD 204 VTD 301 VTD 400 VTD 504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRTUAL TECHNOLOGY AND DESIGN 790</td>
<td>V00782550</td>
<td>Virtual Technology and Design</td>
<td>Lew, Roger</td>
<td>Research Faculty, Associate Professor</td>
<td>VTD 153 VTD 245 VTD 355 VTD 404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VTD 153L VTD 246 VTD 356 VTD 425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Academic Units

Architecture
Dr. Randall Teal
Program Head
11 Faculty
316 Students

Art + Design
Delphine Keim
Program Head
9 Faculty
95 Students

Interior Architecture
& Design
Dr. Rula Awwad-Rafferty
Program Head
3 Faculty
117 Students

Landscape
Architecture
Dr. Raffaella Sini
Interim Program Head
5 Faculty
28 Students

Virtual Technology &
Design
Jean-Marc Gauthier
Program Head
5 Faculty
115 Students

Research Units

Integrated Design Lab
Damon Woods
Director

Center for Resilient Communities
Dr. Lillian Alesi
Dr. Andrew Kilskey
Co-Directors

Other CAA Units- Shop/Center

Computer Studio
Vacant
Design Resource Center
Miranda Anderson
Director

Technical Shops
David Schmidt
Director

Urban Design Center
NA

Prichard Gallery
Vacant

Administrative Support

Dean
Dr. Shauna Corry

Dean’s Office Staff
Kim Osborne, Director of Admin and Fiscal Operations
Joan Jones, Dean’s Assistant/Project Manager .50
Rebecca Cromwell, Recruitment and Retention Coordinator
Quinn Kendall, Administrative Assistant
Manda , Grants Specialist .50*
Amanda Myron, Admin/Facil Specialist
Sandi Klingler, Academic Program Coordinator
Technology Assistant
Lissett .5 Web Coordinator *
Hannah Finkas-Gardner, Director of Development *

CAA Support Staff
Claire Brundage, Academic Advisor
Jen Smith, Career Advising Liaison *
Reilly Cesca, Technology Solutions Partner *
Maria , Marketing Manager*
David Johnson, Writer*

* split appointments or funding provided by other units

Updated 09.02.2022
Dean's Office Staff
- Director of Admin and Fiscal Operations
- Dean's Assistant/Project Manager: .50 /Temporary
- Recruitment and Retention Coordinator
- Administrative Assistant
- Grants Specialist: .50 *
- Admin/Fiscal Specialist
- Academic Program Coordinator
- Technology Assistant/Temporary: .5 Web Coordinator *
- Director of Development *
- FTE TBD: Communications Manager *
* split appointments

Art & Design Dept.
- Department Chair
- 1 Program Director
- 10 Faculty
- 95 Students

Design Dept.
- IAD/LArch/ VTD Dept.
- Department Chair
- 3 Program Directors
- 15 Faculty
- 260 Students

Architecture Dept.
- Department Chair
- 1 Program Director
- 12 Faculty
- 316 Students

Research Units
- Integrated Design Lab-Boise
  - 1 Director
  - 2 Research Scientists
- Center for Resilient Communities
  - Director: *Shared Role
  - 2 Research Faculty
  - Program Specialist

Other CAA Units - Shop/Center
- Computer Studio
  - Technology Assistant
- Technical Shops
  - Director
  - 1 Tech Shop Instructional Assistant (.50)
- Urban Design Center-Boise
  - Architecture – Interior Architecture & Design – Landscape Architecture
  - .50 Administrative Assistant
- Prichard Gallery

Dean's Office Staff
- Director of Admin and Fiscal Operations
- Dean's Assistant/Project Manager: .50 /Temporary
- Recruitment and Retention Coordinator
- Administrative Assistant
- Grants Specialist: .50 *
- Admin/Fiscal Specialist
- Academic Program Coordinator
- Technology Assistant/Temporary: .5 Web Coordinator *
- Director of Development *
- FTE TBD: Communications Manager *
* split appointments

Art & Design Dept.
- Department Chair
- 1 Program Director
- 10 Faculty
- 95 Students

Design Dept.
- IAD/LArch/ VTD Dept.
- Department Chair
- 3 Program Directors
- 15 Faculty
- 260 Students

Architecture Dept.
- Department Chair
- 1 Program Director
- 12 Faculty
- 316 Students

Research Units
- Integrated Design Lab-Boise
  - 1 Director
  - 2 Research Scientists
- Center for Resilient Communities
  - Director: *Shared Role
  - 2 Research Faculty
  - Program Specialist

Other CAA Units - Shop/Center
- Computer Studio
  - Technology Assistant
- Technical Shops
  - Director
  - 1 Tech Shop Instructional Assistant (.50)
- Urban Design Center-Boise
  - Architecture – Interior Architecture & Design – Landscape Architecture
  - .50 Administrative Assistant
- Prichard Gallery

Dean's Office Staff
- Director of Admin and Fiscal Operations
- Dean's Assistant/Project Manager: .50 /Temporary
- Recruitment and Retention Coordinator
- Administrative Assistant
- Grants Specialist: .50 *
- Admin/Fiscal Specialist
- Academic Program Coordinator
- Technology Assistant/Temporary: .5 Web Coordinator *
- Director of Development *
- FTE TBD: Communications Manager *
* split appointments

Art & Design Dept.
- Department Chair
- 1 Program Director
- 10 Faculty
- 95 Students

Design Dept.
- IAD/LArch/ VTD Dept.
- Department Chair
- 3 Program Directors
- 15 Faculty
- 260 Students

Architecture Dept.
- Department Chair
- 1 Program Director
- 12 Faculty
- 316 Students

Research Units
- Integrated Design Lab-Boise
  - 1 Director
  - 2 Research Scientists
- Center for Resilient Communities
  - Director: *Shared Role
  - 2 Research Faculty
  - Program Specialist

Other CAA Units - Shop/Center
- Computer Studio
  - Technology Assistant
- Technical Shops
  - Director
  - 1 Tech Shop Instructional Assistant (.50)
- Urban Design Center-Boise
  - Architecture – Interior Architecture & Design – Landscape Architecture
  - .50 Administrative Assistant
- Prichard Gallery

Updated 10-2022
CAA leadership began the discussion to change our structure during Provost John Wiencek’s tenure. Our focus was on becoming more efficient in terms of college management and within the University system while supporting small programs in faculty service responsibilities (allowing for more time to devote to teaching or research). We began discussions with the faculty during our All-College meetings (held twice a semester) and an Ad Hoc Committee was developed by the faculty to explore restructure possibilities. Landscape Architecture assistant professor, Dan Cronan, and Virtual Design and Technology associate professor Jean-Marc Gauthier chaired the committee. Meetings were held with all faculty and staff invited to join and one of the meetings separated the junior faculty and the senior faculty to encourage open and honest communication. The committee leaders authored a report outlining strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT analysis), as well as structure models, and next steps that was shared college wide.

Beginning Fall Semester of 2021, Dean Corry convened three Town Hall Meetings to refine possible structure ideas and program leaders were requested to meet with each other (Art + Design called it speed dating) to see what synergies would develop or be capitalized on to help identify preferred structure models.

A snapshot of the refined structure models, leadership responsibilities for Department Chair and Program Director/Heads (accreditation requirements for all programs were reviewed for leadership requirements), administrative search processes following FSH, and possible financial models showing budgetary savings was distributed college wide along with a link to a Qualtrics survey.

The survey asked for feedback on the structure models (varying program combinations), and which model was preferred, a two department or three department model. Twenty-nine people responded to the survey (CAA has approximately thirty-nine faculty and twenty staff depending on the semester). The responses indicated an even split between the two or three department model with a few respondents indicating they preferred to stay the same. Discussions with current Program Heads revealed they preferred to have five departments, but with the choice narrowed down to either the two or three department model the majority preferred the three-department model. CAA Advisory Council discussed the proposed change during the Spring 2022 meeting and initially expressed concerns about program visibility, however after understanding that the programs would continue to be the focus of the website and all recruitment and marketing efforts, they understood the need for great efficiency.

Dean Corry reviewed the responses and process with Provost Lawrence and requested the college go forward with the three-department model informed by the Ad Hoc Committee report, the Town Hall meeting dialog, the survey responses, and discussions with Program Heads, faculty, and staff.

Supporting Documentation
- Ad Hoc Committee Report
- Town Hall Agenda
- Qualtrics Survey and Responses
- Process Information Sheet
CAA Town Hall AGENDA

9/10/20 – 1:00 pm – 2:30 pm
9/16/20 – 9:00 am – 10:30 pm
9/22/20 – 2:00 pm – 3:30 pm

1) Town Hall Goals and Focus – 5 minutes
   a) Goals and Objectives of the CAA Town Hall
      (i) Validate pros & cons, and guiding principles of each model
      (ii) Gather feedback from those who could not participate in the Ad Hoc Committee in Spring 2020
   b) Meeting Organization and Participation Request
      (i) “Raise hand” function in zoom
   c) Overview and Additional Comments per 3 CAA Models
      i) 1 Department Model
         (1) Pros and Cons
         (2) Guiding Principles
         (3) Additional Comment Period:
            **Prompt: How do we operate and how are we evaluated?
      ii) 2 Department Model
         (1) Pros and Cons
         (2) Guiding Principles
         (3) Additional Comment Period:
            **Prompt: How do we operate and how are we evaluated?
      iii) 3 Department Model
         (1) Pros and Cons
         (2) Guiding Principles
         (3) Additional Comment Period:
            **Prompt: How do we operate and how are we evaluated?

2) Discussion: What can we learn from our current situation?
   a) Leadership - How do you see leadership with each model?
   b) Integration – How might you see program integration with each model?
   c) Land Grant Mission - How do you envision teaching, research, and service with each of these models?

***Please take the opportunity to fill out the anonymous questionnaire in the link below:
https://uidaho.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_0H5plVmaWb44UQZ
I. **CHARGE:**
TheFaculty of the College of Art & Architecture at the University of Idaho was charged with a need to determine models of integration, with budgetary constraints, best-suited to meet the needs of all programs: Architecture, Art and Design, Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture, and Virtual Technology and Design. The following report describes the charge, the committee’s process, and recommendations to move forward.

II. **TIMELINE & CHARGE ITEMS: 04/23/2020 - 05/28/2020**
1. **Tasks identified** - need for change and determination of change
2. **Possibilities:** Greater integration, depth of leadership opportunities, less committee work, etc.
3. **Concerns:** Loss of Autonomy, loss of identity, loss of voices heard from individuals within the College of Art & Architecture
4. **Financial Considerations:** extremely tight budget and reorganization is part of the plan
5. **Timeline:** 4.5 weeks; may require SBOE/NWCCU notification or approval; October 1 deadline if this approval is required

Figure 1. Conceptual Diagram of the CAA current model. This diagram illustrates the pillars of CAA and the integrated cores and foundations synthesizing strengths and opportunities within the College.
III. PROCESS
A Delphi Method was used to assess current understandings, evaluate threats and opportunities, and established consensus among committee members. The results of this process intend to inform ACT and the Dean of the College of Art & Architecture. The Delphi Method aims to iteratively collect feedback from committee members through iterative survey instruments and verbal statements made during committee meetings. This method was selected as it is a systematic method for obtaining, exchanging, and developing informed opinions on an issue which can potentially inform consensus from a group (Landeta, 2006; Kittell-Limerick, 2005; Listone, 1975).

Figure 2. Ad Hoc Committee Process Diagram. The Committee utilized the Delphi process to inform scenarios and their implications based on iterative survey instruments.

IV. SCENARIOS
   a. SCENARIO 1: IMPLEMENTED INTEGRATION OF CURRENT MODEL
      i. Description: Improved Current Model with strategic planning; find/create efficiencies through improved integration
         - 5 programs
         - Eliminate $40K - $67K in stipend spending
         - Remainder of stipends pooled and shared 5 ways or other revision of stipend distribution
         - One Department w/ 5 program heads
      ii. Pros
         • Straightforward Solution
         • Retains Program Autonomy
         Allows for self-determined program growth as identified in strategic planning efforts
      iii. Cons
         • Smaller programs may be endangered - perceived to be more so than is actually the case; small programs are not protected by department structure
         • Lack of depth
         • Larger amount of pressure on chairs - Lack of balance with Program head
         • Programs are Autonomous but separate in decision-making
iv. Guiding Principles: Improvements and Solutions to Address Issues & Weaknesses

**NOTE: Solutions are meant to inform decision-making and strategies forward. These solutions are not meant to be prescriptive but rather for aspirational guidance.**

- **FIRST STEP:** Need for implementation strategy for integration
  - Increased shared teaching/instruction – need for foundations – reassignment of roles, structures; expand cross-disciplinary course offerings and delivery where there is disciplinary overlap
  - Crucial to look at strengths of faculty, bylaws and policies that we have
- Need for addressing misconceptions/ issues with current model
- Potential for Associate Dean Roles (e.g. Assoc. Dean of Research, Assoc. Dean of Instruction, Assoc. Dean of Student Affairs, etc.)
  - Assoc. Dean can provide oversight over all programs
  - Provide insight for integration
  - Shared responsibilities
  - Mapping Benefits of Entire College
  - Possibly Rotating Roles/ Responsibilities – (e.g. college-based integration strategies)
- **BUDGET:** Sliding Scale of Stipends per Program
- Integrated Core Areas
  - New Degrees, Certificate Programs
  - Non-professional UG degree that could be a feeder to grad programs
- Need for keeping program autonomy & retaining/ operationalizing faculty resources
- Find cross-college efficiencies as a strategy

b. **SCENARIO 2: TWO DEPARTMENT MODEL**

i. **Pros**
   - Logical Solution (JUSTIFICATION: combined strengths, similar definitions)
   - Shared/Similar Accrediting bodies in the case of Art, Design, VTD; not true of Arch, IAD, LA
   - Boise programs retain connectivity
   - Shared concepts, ideas – possibilities for recruitment, retention, grad opportunities
   - Opportunities for coordination/alignment (curriculum, seminars, organization, etc.)
   - organizes us in Arts and sciences (BS, BA.. etc)

ii. **Cons**
   - Feared loss of autonomy
   - Each program acting as an armature: ie. Overarching curriculum decisions
   - Question of amount of savings - program administrators are still needed for certain accredited programs
   - Interdisciplinary Collaboration may be hindered
   - Influence recruitment and retention – would all programs receive equal focus in recruiting efforts?
   - Fiscal issues may impact Faculty Cohorts
   - Impedes on total college integration
• Loss of discipline-based connections to alums, professional groups could impact fundraising, student activities and opportunities
• gives a logical line to cut in the future, not a unified group. one in the future may receive preference

iii. Guiding Principles: Solutions/Stipulations
• bylaws must be set, accreditation standards/ considerations
• Areas of Concentration, Emphasis Areas (SWARM Model) – but with teeth - “At Home” – Emphasis Area, Area of Concentration
• Consideration of what the home base is for accreditation standards
• Scheduled Thematic Seminars
• Crucial to look at strengths of faculty, bylaws and policies that we have
• Faculty fatigue consideration – Strategy to reduce teaching loads

c. SCENARIO 3: THREE DEPARTMENT MODEL
   i. Description:
   • Three Departments
   • Each Department contains multiple Programs
   • 3 chairs | multiple program heads | possible Associate Chair
   ii. Pros
   • Added value for student success (well-rounded integrated education) – Preparing creative professionals
   • Shared balance – more equal representation of all programs
   • Visibility and branding
   • Allows for integration of other units (across the university e.g. theatre)
   • Maintains experience / knowledge base for accreditation, and administrative capacity for each program’s strategic planning
   iii. Cons
   • Added cost (3 chairs, Associate dean)
   • More work for program chairs and associate dean
   • Not a unified group. one in the future may receive preference or be exposed to risk

V. RECOMMENDATION for NEXT STEPS
   a. Proposal for Academic Year 2020 – 2021
      i. Ad Hoc Committee as standing committee for FALL 2020 & SPRING 2021
      ii. PROPOSED AGENDA:
          1. Analyze Risks, Opportunities and costs per Scenario
          2. Determine Implementation Strategy
          3. Create Phased Strategic Plan

Sources:


Thank you for everyone’s engagement in this process. It has been a long one, beginning with a desire to work more efficiently within the university and college by moving to departments, followed by the need to address our budget reduction. We are now nearing completion and looking forward to meeting our goals of:

1. Increasing efficiency within the University structure
2. Addressing our college need to decrease committee work, and enhance opportunities for leadership development
3. Budget Reduction commitment

**Leadership:**
Once a structure (2 or 3 department mode and the programs that make up each one) is determined we will follow the Faculty Staff Handbook and our CAA Bylaws for determining Department Chairs and Program Heads/Coordinators:

**Department Chairs**

* Determination Process
Department Chairs are confirmed by the Dean based on nominations from the unit committee with approval by the Provost, See E-4. SELECTION OF PERMANENT ADMINISTRATOR. for detailed procedure.

* Responsibilities

E-1. RESPONSIBILITIES. The administrator of a school, division, or department (i.e., the first organizational unit below the college level) is responsible for interpreting university and college objectives and policies for the faculty of the unit and, through leadership, ensuring faculty participation in formulating and carrying out the unit’s policies within the framework of the objectives and policies of the college and university. The role may be defined more specifically by the bylaws of each college, but it is understood that the general responsibility for leadership includes: assisting higher administration in the assignment (3240 A) and in the evaluation (3320 and 3340) of the services of each member of the unit’s faculty and staff; promoting effective leadership of personnel and management of departmental resources; providing leadership in the development and implementation of unit plans; providing for open communication with faculty and staff; fostering excellence in teaching, scholarship and outreach for faculty, students, and staff in the department; effectively representing all constituents of the department; and continuing personal professional development in areas of leadership.

- Manage and develop position descriptions, annual performance evaluations, third year reviews and tenure and promotion recommendations in consultation with Program Heads
- Schedule classes, assign teaching, and assign classrooms when appropriate in consultation with Program Heads
- Assign graduate research and teaching assistantships in consultation with Program Heads
- Recruitment and Retention Management with support from Program Heads
- Other (to be determined)

**Program Heads/Coordinators (title to be determined)**

* Determination Process
-Nominations are solicited from the Department Chair from the program faculty
-Program Faculty submit nominees (one or more can be submitted)
-Department Chair makes the determination in consultation with the Dean and the Provost

**Responsibilities to Include**
Overarching goal is to meet the autonomy needs of accrediting bodies.
-Program leadership and management including curriculum development and management
-Budget and Personnel Management (significant influence in budget management and personnel management to include input in evaluations, hiring, and termination)
-Recruitment and Retention Management
-Accreditation reports and management
-Assessment planning and management
-Facility needs
-Other (to be determined)

**Cost/Savings Estimates:**
Based on our original leadership cost of $61,000 (for the past two years we have saved approximately $35,000 per year by reducing all program head salaries to $7,000) as we go forward with the Department Model each Department Chair will receive either $15,000 or $10,000 depending on the configuration of the department.

**Cost Estimate for Two Department Structure**
Department Chair Stipends: $15,000 ea. = $30,000
Program Director (name TBD) Stipends: $2,500* ea. = $12,500
Total Cost: $42,500 – Previous Stipends were 15% of base faculty salary holding position- $61,292 for FY21- Savings of $18,792 for new model.

**Cost Estimate for Three Department Structure**
Department Chair Stipends: $10,000 ea. = $30,000
Program Director (name TBD) Stipends: $2,500* ea. = $12,500
Total Cost: $42,500 – Previous Stipends were 15% of base faculty salary holding position- $61,292 for FY21- Savings of $18,792 for new model.

*Summer funds available for Program Heads/Coordinators for accreditation reports/visit preparation

**Possible Scenarios:**
The following are possible scenarios identified in our Town Hall and program meetings along with individual input. These scenarios are not listed in any order of preference nor do the titles reflect a name. Names of the departments will be submitted by the faculty of the departments and follow the curriculum change process.

Current Department Demographics (based on Fall Semester 2021 Institutional Dashboard):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>287 (-4 MSIAD)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art + Design</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAD</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LArch</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTD</td>
<td>112 (+4 MSIAD)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A.  **2 departments split by NASAD Accreditation-**
Department 1: Architecture and Landscape Architecture (318 students, 16 faculty)
Department 2: Art + Design, Interior Architecture and Design, Virtual Technology and Design (approximately 306 students, 18 faculty)

Or

B.  **2 departments split by Professional Designation-**
Department 1: Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Interior Architecture and Design (approx. 415 students, 19 faculty)
Department 2: Art + Design, Virtual Technology and Design (approx. 209 students, 15 faculty)

Or

C.  **3 departments split by feedback-**
Department 1: Architecture (283 students, 11 faculty)
Department 2: Art + Design (93 students, 10 faculty)
Department 3: IAD, Landscape Arch, and VTD (approx. 247 students; 13 faculty)

Or

D.  **3 departments split by feedback-**
Department 1: Architecture (283 students, 11 faculty)
Department 2: Art + Design and Virtual Technology and Design (approx. 209 students, 15 faculty)
Department 3: IAD and Landscape Arch (approx. 131 students; 8 faculty)

**Anticipated Timeline:**

- **January 21**  Structure Determined, current Program Heads notify program faculty; All College Announcement
- **February 15**  Department names determined, and Curriculum changes submitted to Provost's Office and Curriculum Committees
- **April 15**  Department Chairs and Program Heads/Coordinators Determined
- **June 1**  Approved by the SBOE
- **July 1**  Department Structure and Bylaws in effect
2021 CAA Restructuring Survey of Staff and Faculty

• 2-Department Configuration 1
1. Blank
3. Architecture, Landscape Architecture
4. Architecture
6. Blank
7. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design
9. Architecture
10. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design, Interior Architecture & Design
11. Architecture
12. Blank
13. Architecture, Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design
15. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
16. Architecture, Art + Design
18. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
19. Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
21. Architecture
22. Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
27. Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
28. Landscape Architecture, Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design

• 2-Department Configuration 2
1. Blank
2. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
5. Architecture
6. Blank
7. Architecture, Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design
8. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
10. Architecture, Landscape Architecture
12. Blank
13. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
15. Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
17. Blank
19. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
20. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
22. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
23. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
25. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
26. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design
27. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design
28. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design

• Potential Challenges?
  1. Blank
  2. Blank
  3. any changes to enrollment could off balance student to staff ratio
  4. Blank
  5. Blank
  6. Blank
  7. A) Feared loss of autonomy
     B) Each program acting as an armature: ie. Overarching curriculum decisions
     C) Question of amount of savings - program administrators are still needed for certain accredited programs
     D) Interdisciplinary Collaboration may be hindered
     E) Influence recruitment and retention – would all programs receive equal focus in recruiting efforts?
     F) Fiscal issues may impact Faculty Cohorts
     G) Impedes on total college integration
     H) Loss of discipline-based connections to alums, professional groups could impact fundraising, student activities and opportunities
     I) gives a logical line to cut in the future, not a unified group. one in the future may receive preference
8. Department 2 may have issues working through technology integration. Also, the name of the program is Virtual Technology & Design - not - Virtual Technology and Design.

9. The wide number of disciplines and faculty/curricular priorities in any configuration would be unwieldy. A two dept model is unnecessary and appears driven by a desire to consolidate chair positions in order to offer a higher stipend for each. The trade off benefits aren’t worth the trouble we shouldn’t determine chair stipends based on number of departments.

10. If one program is significantly larger than other(s) then the smaller program could feel marginalized. Personality differences in leadership could create challenges.

11. The restructure is unnecessary and detrimental to the college, its programs, faculty, staff, and students. The proposal creates two new administrative positions with no benefit. Under the restructure, faculty and staff would have a chair *and* a director with whom to address issues and opportunities. Program directors would ultimately have much the same responsibilities as they do currently but then have the additional administrative layer of a chair between themselves and the dean; faculty would have two such layers. The result will be a reduction in the clarity of each of the programs’ missions and goals and the unnecessary diffusion of leadership throughout the college. The restructure proposal is disruptive and counter-productive, all for a negligible cost savings, savings which could easily be accomplished by simply and equitably adjusting individual program administrative costs.

12. A. the two department option does not make any further saving comparing to the three department option.

B. There will be many programs with different accreditation requirements are placed together within one department.

C. Potentially, smaller unit in one department with larger unit may start to loose its autonomy and identity.

D. The two department option makes our college look like a smaller unit in the eyes of the whole university community. This may bring potential risks when there is a push for reducing the college structures on campus during challenging times.

13. Blank

14. Blank

15. The only issue I can see with this is that Architecture is such a large program, that combining it with IAD and Larch would make it a large department. Therefore, making it more challenging to run (and over powering) than the other ones. I could also see it causing issues with the mentality of views. The is a certain attitude that some Architecture personnel have that might clash with IAD and Larch. In another way of thinking, it might encourage them to "play nice".

16. Personalities

17. We are one department now that is trying to function as 5 independent departments. The last all College meeting we held in 2020 discussing potential re-configuration we concluded that it would be in the College's best interest to explore how to make one department work rather
than spend more money to divide programs. There has not been much effort to make this model work since the reformation of CAA and we should start here first.

The Department Chair of the 5 programs would function similarly to an Associate Dean level role working with the individual program heads to help administer our degree programs. All of our programs make significant impacts on the students experience but more work is needed to bring the faculty and curriculum together to reinforce this notion of design integration.

Challenges: Mutual Understanding across CAA, Academic Degree Bias, willingness to integrate. I see very little value in a two department model which has historically been the configuration of CAA prior to its dissolution into CLASS. I am not nostalgic and witnessed several issues of a two department model for power control of CAA resources. If we do go with a two department model I see no way around associating our Science based programs with each other from Art based programs which would significantly put Art in a disadvantage within the larger CAA. Integrated within one department shows we integrate Art into our Science and our Science into our Arts.

18. Blank

19. It is my understanding in conversation and from lived experience as former chair of VTD that VTD doesn't potentially want to combine with A+D because it might impact their grant-getting opportunities. While there is a wee modicum of truth in this, it was really more of a concern when Kyle was on faculty. I am not sure that is really a concern now.

Additionally, I think certain faculty view A+D as antiquated and a combination as problematic for their image. This, I argue, is short-sighted and not really true. There is actually some really interesting opportunities and A+D are eagerly using or want to use new media tools and techniques. A+D faculty have expressed genuine interest in working with VTD. Ironically, it is the VTD faculty unable to envision cool new opportunities.

For the other programs, I know that IAD and Landscape feel that they will be subsumed by Architecture and their needs will be lost.

20. At the college level, the challenge will depend greatly on the willingness of the Department Chairs to work constructively with the Dean to build and buy into a collective vision. Trust, respect and candid communication are key. At the department level, program rivalries could flare up until the anxiety of the unknown recedes. Department heads will have to lead faculty they don't know well. Trust will have to be developed. Faculty will take cues from their leaders on living into and developing the specifics of our new configuration. The potential for individual behavior undermining a collective vision exists. This is probably true no matter what our new configuration is. Inclusive visioning will be key. At the program level, I can imagine faculty venting concerns to the people they know best. Program directors will need to be good listeners and bring concerns to the Chairs.

21. CAA criteria for restructuring is mostly based in budget, number of faculty and students' numbers. Architecture has enough growth and demonstrated positive performance trend that it can stand as an autonomous Department-1. The TWO Department scenario diminishes autonomy of units merged and increases difficulty for a Department-2 Chair to manage the
diverse programs (all other units would need to be merged in order to keep Architecture as an autonomous unit). This scenario blurs the presence of leadership advocating for each merged program in CAA committees and diminishes the opportunities of diverse leadership in CAA and UofI overall.

22. The only potential problems I can imagine would be chain of command/ administrative. How are decisions being made in relationship to each department. With two Chairs I could see some people feeling underrepresented. I really feel like this whole process really won't change anything other than chain of command. If we have people in those positions that are willing to work with multiple departments and will listen and fight for the needs of department Heads under them I see no problems.

23. personality issues for some, differing tools, equipment, and space utilization in D2, leadership positions may have to develop the trust of newer managed programs

24. All three Arch disciplines continually stress that their professional accreditation standards have certain requirements for autonomy, though I have never seen any satisfactory evidence to this effect. Combining them will subvert this (if such policies exist). The coursework and scholarship adjacencies in VTD and Art + Design make sense for the design emphasis areas of the BFA program. However, the VTD program does not seem to see the value of fine arts coursework, despite the fact that guest speakers to the college routinely emphasize that the only students who are employable in these industries are those who can draw and paint as well as they think (despite whatever stellar technological acumen they might possess). Conversely, Art faculty might shy away from closer ties with designers and the design world. It also needs to be noted that there are gendered concerns within the college. VTD is a “boys club” of a male majority student population with 100% male faculty. IAD, conversely, has the opposite student population and nearly the same opposite faculty situation. Granted, there are long-standing intrinsic cultural biases around interior “decorating” being “woman's work” and “Virtual games” being “for boys.” We know this is not true and it is less and less true with each passing graduating class. Still, this remains an elephant in the room within our college. More diverse faculty across the board will help shape, in time, a more diverse student population. On the topic of gender, VTD projects (at times subtly, and at other times more directly) a position that the fine arts are also “woman's work” and that combining with Art + Design will “feminize” their department.

25. Blank

26. I foresee some initial hiccups determining who is doing what as faculty and staff get more accustomed to the way programs have been doing things. Finding new efficiencies and grace for each other always takes some time to strengthen, fortify and trust. But with this 2 department model, all get to learn to adapt together and I’ve always appreciated our College's resilience when asked to do so. I truly believe we can make this work well!

27. college challenges: only two departments, this is not a viable college. Visibility for programs is undermined. If the issue is to reduce committee work, there is n reality no committee work reduction here since the representation on key committees will still be needed, for instance: curriculum committee, recruitment and retention, design days, tenure an promotion: all these
will still need representation from every program; serious issues of inequity occur, across the board; a program with major student number and faculty number is more in control of major decisions, of budget, even of numbers of students allowed to persist through the gates to second year (and beyond) as happened before.

28. Some faculty may feel in this configuration that they are losing their programs autonomy.

• Potential Benefits
  1. Blank
  2. This structure aligns with our Boise offerings of the Architecture fields. Also with accreditation and possible new fee structure for Professional Fees.
  3. More organization less hierarchy – hopefully
  4. Blank
  5. Blank
  6. Blank
  7. This configuration seems to align practice-based professions with similar (however completely different) accreditation standards. This configuration also appears to aggregate smaller programs to benefit the college as a whole.

Pros:
  a) Logical Solution (JUSTIFICATION: combined strengths, similar definitions)
  b) Shared/Similar Accrediting bodies in the case of Art, Design, VTD; Arch, IAD, LA
  c) Boise programs retain connectivity
  d) Shared concepts, ideas – possibilities for recruitment, retention, grad opportunities
  e) Opportunities for coordination/alignment (curriculum, seminars, organization, etc.)
  f) Organizes us in Arts and sciences (BS, BA .. etc)

8. Not sure

9. None. This is a bad idea

10. Unforeseen opportunities occur when two or more programs merge. Staffing efficiencies.

11. I see no benefits to the college restructure proposed.

12. Blank

13. Blank

14. Blank

15. A benefit for having all the architecture programs in one department is that all those programs are offered in Boise. So it will be easier to group them together and advertise them together because potential and current students can visually group those together based off the idea that they are all related to architecture, and are all offered in Boise. Easy to remember.

Another benefit is that they are all similar fields, therefore will be able to work in the same mindset/vocabulary than students would if they were in Art + Design and VTD. Art + Design and VTD have similarities as well. Ever since there was talk about creating departments, this has seemed like the best option for programs to separate out.
This could also open the doorway to collaboration within the programs. Many students already minor or double major within these programs, it would be nice to see them collaborate more on projects and classes.

16. Integration of Disciplines

17. Benefits: Potential Budgetary savings by reducing redundancies across programs. Leadership within the Chair position who can more effectively distribute support across programs more equitably and bring stronger alignments between existing programs. Nothing really changes for any of the programs, but support can be more effective. Potentially reduces internal program conflicts by providing needed CAA leadership targeting integrated teaching, research, and creative scholarship. Everyone is listened to

18. Blank

19. - VTD students are already increasingly taking art classes or are art minors

- There is a substantial number of students who want to explore and create work that borrows from both programs

- Recruiters (even those that have been brought to campus by VTD faculty) tell us that students really need good foundational art skills. Technology skills can be more easily taught on the job especially if they are using propriety software.

- Many design courses--especially Interaction and Experience--should be required for VTD students

- A combination of A+D and VTD re-establishes gender parity among faculty and students.

For the other, professional programs, a combination might be essential for eliminating redundant courses and promoting efficiencies.

20. Cost savings and equitable distribution of work are major benefits. At the college level this configuration strikes a balance between having an Associate Dean (it's like having two Co-Associate Deans) along with program-specific leadership. The economy of consolidating certain kinds of work towards the Chairs easily reconciles with program autonomy. There is potentially more opportunity to see commonalities among programs with licensing in this model. Also, with Interior Architecture and Design students fully subscribing to the Architecture Minor, this model makes sense. There is potential to see and cultivate more common ground between Art and Design and Virtual Technology and Design. Both programs have a range from work that is entertaining, emotional, and expressive to the other end which is data driven, rhetorically more objective, and informed by human behavior.

21. This configuration is only based in preserving Architecture as an autonomous unit and leadership presence due to its successful performance and growth as such. I do no see any benefit on merging all other units in one Department so this scenario of TWO Departments does not seem reasonable.

22. Benefits are cost savings and aligning programs that are most similar. I see potential for more collaboration also. If programs across the college are able to see what and how other departments work and what their needs are, I could really see this helping all areas grow.
23. the logic, naming, and numbers balance seems entirely reasonable. saves money, perhaps? would love to have additional staff support or crossover

24. At many other universities across the country, the Arch disciplines are within a single department. It is a natural and logical way to organize them; students in all three programs will be entering a unified workforce and networking environment. They will all someday work together at the same studios. VTD and Art + Design share NASAD accreditation, which is a very rational and easy sell to upper administration. VTD and Art + Design students, too, will be entering a unified workforce and networking environment. They will all someday work together at the same studios. Even students who choose to pursue a fine arts emphasis within their BFA, the majority of these graduates will at some point hold design jobs (and, like most creative professionals, probably night owl as one kind of practicing artist or another).

25. Blank

26. Through this configuration, I see strength for student programing both in and outside of classes. I believe faculty research opportunities that lead to student events and integrative course work will thrive more in this mix. Department 1, as show here, celebrates what happens in most firms and will also allow architecturally-minded students at early stages to better understand where they best fit in pursuing a particular degree. Department 2 can better support student’s more varied professional approaches to general making, storytelling, innovation in imaging, and portfolio output.

27. This could be a school, a named opportunity for the school; however, the programs within ought to maintain their autonomy. it focuses on licensed professional programs. could have some further collaborations, but these collaborations in the curriculum already happen.

28. This configuration will benefit all of our students. Architecture/IAD/LA students will benefit. Potentially Art + Design & VTD can collaborate for the benefit of all of our students. Art +Design will benefit with access to VTD classes such as world building, character design and use of software. This will be highly beneficial for many of students in their career as illustrators and story tellers. VTD students can benefit from physical classes in 2d/3d (observational drawing, ceramics, etc...) Through the observational world students can better create a virtual world.

- 3-Department Configuration 1
  1. Architecture
  2. Architecture
  3. Architecture
  4. Architecture
  5. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
  6. Architecture
  7. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  9. Architecture
  10. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  11. Architecture
12. Architecture
13. Architecture, Landscape Architecture
14. Architecture, Landscape Architecture
15. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
16. Architecture, Art + Design
17. Architecture
18. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design
19. Architecture
20. Architecture
21. Architecture
22. Architecture
23. Architecture
24. Architecture
25. Architecture
26. Architecture
27. Architecture
28. Architecture

- 3-Department Configuration 2
  1. Art + Design, Virtual Technology and Design
  2. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
  3. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  4. Art + Design
  5. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  6. Art + Design
  7. Art + Design
  8. Art + Design
  9. Art + Design
  10. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
  11. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
  12. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
  15. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
  16. Virtual Technology & Design, Landscape Architecture
  17. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  18. Architecture
  19. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  20. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  21. Art + Design
  22. Art + Design
  23. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design
  24. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
  25. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
26. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design
27. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
28. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design

• 3-Department Configuration 3
  1. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture and Design
  2. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  3. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design
  5. Architecture
  7. Architecture
  8. Virtual Technology & Design
  10. Architecture
  11. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  12. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design
  13. Virtual Technology & Design
  14. Virtual Technology & Design
  15. Architecture
  16. Interior Architecture & Design
  17. Art + Design
  18. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design
  19. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design
  20. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
  23. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design
  25. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design
  26. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design
  27. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  28. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design

• Potential Challenges?
  1. Blank
  2. Blank
  3. Possible risk of hierarchy
  4. Blank
  5. Blank
  6. Each program must still be responsible for their own faculty evaluations, curriculum and budget.
  7. A) Added cost (3 chairs, Associate dean)
     B) More work for program chairs and associate dean
C) Not a unified group. One in the future may receive preference or be exposed to risk.
8. Overall approval from the College.
9. This has been proposed at multiple points and there does not appear to be consensus among programs who will be joined together about how they would operate. At some point, the decision will have to be made and the combined departments will need to sort this out. The three department configuration should maintain the same stipend for chairs as the two department configuration. The work load in any scenario is worth the $15,000.
10. Personality differences in leadership could create challenges.
11. The restructure is unnecessary and detrimental to the college, its programs, faculty, staff, and students. The proposal creates three new administrative positions with no benefit. Under the restructure, faculty and staff would have a chair *and* a director with whom to address issues and opportunities. Program directors would ultimately have much the same responsibilities as they do currently but then have the additional administrative layer of a chair between themselves and the dean; faculty would have two such layers. The result will be a reduction in the clarity of each of the programs' missions and goals and the unnecessary diffusion of leadership throughout the college. The restructure proposal is disruptive and counter-productive, all for a negligible cost savings, savings which could easily be accomplished by simply and equitably adjusting individual program administrative costs.
12. Blank
13. Blank
14. Blank
15. The only challenge I see with this model is trying to coordinate three departments. Two are easier than three.
One other thing is it would mean there are two departments in Boise, and that might seem unnecessary for the amount of years we provide for students there. It might seem like we have more there than we do. That is just an assumption though.
16. I don't think a 3 dept model will work
17. Budgetarily we will be adding three department Chairs with potentially some level of program head responsibilities for Department B. Faculty buy-in, marketing to make sure we can best explain our mission and vision under this new model. Power struggles between departments.
18. Blank
19. This 3-program model doesn't really take advantage of the connectivity that could happen within the professional programs. In particular, IAD and architecture. Also, one could argue that this doesn't prepare students for real-world work environments where everybody is working in the same office in collaborative manner regardless of discipline. This seems also to (perhaps) assuage certain personalities but the decision should be made based on what is really best for the students in the long term. Another issue is that when the next economic downturn happens, Architecture will be by itself and that may be somewhat problematic if numbers of students are important. Architecture's boom may or may not last.
20. With this configuration, I can imagine Architecture acting a little too independently from the college. A respectful relationship between the Program Chair and the Dean would be key. A strong program level leader might help complement the dynamics in this program. At the department level, the challenges will be to navigate the unknowns in the new configurations. Developing trust and collective vision will be key. Asserting program autonomy will be key. Making a clear division of labor and responsibilities between Chairs and program level
leadership will be important. There is quite a bit of variation in the current culture of how each program distributes work.

21. As CAA restructuring seems only based on budget, number of students & faculty in units, criteria for a scenario merging the other programs (and keeping Architecture as a separate Department Unit) is based on selecting one of the two provided by feedback in the CAA document shared. It is going to be a challenge for a Department-3 Chair as proposed to address the diverse processes involved in these very distinct programs. To address the fact that some programs might be too small today (based on faculty and student numbers) to work as independent units (departments) due to costs involved in leadership, there should be a more clear threshold on what are the minimum requirements across the university. Each discipline has the potential to function better as an autonomous unit with leadership presence at the college level. The potential should be assessed beyond actual numbers and focus on future scenarios of growth and development for these disciplines in the state of Idaho/US/Global. Collaborations among disciplines emerge when there are common projects individuals agree on engaging with not through a forced merging process based on budget/efficiency priorities.

22. Really are we saving enough with this configuration and are we just creating more work for the administrators? Also there is less equality with students and faculty

23. less balance in numbers yet more identity (+ autonomy?) for certain programs territoriality issues?

24. Same comments apply as above

25. Blank

26. I worry that students needing to shifting their major in the territory of Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Interior Architecture and Design will have less support than they should in this arrangement (I believe the 2 Department Model addressed above is strongest). I also worry that Architecture (or any program not blended in this transformation), left alone, will feel even more divergent and uncollaborative, than they do now. AND I want to state that I don't actually believe Architecture doesn't or can't work well with others (they are actually quite collaborative), but in being allowed to be separate, we've all had the ability to become insular and avoidant of playing well with others. Strong leadership would be needed to force a sense of balance when one program gets to stay the same and others have to adapt. I think this would be a difficult, unneeded challenge to take on in this transition.

27. Need to change the name of the college, this is essential since now the name could be misleading on the outside; when a third department exists but the name of the college only for the other two departments it becomes an issue of invisibility and inequity. Can impact recruitment, retention, and recognition of the third department. Structural injustice or ill representation Some issues about one of the restructure due to faculty resisting it due to separation of arts and sciences. Need to avoid "stepchild" any program, there is a great likelihood for that to occur here. undermines some of the great rebranding efforts that have been ongoing and proven successful in terms of programmatic identity, recruitment, retention (for example as with IAD).

28. Architecture will have little incentive to collaborate with others.

- Potential Benefits?
  1. Blank
  2. Blank
  3. Better balance of responsibilities
4. Blank
5. Blank
6. Blank
7. A) Added value for student success (well-rounded integrated education) – Preparing creative professionals
   B) Allows for integration of other units (across the university e.g. theatre)
   C) Maintains experience / knowledge base for accreditation, and administrative capacity for each program’s strategic planning

8. Integrated projects between Architecture, IAD and Landscape. Opportunity for program growth and Identity branding (Art & Design - VTD)

9. This arrangement balances faculty numbers, allows programs with fewer faculty to share service and administrative responsibilities, and limits the number of disciplines in each, without making any program unduly large in comparison to the rest of the college.

10. Unforeseen opportunities occur when two or more programs merge. Large programs can operate more effectively without compromising smaller programs. Staffing efficiencies.

11. I see no benefits to the college restructure proposed.

12. A. Based on the existing circumstance, this may be the best way to balance our existing resources with our student sizes among different programs.
   
   B. This option makes disciplines with similar needs and similar size together, which can make the use of resources more efficiently.

   C. Smaller department size can reduce the chance of potential internal conflicts. The small units in a department will have better chance to retain its autonomy and identity.

   D. The three department option provides more opportunity for more departments in the future when certain growth of our college can achieve.

13. Blank

14. Blank

15. The benefits to this model is that all are about equal in amount of students per department. This means resources and funding would be similar for each, so there would be less arguments and disagreements with how they are dispersed. This would also help with the fact that Architecture is growing so much, and they would be able to just focus on them and not have to worry about another program.

16. Blank

17. CAA excels in three areas, Art, Architecture and Virtual Design that all focus on visual communication. We have four programs that are Science based with 1 program being Art based. This aligns programs to their associated academic responsibilities. Architecture is large enough to function as a small department and can retain autonomy. Art can continue to focus on BFA and MFA opportunities for the College since they are the only Art based degree program
and has different outcomes concerning service from the other programs. Associating LA, IAD and VTD (Virtual Technology and Design) together compliments each other through research and has natural meeting points for integration for students. Lighting, Environmental, Industrial design emphasis can be supported while sharing similar design affordances concerning space and place making. The students would be better aligned under this model (my opinion).

18. Blank

19. Landscape and IAD can be free from the constraints that a combination with Architecture might impose. Architecture could continue as it own entity.

20. This would be a smaller incremental step in our evolution. It might be less shocking to the system.

21. This configuration is only based in preserving Architecture as an autonomous unit and leadership presence due to its successful performance and growth as such and addressing the budget/efficiency priority concern defined by UofI & CAA leadership which limits to a 3 Department scenario. I do not agree on merging these three disciplines proposed in Department-C as they have better chances of potential of growth if left as autonomous units with leadership development (e.g. recent hires showing trends of contributing to program growth).

22. I honestly do not see how the three department configuration will benefit the college. I see us keeping the same old silos that we have always sworn this college doesn't have. We have talked about how being integrated has been a great selling point and how Alumni are proud of that. I don't feel like the idea of collaboration or integration is very strong in our college anymore.

23. One doesn't want to get lumped and lost nor isolated and withered...

I don't know what the answers are, but I think paying program heads according to a students served metric is more equitable than the current model.

24. Same comments apply as above, although this arrangement better balances student and faculty numbers.

25. Blank

26. I think early on Landscape Architecture and Interior Architecture and Design will feel stronger in regard to having a seat at the table, but I also believe this feeling will be short lived and the perceived power of architecture will settle back and feel much the same as it does now soon enough.

27. The IAD + Env Design/Larc department can also have the great naming opportunity, can be the seed for a near-future school for the environment, with the potential of adding planning to the mix, and facilities management; this is a licensed professional department (the programs within are licensed professional programs), there are significant synergies and alignments between the two programs (IAD+Env Design/Landscape Architecture) including teaching alignments, service alignment, research/scholarship alignment, and professional
outreach. (certification/license, sustainable sites initiative, LEED, Well Building, stakeholder involvement, multiscalar, service-learning, place-based, ..etc.
SYNERGIES - Human-centered focus and a shared body of knowledge
Shared- embodiments fo the land grant mission. Reviews and Professional Pool for sponsored professionally aligned studios; and Italy Studio. Discussions and some collaborative work have already begun.
Also, for BIAD + Env Design/Larc the multiscalar opportunity: scale from intimate to exponentially larger, can be an exciting opportunity to explore what else to add or investigate. Plus the shared theoretical and programmatic body of knowledge focusing on environmental design is a critical asset. This BIAD+LARC/Env design allows these programs to maintain their identity and cohesiveness to the internal and external stakeholders; currently exploring ideas about super studio across the two programs, build on collaborative and visionary efforts underway and on significant enrollment and recruitment success in BIAD, and enable IAD to have a direct path to related graduate degree. Can have a great opportunity for professional outreach locally and globally.
Accreditation for IAD (undergraduate-CIDA) and LARC (graduate-LAAP) can afford the interesting seamless scenario here too, and those two accreditation have more in common (especially about HLSW, research, etc) than with others.
VTD+ART share the same body of knowledge can broaden their offering by coalescing BA /Bs/BFA/Ms/MFA; can focus financials and efforts of faculty to deliver needed courses across the two related fields.

28. Blank

• Any Further Thoughts or Concerns? Indicate Preference Here
  1.  3 departments
  2. Prefer two Department Structure for CAA
  3.  I prefer the 3-department configuration
  4.  Concerns: too many to mention here.
  5.  This process has gone on far too long.
  6.  Of the choices, a 3 department configuration is preferable.
  7.  Thank you for framing this. I’m slightly drawn towards the two-department model: IAD + LA + ARCH; VTD + A&D. However, whatever the configuration, I’m sure we’ll all adapt and adjust quickly. Thanks again and looking forward to next steps!
  8.  3 Department Model (Architecture, IAD, Landscape --- VTD --- Art&Design). Some of these combinations could drastically enhance or atrophy the growth and potential of the programs. I would highly recommend looking at this reorganization from a marketing standpoint. What combinations make the most sense internally and externally? How will incoming students find their people, their home, their community?
  9.  I strongly prefer the 3 department arrangement.
  10. I prefer the three programs.
  11. I am against the restructuring of the college. Combining programs and adding a chair will not alleviate the critical necessity, nor responsibility, of directing each of those programs. The proposed addition of administrative chair positions is redundant, ineffective, and
unnecessarily disruptive. The anticipated cost savings are negligible and could easily be accomplished by more rational and equitable methods.

12. I consider the three department option offers more benefits than the two department option based on existing circumstance. It can reduce possible conflicts within our disciplines and also prepare us better for possible growth in the future. This structure can be easier and more efficient for the college to administer the resources according to different needs.

13. I trust the administration to develop a fair model. I defer to Randy and Dean Corry as to how to integrate other programs with Architecture.

14. Configuration 2
15. I would prefer to have the two departments rather than the three.

16. New configurations

17. At this stage we need to seriously make the one department model work. Two in my opinion is the most dangerous model to explore as it would significantly impact the Arts in a negative way. The only other option I see is the Three department model where we can "stay the same" for Architecture and Art, but allows for innovation and integration within Design for VTD, IAD and the Environmental Design program.

18. I prefer the program that makes the most sense for students in the courses and that faculty have the most overlap in helping students with discipline-specific skills and professional opportunity.

19. The issue of saving money is important and that is fundamentally why we are doing this exercise. But the opportunity changes like this afford shouldn't be discounted. As we move forward, it is best, I believe, to really explore beyond disciplines and look at the potential of where the markets will be in a few years. Junior faculty often are better at seeing this and are eager to make new things happen. They just want the administrative nod and they will make it work!

20. I believe we are ready for a two department model. This is my preference. With program level leadership, and respectful and collaborative leadership from the Chairs, I anticipate being able to maintain program autonomy that is required for individual curricular authority, program identity and accreditation.

21. I was surprised that this topic (on-going survey) was not mentioned during our CAA Spring meeting this semester. I am concerned the "Great Colleges to Work for Survey" process will be managed in a similar way as it was also allowed very few minutes in the CAA Spring meeting agenda for discussion. These are some of the most processes with topics that will have high impacts for years to come.

22. "B. 2 departments, split by Professional Designation-
Department 1: Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Interior Architecture and Design (app 415 students, 19 faculty)
Department 2: Art + Design, Virtual Technology and Design (approx. 209 students, 15 faculty)"
This make the most sense in every way. Anyone in marketing would love to be able to sell this.

23. I think 2 depts. makes the most sense (as listed by architectures and designs in titles)... would 2 dept heads become more like associate deans (which we need) but at the same time shunt a bulk of the work off to the relatively less well compensated program heads???
There would be so much less incentive to do that job (all the work in the trenches, yet always answering to another level and with less monetary compensation, or administrative rank.)

I would consider restructuring compensation levels to make program heads somewhat attractive and lessen some of the department head bonuses with the title/role being something of its own reward.

Some of our staff are outstanding, others, less so... I think more shared roles for what a person is suited toward could come of this (and I'll offer details or suggestions if needed).

24. If the primary goal is to save money by reducing the number of program heads, then two departments is better than three. Honestly, this seems like a poor motivation for any kind of reorganization. Any such move should be made in the students’ interests, and the students’ interests only. That is why I have chosen these models; they make the most sense to me from the student perspective. Perhaps I am naïve in this, but my primary focus is on the career viability of our graduates. That’s the only reason why I teach the material I teach in the first place. How hireable are our graduating seniors? Period. Combining the Arch disciplines should (with proper shepherding and modeling from faculty) produce more successful graduates. The same goes for a combined Virtual Technology, Art + Design department. What I think we need to be extremely, extremely cautious about is reorganizing for our faculty’s interests and (more pointedly) for the interests of any particular individuals. This new college structure might still be here in 20 years. It might outlast us all. It’s irrational and shortsighted to make any decisions whatsoever based on the individuals involved. People leave. People retire. People die. Whatever new organizational chart the college agrees upon, it should be conceived with every chair on it empty.

25. 2 departments

26. I prefer the 2 department configuration. We are already a small College expressing overwhelm in regard to having too much to do. At least with this structure 7 faculty will take on a leadership role instead of the 8 faculty that would play roles in the 3 department configuration. We need as many faculty as we can really pursuing their research if we want to remain strong in a University seeking Research 1 status. The 2 department configuration taxes one less person.

27. The amounts of funds being saved are minimal across all scenarios.

This while at the same time administrative staff is removed from the department and is serving at the college; there are insurmountable responsibilities for a department head and a program head to complete, while also trying to address teaching, advising, outreach, and scholarship without the direct support of an administrative assistant.

Allow the programs that are willing to step in right now and change to do so without having to create major college reorganization, for instance, the ongoing IAD+LARC conversations can yield very interesting fruition if allowed to move forward without forcing another program in, or having to create upheaval, simply because the programs know there is something they themselves are working toward; this might mean we will have four departments, with expectations of growing being put on each of the departments Department heads or program heads also have an additional administrative role, for instance: associate dean of students, associate dean of faculty, associate dean of outreach/etc; this while reducing their teaching load and making them abide by the reduced...
teaching load (no three courses, for instance, speaking from the personal story). This will
distribute the load, make us as a college very present in all of the important realms, does
not put the power in the hands of one associate dean or one department, and engage us all
in the collective of what we are here for the students, faculty, staff, and community.
curriculum, recruitment, accreditation remain in hands of programs.
Revisit a college core, that is vertical; also, Need to have the foundation be the human-
centered foundation, where art, culture, and other parts of environment are integrated.
28. I prefer the 2 department option
Program Resource Requirements.
- Indicate all resources needed including the planned FTE enrollment, projected revenues, and estimated expenditures for the first four fiscal years of the program.
- Include reallocation of existing personnel and resources and anticipated or requested new resources.
- Second and third year estimates should be in constant dollars.
- Amounts should reconcile subsequent pages where budget explanations are provided.
- If the program is contract related, explain the fiscal sources and the year-to-year commitment from the contracting agency(ies) or party(ies).
- Provide an explanation of the fiscal impact of any proposed discontinuance to include impacts to faculty (i.e., salary savings, re-assignments).

I. PLANNED STUDENT ENROLLMENT

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. New enrollments

B. Shifting enrollments

Total Enrollment
```

II. REVENUE

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. New Appropriated Funding Request

2. Institution Funds $18,215.00

3. Federal

4. New Tuition Revenues from Increased Enrollments

5. Student Fees

6. Other (i.e., Gifts)

Total Revenue $18,215

Ongoing is defined as ongoing operating budget for the program which will become part of the base.

One-time is defined as one-time funding in a fiscal year and not part of the base.
### III. EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Personnel Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Graduate/Undergrad Assistants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Research Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Directors/Administrators</td>
<td>14000</td>
<td></td>
<td>14000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Administrative Support Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>4215</td>
<td></td>
<td>4480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel and Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,215</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,480</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2024</td>
<td>FY 2025</td>
<td>FY 2026</td>
<td>FY 2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Operating Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Professional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Materials and Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rentals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Materials &amp; Goods for Manufacture &amp; Resale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Capital Outlay</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Library Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Outlay</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## D. Capital Facilities Construction or Major Renovation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## E. Other Costs

- **Utilities**
- **Maintenance & Repairs**
- **Other**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Other Costs**: $0 $0 $0 $0

**TOTAL EXPENDITURES:**

- FY 2024: $18,215
- FY 2025: $0
- FY 2026: $18,480
- FY 2027: $0

**Net Income (Deficit):**

- FY 2024: $0
- FY 2025: $0
- FY 2026: $0
- FY 2027: $0

---

**Budget Notes** (specify row and add explanation where needed; e.g., "I.A., B. FTE is calculated using…"):  
- Row 59- Current General Education Funds within the College of Art and Architecture will shift to provide a $10,000 Administrative Stipend Per AY for the Department of Architecture Chair and $4,000 per Program Director.  
- A small increase in Fringe Benefits is factored in for FY25-27.

*All other blank sections are not applicable since CAA is only changing administrative leadership structure all other program costs will remain the same.*
# 71: DEPARTMENT OF ART AND DESIGN

## In Workflow
1. 09 Curriculum Committee Chair (stacyi@uidaho.edu)
2. Registrar’s Office (none)
3. Provost’s Office (kudas@uidaho.edu; mstout@uidaho.edu; jvalkovic@uidaho.edu; gwen@uidaho.edu)
4. SEM Review (dkahler@uidaho.edu)
5. Ready for UCC (disable)
6. UCC (none)
7. Faculty Senate Chair (mstout@uidaho.edu; jvalkovic@uidaho.edu; cari@uidaho.edu)
8. Provost’s Office (kudas@uidaho.edu; mstout@uidaho.edu; jvalkovic@uidaho.edu; gwen@uidaho.edu)
9. State Approval (mstout@uidaho.edu; jvalkovic@uidaho.edu; lindalundgren@uidaho.edu)
10. NWCCU (sara@uidaho.edu; mstout@uidaho.edu)
11. Catalog Update (V00814390@uidaho.edu)

## Approval Path
1. Tue, 18 Oct 2022 17:12:12 GMT
   Stacy Isenbarger (stacyi): Approved for 09 Curriculum Committee Chair
2. Tue, 18 Oct 2022 17:17:06 GMT
   V00814390: Approved for Registrar’s Office
3. Tue, 18 Oct 2022 22:20:05 GMT
   Gwen Gorzelinsky (gwen): Approved for Provost’s Office
   Dean Kahler (dkahler): Approved for SEM Review
5. Wed, 02 Nov 2022 17:49:06 GMT
   Theodore Unzicker (tunzicker): Approved for Ready for UCC
6. Tue, 08 Nov 2022 22:54:06 GMT
   Theodore Unzicker (tunzicker): Approved for UCC

## New Proposal
*Date Submitted: Fri, 07 Oct 2022 06:28:30 GMT*

**Viewing: Department of Art and Design**
**Last edit: Tue, 08 Nov 2022 22:54:01 GMT**

Changes proposed by: Shauna Corry

### Faculty Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Name</th>
<th>Faculty Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shauna Corry</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scorry@uidaho.edu">scorry@uidaho.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Request Type**
Add/Drop a Department/School/Unit/College

**Effective Catalog Year**
2023-2024

**Title**
Department of Art and Design

**Request Details**
CAA is proposing a change in organizational structure from a one-department model to a three-department model. This is the Art and Design proposal.

**Attach State Form**
CAA Restructure Instructional_Administrative_Unit-Form Art Design FINAL Oct 6 22.doc

**Supporting Documents**
CAA Restructure Faculty List With Courses FINAL OCT 6 22.xlsx
CAA Org Chart Fall 2022 FINAL.pdf
CAAOrgChart_New3DepartmentStructure_OCT_14_2022.pdf
CAA Restructure Faculty Participation Information Final.docx
Reviewer Comments
Theodore Unzicker (tunzicker) (Tue, 08 Nov 2022 22:54:01 GMT): Per UCC, proposal shouldn't be forwarded to Faculty Senate until final names are determined.

Key: 71
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PROPOSAL FORM</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional and Administrative Units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Date of Proposal Submission:</strong></th>
<th>February 18, 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution Submitting Proposal:</strong></td>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of College, School, or Division:</strong></td>
<td>College of Art and Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of Department(s) or Area(s):</strong></td>
<td>Art + Design Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title of Proposed Unit</strong></td>
<td>Department of Art + Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Implementation Date:</strong></td>
<td>July 1, 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicate whether this request is either of the following:**

- [X] New Administrative Unit
- [ ] New Instructional Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>College Dean</strong></th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vice President for Research (as applicable)</strong></td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Dean (as applicable)</strong></td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OSBE Program Manager/IDCTE Director, Program Services</strong></td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FVP/Chief Fiscal Officer</strong></td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Administrator, IDCTE</strong></td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provost/VP for Instruction</strong></td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chief Financial Officer, OSBE</strong></td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>President</strong></td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chief Academic Officer, OSBE</strong></td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SBOE/Executive Director or Designee Approval</strong></td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Revised November 24, 2021
1. What are the goals and objectives for the new unit?

The College of Art and Architecture (CAA) has a unique organizational structure within the context of the University: it is composed of one department (Department of Art and Architecture) that includes five programs (Architecture, Art + Design, Interior Architecture and Design, Landscape Architecture, and Virtual Technology and Design). This organization was implemented in 2012 to encourage collaboration and integration; however, this structure has not been efficient for important University procedures and processes, such as those initiated by the Registrar’s Office, Enrollment Management, the Provost’s Office, and Institutional Assessment. In order to address these inefficiencies and initiate a governance structure that dovetails with the University structure overall (aligning the units of CAA with the rest of the units across campus) and to address the budget reduction implemented in 2020, CAA proposes restructuring from one broad department (Department of Art and Architecture) into three focused departments.

Proposed Structure:

1. Department of Art and Architecture (existing, name change submitted)

2. Department of Architecture (new department)
   Architecture program

3. Department of Art + Design (new department)
   Art + Design program

In addition to increasing alignment and efficiency with university and college processes additional goals for the restructuring include: 1) relieve faculty from small units (3 and 5 persons) from numerous service commitments and allow an increased focus on teaching and scholarship, 2) increase leadership opportunities within programs and departments, and 3) reduce administrative costs (the five-program model was supported with five program head stipends equivalent to department chair stipends).

The three-department model requires three department chair stipends along with two modest program director stipends resulting in a savings of approximately $10,708 (from the original stipend of 15% of base salary per program head for a total of $61,292 in FY 2021. The savings amount is factored on the current base salary plus a 15% administrative stipend, which would be $65,708). Our new three-department model will cost an estimated $55,000.

This proposal is to create the Department of Art + Design. The department will have 10 faculty members. Administrative support is centrally provided by the college office.

Objectives are:

1. Greater efficiencies within the university system. Currently as one large department university systems including Banner do not always acknowledge individual programs and data is not readily available. An attempt was made over three years ago to address this issue with various administrative offices on campus including the Registrar’s and Institutional Assessment. However, with the current operating systems it was not feasible to support CAA’s unique needs.
2. With smaller faculty size leadership opportunities are limited to tenured faculty, and this change allows for a tenured faculty member to serve as a Department Chair (taking on the responsibility of university processes including Promotion and Tenure and Annual Evaluations) while an untenured faculty may serve as a Program Director and focus on curriculum design, content, and accreditation requirements.

3. Support CAA budget reduction (reducing total leadership costs by $10,708).

2. What is the relationship of the unit to the university’s mission and priorities? Is the unit involved in instruction and if so, to what extent?

The Department of Art + Design is central to the mission and priorities of the university with emphasis in providing innovative thinking, community engagement and transformative education. With hands-on studio programming, students become adept and problem solving through the design process. As visual thinkers and makers, Art + Design provides leadership in the university in the realm of visual language. The department also supports the university’s vision through expanding the institution’s reach and capacity for economic impact and accessibility to qualified students of all backgrounds. Art + Design instructs its majors, students with other degrees from CAA, students with degrees outside of the college, and serves General Education requirements with coursework.

The department is also integral to CAA’s Vision and Mission:

**Vision**

The College of Art and Architecture strives to empower the next generation of artists and designers to positively impact a rapidly changing world and one of the fastest growing states in the nation. We design with communities and industry partners, we conduct hands-on research, and we infuse our work with empathy, storytelling, placemaking and the utmost creativity.

**Mission**

Delivering on the university’s land-grant mission, the College of Art and Architecture contributes to the well-being of statewide and global communities through innovative design education that safeguards sustainability, economic resiliency, cultural vibrancy and the common good. Our faculty and graduates’ leading-edge work emerges from an arts foundation and strong commitment to design integration — and results in built, cultural, natural, and virtual environments that enrich our communities and our world.

The programs within the proposed Art + Design department are involved with instruction and offer 2 undergraduate programs and 1 graduate degree with a total of approximately 95 students majoring in the department. This department also supports students graduating with K-12 education degrees focusing on art instruction. The department will also support general education requirements focusing on artistic ways of knowing while also supporting CAA’s all college foundation courses.

Students in the Art + Design department are thinkers and makers. Their work, as artifact or experience, causes reflection, challenges societal assumptions, and serves the needs of the built, natural, and cultural environments we occupy. Faculty and students are engaged in creative conversation throughout the Pacific Northwest, while their thought and practice extend
far beyond the region.

3. **What is the demand for the unit's services? What population will the unit serve?**

The unit serves communities, business, and industry within the state of Idaho and region within the disciplines of fine art and graphic design. Graduates support the growth economy and state population increase by working in creative industry in private and public sector positions. Some students are hired by local government and non-profit organizations that provide arts programming to localities. As the return on investment for the arts is more widely understood, our students are well-positioned to participate and provide leadership in creative economy. Some graduates work for firms in the design industry including, user experience, graphic design, and advertising. Some graduates work as freelance artists and illustrators, or they function as sole proprietors of creative firms. Our graduates also work with publishing companies as well in-house for companies, particularly in the tech industry. Graduates serve as user experience leads for companies such as REI, USAA, Amazon, Google, Twitter, and Meta. Graduates of our M.F.A. Art — a terminal degree program — typically go on to teach in higher education. Graduates of our programs support the growing economies of the Intermountain West including Boise, Spokane, Coeur d’Alene, Seattle, Portland, and Salt Lake City.

The unit supports students pursuing degrees in the following Instructional areas:

- Fine Art
- Graphic Design
- Interaction Design

Degrees Offered are:

- Bachelor of Art: Art 31 students
- Bachelor of Fine Arts: Studio Art + Design 53 students
- Master of Fine Arts: Art 11 students
- Art Minor (20 credits)

Supportive Coursework in Service to other degrees:

- Art Foundations provided for all first year CAA students
- Art and Design coursework provided for Bachelor of Science: Education (Art); Secondary Education (Art)

4. **Describe the proposed unit's organizational structure.**

The unit will reside in the College of Art and Architecture and have department chair (and program directors as needed and supported by department operations funding or identified as a service component). *

---

* Revised November 24, 2021
5. What targets have been set to assess the proposed unit’s success in achieving objectives?

a. Institutional data sets from all areas including assessment, enrollment management, provost’s office, etc. will mirror other colleges in the university allowing for accurate comparisons.

b. Increased leadership opportunities and enhanced responsibilities with the department and programs.

c. Continuing national accreditation from the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD).

d. Budget reduction (reducing college leadership costs).

6. Briefly describe the processes that will demonstrate the quality of the unit.

• Successful instruction and maintenance of National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) accreditation. This accreditation acknowledges programs who maintain high academic quality and integrity, meet recommended standards in art and design education, and rigorous curricular requirements
• Successful development and implementation of transformational learning experiences
• Successful increase in enrollment and percentage of degree completions
• Faculty success with the promotion and tenure process
• Winning regional, national, and international competitions
• Faculty recognized for the scholarship/research products
• Students securing employment within their field of choice

7. Indicate the number of students, businesses, industries, and/or other clients to be served by this unit. Include a description of faculty participation and student involvement in the unit if applicable.

The department will continue the statewide mission of the program to positively impact communities through service-learning projects focusing on enhancing life quality, and graduate students prepared to enter a thriving and competitive job market within the creative economy.

Faculty are an integral part of the proposed department offering excellent real world transformative learning experiences to students and conducting research that enhances cultural vibrancy, documents artistic history within the state, region, nation, and the world, explores and informs experience design in terms real and virtual environments, and material use experiments all while telling and creating stories of the human experience.

Approximately 95 students within the art and design programs will be actively involved in the new department. They are required to complete their course of study in obtaining undergraduate and graduate degrees and are important and integral participants in the processes of creating, making, and designing.
8. Financial Impact: Using the budget template, provide a narrative budget summarizing the needs and requirements for implementing the new unit.

This new unit will support increased efficiency, streamline university and college processes and result in a savings of $10,708 for the college (factored on the formula of 15% of program head base salary which today would equal $65,708). CAA chose to restructure based on academic needs, but also as part of our budget reduction plan in 2020.

Department Chair Stipends: 3 at $15,000 ea. = $45,000

Program Director Stipends for 3-unit department: 2 at $5,000 ea. = $10,000
Total Stipend Cost: $55,000

Previous program head stipends were 15% of the base faculty salaries of those serving in the positions for a total of $61,292 in FY21.

Refer to budget template for department and program budgets. Note: Fringe benefit costs are included in the attached budget template, but not included in the example above. A modest increase is included for each fiscal year represented.
### DEPARTMENT 1 - ARCHITECTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orgn</th>
<th>Orgn Title</th>
<th>Vandal ID</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>V01212971</td>
<td>Teal, Randall</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Arch 151 Arch 361 Arch 423 Arch 499 Arch 520 Arch 574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>V01067601</td>
<td>Brehm, Matthew</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Arch 154 Arch 362 Arch 430 Arch 500 Arch 521 Arch 575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>V00646028</td>
<td>Carver, Dwayne</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Arch 200 Arch 385 Arch 431 Arch 501 Arch 522 Arch 580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>V00007073</td>
<td>Haglund, Bruce</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Distinguished Professor</td>
<td>Arch 203 Arch 386 Arch 454 Arch 502 Arch 523 Arch 585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>V00808605</td>
<td>Hu, Xiao</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Arch 204 Arch 388 Arch 461 Arch 503 Arch 552 Arch 598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>V00603364</td>
<td>Lawrence, Scott</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Arch 243 Arch 400 Arch 463 Arch 504 Arch 553 Arch 599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>V00487886</td>
<td>Manrique Hoyos, Carolina</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Arch 253 Arch 403 Arch 462 Arch 505 Arch 554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>V00570103</td>
<td>Marshall, Anne</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Arch 254 Arch 410 Arch 464 Arch 510 Arch 556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>V00885434</td>
<td>Mead, Phillip</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Arch 257 Arch 411 Arch 464 Arch 511 Arch 558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>V00885434</td>
<td>Rakich, Amy</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Arch 266 Arch 416 Arch 475 Arch 514 Arch 568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>V00708592</td>
<td>Barakat, Hala</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Arch 353 Arch 421 Arch 483 Arch 516 Arch 570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INTEGRATED DESIGN LAB/Architecture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orgn</th>
<th>Orgn Title</th>
<th>Vandal ID</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>849</td>
<td>Integrated Design Lab</td>
<td>V01130929</td>
<td>Woods, Lindsay</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Arch 354 Arch 422 Arch 498 Arch 517 Arch 571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEPARTMENT 2 - ART & DESIGN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orgn</th>
<th>Orgn Title</th>
<th>Vandal ID</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00571516</td>
<td>Keim, Delphine</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Art 100 Art 205 Art 251 Art 322 Art 400 Art 495 Art 505 Art 598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00031062</td>
<td>Carter, Val</td>
<td>Instructor Faculty</td>
<td>Senior Instructor</td>
<td>Art 110 Art 211 Art 261 Art 323 Art 403 Art 497 Art 507 Art 599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00405940</td>
<td>Doyle, Joe</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Art 111 Art 213 Art 271 Art 330 Art 404 Art 498 Art 508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00659850</td>
<td>Gosse, Johanna</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Art 112 Art 216 Art 272 Art 340 Art 405 Art 499 Art 513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00553672</td>
<td>Gottwald, David</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Art 121 Art 217 Art 280 Art 350 Art 407 Art 500 Art 515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00404557</td>
<td>Isenbarger, Stacy</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Art 122 Art 221 Art 299 Art 360 Art 409 Art 501 Art 516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00864511</td>
<td>Johnson, Aaron</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Art 200 Art 222 Art 302 Art 370 Art 410 Art 502 Art 521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00468642</td>
<td>Sonnichsen, Michael</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Art 203 Art 231 Art 303 Art 373 Art 488 Art 503 Art 590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V01066717</td>
<td>Turner-Rahman, Gregory</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Art 204 Art 241 Art 321 Art 380 Art 490 Art 504 Art 597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00437001</td>
<td>McManus, Lauren</td>
<td>Clinical Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Art 205 Art 242 Art 322 Art 380 Art 490 Art 504 Art 597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEPARTMENT 3 - Department of Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orgn</th>
<th>Orgn Title</th>
<th>Vandal ID</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>867</td>
<td>Interior Architecture and Design</td>
<td>V00099906</td>
<td>Awwad-Rafferty, Rula</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>IAD 151 IAD 231 IAD 299 IAD 368 IAD 415 IAD 498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>867</td>
<td>Interior Architecture and Design</td>
<td>V00761104</td>
<td>De Silva, Therique</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>IAD 152 IAD 244 IAD 332 IAD 400 IAD 417 IAD 499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>867</td>
<td>Interior Architecture and Design</td>
<td>V00000446</td>
<td>Anderson, Miranda</td>
<td>Clinical Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>IAD 200 IAD 254 IAD 344 IAD 403 IAD 443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>867</td>
<td>Interior Architecture and Design</td>
<td>V00844244</td>
<td>Corry, Shauna</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>IAD 203 IAD 281 IAD 351 IAD 404 IAD 451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>867</td>
<td>Interior Architecture and Design</td>
<td>V00437001</td>
<td>McManus, Lauren</td>
<td>Clinical Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>IAD 205 IAD 242 IAD 322 IAD 380 IAD 490 IAD 504 IAD 597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orgn</th>
<th>Orgn Title</th>
<th>Vandal ID</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>V00554501</td>
<td>Sini, Raffaella</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Larc 150 Larc 253 Larc 353 Larc 390 Larc 463 Larc 499 Larc 548 Larc 597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>V00908462</td>
<td>Alessa, Lilian</td>
<td>Research Faculty</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Larc 151 Larc 254 Larc 355 Larc 395 Larc 465 Larc 500 Larc 549 Larc 598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>V00430930</td>
<td>Kliskey, Andrew</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Larc 154 Larc 288 Larc 358 Larc 400 Larc 480 Larc 501 Larc 554 Larc 599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>V00844244</td>
<td>Corry, Shauna</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant*</td>
<td>Larc 200 Larc 289 Larc 363 Larc 403 Larc 481 Larc 502 Larc 555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>V00908462</td>
<td>Alessa, Lilian</td>
<td>Research Faculty</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Larc 151 Larc 254 Larc 355 Larc 395 Larc 465 Larc 500 Larc 549 Larc 598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>V00430930</td>
<td>Kliskey, Andrew</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Larc 154 Larc 288 Larc 358 Larc 400 Larc 480 Larc 501 Larc 554 Larc 599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>V00844244</td>
<td>Corry, Shauna</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant*</td>
<td>Larc 200 Larc 289 Larc 363 Larc 403 Larc 481 Larc 502 Larc 555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>V00908462</td>
<td>Alessa, Lilian</td>
<td>Research Faculty</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Larc 151 Larc 254 Larc 355 Larc 395 Larc 465 Larc 500 Larc 549 Larc 598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>V00430930</td>
<td>Kliskey, Andrew</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Larc 154 Larc 288 Larc 358 Larc 400 Larc 480 Larc 501 Larc 554 Larc 599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>V00844244</td>
<td>Corry, Shauna</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant*</td>
<td>Larc 200 Larc 289 Larc 363 Larc 403 Larc 481 Larc 502 Larc 555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAA leadership began the discussion to change our structure during Provost John Wiencek’s tenure. Our focus was on becoming more efficient in terms of college management and within the University system while supporting small programs in faculty service responsibilities (allowing for more time to devote to teaching or research). We began discussions with the faculty during our All-College meetings (held twice a semester) and an Ad Hoc Committee was developed by the faculty to explore restructure possibilities. Landscape Architecture assistant professor, Dan Cronan, and Virtual Design and Technology associate professor Jean-Marc Gauthier chaired the committee. Meetings were held with all faculty and staff invited to join and one of the meetings separated the junior faculty and the senior faculty to encourage open and honest communication. The committee leaders authored a report outlining strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT analysis), as well as structure models, and next steps that was shared college wide.

Beginning Fall Semester of 2021, Dean Corry convened three Town Hall Meetings to refine possible structure ideas and program leaders were requested to meet with each other (Art + Design called it speed dating) to see what synergies would develop or be capitalized on to help identify preferred structure models.

A snapshot of the refined structure models, leadership responsibilities for Department Chair and Program Director/Heads (accreditation requirements for all programs were reviewed for leadership requirements), administrative search processes following FSH, and possible financial models showing budgetary savings was distributed college wide along with a link to a Qualtrics survey.

The survey asked for feedback on the structure models (varying program combinations), and which model was preferred, a two department or three department model. Twenty-nine people responded to the survey (CAA has approximately thirty-nine faculty and twenty staff depending on the semester). The responses indicated an even split between the two or three department model with a few respondents indicating they preferred to stay the same. Discussions with current Program Heads revealed they preferred to have five departments, but with the choice narrowed down to either the two or three department model the majority preferred the three-department model. CAA Advisory Council discussed the proposed change during the Spring 2022 meeting and initially expressed concerns about program visibility, however after understanding that the programs would continue to be the focus of the website and all recruitment and marketing efforts, they understood the need for great efficiency.

Dean Corry reviewed the responses and process with Provost Lawrence and requested the college go forward with the three-department model informed by the Ad Hoc Committee report, the Town Hall meeting dialog, the survey responses, and discussions with Program Heads, faculty, and staff.

**Supporting Documentation**

- Ad Hoc Committee Report
- Town Hall Agenda
- Qualtrics Survey and Responses
- Process Information Sheet
CAA Town Hall AGENDA

9/10/20 – 1:00 pm – 2:30 pm
9/16/20 – 9:00 am – 10:30 pm
9/22/20 – 2:00 pm – 3:30 pm

1) Town Hall Goals and Focus – 5 minutes
   a) Goals and Objectives of the CAA Town Hall
      (i) Validate pros & cons, and guiding principles of each model
      (ii) Gather feedback from those who could not participate in the Ad Hoc Committee in Spring 2020
   b) Meeting Organization and Participation Request
      (i) “Raise hand” function in zoom
   c) Overview and Additional Comments per 3 CAA Models
      i) 1 Department Model
         (1) Pros and Cons
         (2) Guiding Principles
         (3) Additional Comment Period:
            **Prompt: How do we operate and how are we evaluated?
      ii) 2 Department Model
         (1) Pros and Cons
         (2) Guiding Principles
         (3) Additional Comment Period:
            **Prompt: How do we operate and how are we evaluated?
      iii) 3 Department Model
         (1) Pros and Cons
         (2) Guiding Principles
         (3) Additional Comment Period:
            **Prompt: How do we operate and how are we evaluated?

2) Discussion: What can we learn from our current situation?
   a) Leadership - How do you see leadership with each model?
   b) Integration – How might you see program integration with each model?
   c) Land Grant Mission - How do you envision teaching, research, and service with each of these models?

***Please take the opportunity to fill out the anonymous questionnaire in the link below:
https://uidaho.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_0H5pIVmaWb44UQZ
I. CHARGE:
The Faculty of the College of Art & Architecture at the University of Idaho was charged with a need to determine models of integration, with budgetary constraints, best-suited to meet the needs of all programs: Architecture, Art and Design, Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture, and Virtual Technology and Design. The following report describes the charge, the committee’s process, and recommendations to move forward.

II. TIMELINE & CHARGE ITEMS: 04/23/2020 - 05/28/2020
1. Tasks identified - need for change and determination of change
2. Possibilities: Greater integration, depth of leadership opportunities, less committee work, etc.
3. Concerns: Loss of Autonomy, loss of identity, loss of voices heard from individuals within the College of Art & Architecture
4. Financial Considerations: extremely tight budget and reorganization is part of the plan
5. Timeline: 4.5 weeks; may require SBOE/NWCCU notification or approval; October 1 deadline if this approval is required

Figure 1. Conceptual Diagram of the CAA current model. This diagram illustrates the pillars of CAA and the integrated cores and foundations synthesizing strengths and opportunities within the College.
III. PROCESS
A Delphi Method was used to assess current understandings, evaluate threats and opportunities, and established consensus among committee members. The results of this process intend to inform ACT and the Dean of the College of Art & Architecture. The Delphi Method aims to iteratively collect feedback from committee members through iterative survey instruments and verbal statements made during committee meetings. This method was selected as it is a systematic method for obtaining, exchanging, and developing informed opinions on an issue which can potentially inform consensus from a group (Landeta, 2006; Kittell-Limerick, 2005; Listone, 1975).

Figure 2. Ad Hoc Committee Process Diagram. The Committee utilized the Delphi process to inform scenarios and their implications based on iterative survey instruments.

IV. SCENARIOS
a. SCENARIO 1: IMPLEMENTED INTEGRATION OF CURRENT MODEL
   i. **Description:** Improved Current Model with strategic planning; find/create efficiencies through improved integration
      - 5 programs
      - Eliminate $40K - $67K in stipend spending
      - Remainder of stipends pooled and shared 5 ways or other revision of stipend distribution
      - One Department w/ 5 program heads
   ii. **Pros**
      - Straightforward Solution
      - Retains Program Autonomy
      - Allows for self-determined program growth as identified in strategic planning efforts
   iii. **Cons**
      - Smaller programs may be endangered - perceived to be more so than is actually the case; small programs are not protected by department structure
      - Lack of depth
      - Larger amount of pressure on chairs - Lack of balance with Program head
      - Programs are Autonomous but separate in decision-making
iv. **Guiding Principles: Improvements and Solutions to Address Issues & Weaknesses**

**NOTE:** Solutions are meant to inform decision-making and strategies forward. These solutions are not meant to be prescriptive but rather for aspirational guidance.

- **FIRST STEP:** Need for implementation strategy for integration
  - Increased shared teaching/instruction – need for foundations – reassignment of roles, structures; expand cross-disciplinary course offerings and delivery where there is disciplinary overlap
  - Crucial to look at strengths of faculty, bylaws and policies that we have

- Need for addressing misconceptions/ issues with current model

- Potential for Associate Dean Roles (e.g. Assoc. Dean of Research, Assoc. Dean of Instruction, Assoc. Dean of Student Affairs, etc.)
  - Assoc. Dean can provide oversight over all programs
  - Provide insight for integration
  - Shared responsibilities
  - Mapping Benefits of Entire College
  - Possibly Rotating Roles/ Responsibilities – (e.g. college-based integration strategies)

- **BUDGET:** Sliding Scale of Stipends per Program

- Integrated Core Areas
  - New Degrees, Certificate Programs
  - Non-professional UG degree that could be a feeder to grad programs

- Need for keeping program autonomy & retaining/ operationalizing faculty resources

- Find cross-college efficiencies as a strategy

b. **SCENARIO 2: TWO DEPARTMENT MODEL**

i. **Pros**

- Logical Solution (JUSTIFICATION: combined strengths, similar definitions)
- Shared/Similar Accrediting bodies in the case of Art, Design, VTD; not true of Arch, IAD, LA
- Boise programs retain connectivity
- Shared concepts, ideas – possibilities for recruitment, retainment, grad opportunities
- Opportunities for coordination/alignment (curriculum, seminars, organization, etc.)
- organizes us in Arts and sciences (BS, BA .. etc)

ii. **Cons**

- Feared loss of autonomy
- Each program acting as an armature: ie. Overarching curriculum decisions
- Question of amount of savings - program administrators are still needed for certain accredited programs
- Interdisciplinary Collaboration may be hindered
- Influence recruitment and retention – would all programs receive equal focus in recruiting efforts?
- Fiscal issues may impact Faculty Cohorts
- Impedes on total college integration
• Loss of discipline-based connections to alums, professional groups could impact fundraising, student activities and opportunities
• gives a logical line to cut in the future, not a unified group. one in the future may receive preference

iii. **Guiding Principles: Solutions/Stipulations**
• bylaws must be set, accreditation standards/ considerations
• Areas of Concentration, Emphasis Areas (SWARM Model) – but with teeth - “At Home” – Emphasis Area, Area of Concentration
• Consideration of what the home base is for accreditation standards
• Scheduled Thematic Seminars
• Crucial to look at strengths of faculty, bylaws and policies that we have
• Faculty fatigue consideration – Strategy to reduce teaching loads

c. **SCENARIO 3: THREE DEPARTMENT MODEL**
   i. **Description:**
   • Three Departments
   • Each Department contains multiple Programs
   • 3 chairs | multiple program heads | possible Associate Chair
   ii. **Pros**
   • Added value for student success (well-rounded integrated education) – Preparing creative professionals
   • Shared balance – more equal representation of all programs
   • Visibility and branding
   • Allows for integration of other units (across the university e.g. theatre)
   • Maintains experience / knowledge base for accreditation, and administrative capacity for each program’s strategic planning
   iii. **Cons**
   • Added cost (3 chairs, Associate dean)
   • More work for program chairs and associate dean
   • Not a unified group. one in the future may receive preference or be exposed to risk

V. **RECOMMENDATION for NEXT STEPS**
   a. **Proposal for Academic Year 2020 – 2021**
   i. Ad Hoc Committee as standing committee for **FALL 2020 & SPRING 2021**
   ii. **PROPOSED AGENDA:**
      1. Analyze Risks, Opportunities and costs per Scenario
      2. Determine Implementation Strategy
      3. Create Phased Strategic Plan

Sources:
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Thank you for everyone’s engagement in this process. It has been a long one, beginning with a desire to work more efficiently within the university and college by moving to departments, followed by the need to address our budget reduction. We are now nearing completion and looking forward to meeting our goals of:

1. Increasing efficiency within the University structure
2. Addressing our college need to decrease committee work, and enhance opportunities for leadership development
3. Budget Reduction commitment

Leadership:
Once a structure (2 or 3 department mode and the programs that make up each one) is determined we will follow the Faculty Staff Handbook and our CAA Bylaws for determining Department Chairs and Program Heads/Coordinators:

Department Chairs

_Determination Process_

Department Chairs are confirmed by the Dean based on nominations from the unit committee with approval by the Provost, See E-4. SELECTION OF PERMANENT ADMINISTRATOR, for detailed procedure.

Responsibilities

_E-1. RESPONSIBILITIES_. The administrator of a school, division, or department (i.e., the first organizational unit below the college level) is responsible for interpreting university and college objectives and policies for the faculty of the unit and, through leadership, ensuring faculty participation in formulating and carrying out the unit’s policies within the framework of the objectives and policies of the college and university. The role may be defined more specifically by the bylaws of each college, but it is understood that the general responsibility for leadership includes: assisting higher administration in the assignment (3240 A) and in the evaluation (3320 and 3340) of the services of each member of the unit’s faculty and staff; promoting effective leadership of personnel and management of departmental resources; providing leadership in the development and implementation of unit plans; providing for open communication with faculty and staff; fostering excellence in teaching, scholarship and outreach for faculty, student and staff in the department; effectively representing all constituents of the department; and continuing personal professional development in areas of leadership.

- Manage and develop position descriptions, annual performance evaluations, third year reviews and tenure and promotion recommendations in consultation with Program Heads
- Schedule classes, assign teaching, and assign classrooms when appropriate in consultation with Program Heads
- Assign graduate research and teaching assistantships in consultation with Program Heads
- Recruitment and Retention Management with support from Program Heads
- Other (to be determined)

Program Heads/Coordinators (title to be determined)

_Determination Process_
Nominations are solicited from the Department Chair from the program faculty.
Program Faculty submit nominees (one or more can be submitted).
Department Chair makes the determination in consultation with the Dean and the Provost.

Responsibilities to Include
Overarching goal is to meet the autonomy needs of accrediting bodies.
- Program leadership and management including curriculum development and management
- Budget and Personnel Management (significant influence in budget management and personnel management to include input in evaluations, hiring, and termination)
- Recruitment and Retention Management
- Accreditation reports and management
- Assessment planning and management
- Facility needs
- Other (to be determined)

Cost/Savings Estimates:
Based on our original leadership cost of $61,000 (for the past two years we have saved approximately $35,000 per year by reducing all program head salaries to $7,000) as we go forward with the Department Model each Department Chair will receive either $15,000 or $10,000 depending on the configuration of the department.

Cost Estimate for Two Department Structure
Department Chair Stipends: $15,000 ea. = $30,000
Program Director (name TBD) Stipends: $2,500* ea. = $12,500
Total Cost: $42,500 – Previous Stipends were 15% of base faculty salary holding position-$61,292 for FY21- Savings of $18,792 for new model.

Cost Estimate for Three Department Structure
Department Chair Stipends: $10,000 ea. = $30,000
Program Director (name TBD) Stipends: $2,500* ea. = $12,500
Total Cost: $42,500 – Previous Stipends were 15% of base faculty salary holding position-$61,292 for FY21- Savings of $18,792 for new model.

*Summer funds available for Program Heads/Coordinators for accreditation reports/visit preparation

Possible Scenarios:
The following are possible scenarios identified in our Town Hall and program meetings along with individual input. These scenarios are not listed in any order of preference nor do they reflect a name. Names of the departments will be submitted by the faculty of the departments and follow the curriculum change process.

Current Department Demographics (based on Fall Semester 2021 Institutional Dashboard):
Arch 287 students (-4 MSIAD) 11 faculty
Art + Design 93 students 10 faculty
IAD 97 students 3 faculty
LArch 34 students 5 faculty
VTD 112 Students (+4 MSIAD) 5 faculty
A. 2 departments split by NASAD Accreditation-
Department 1: Architecture and Landscape Architecture (318 students, 16 faculty)
Department 2: Art + Design, Interior Architecture and Design, Virtual Technology and Design 
(approximately 306 students, 18 faculty)

Or

B. 2 departments split by Professional Designation-
Department 1: Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Interior Architecture and Design (approx. 415 students, 19 faculty)
Department 2: Art + Design, Virtual Technology and Design (approx. 209 students, 15 faculty)

Or

C. 3 departments split by feedback-
Department 1: Architecture (283 students, 11 faculty)
Department 2: Art + Design (93 students, 10 faculty)
Department 3: IAD, Landscape Arch, and VTD (approx. 247 students; 13 faculty)

Or

D. 3 departments split by feedback-
Department 1: Architecture (283 students, 11 faculty)
Department 2: Art + Design and Virtual Technology and Design (approx. 209 students, 15 faculty)
Department 3: IAD and Landscape Arch (approx. 131 students; 8 faculty)

Anticipated Timeline:

January 21  Structure Determined, current Program Heads notify program faculty; All College Announcement

February 15  Department names determined, and Curriculum changes submitted to Provost's Office and Curriculum Committees

April 15     Department Chairs and Program Heads/Coordinators Determined

June 1       Approved by the SBOE

July 1       Department Structure and Bylaws in effect
2021 CAA Restructuring Survey of Staff and Faculty

- 2-Department Configuration 1
  1. Blank
  3. Architecture, Landscape Architecture
  4. Architecture
  6. Blank
  7. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design
  9. Architecture
  10. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design, Interior Architecture & Design
  11. Architecture
  12. Blank
  13. Architecture, Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design
  15. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  16. Architecture, Art + Design
  18. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  19. Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
  21. Architecture
  22. Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
  27. Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
  28. Landscape Architecture, Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design

- 2-Department Configuration 2
  1. Blank
  2. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  5. Architecture
  6. Blank
  7. Architecture, Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design
  8. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
10. Architecture, Landscape Architecture
12. Blank
13. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
15. Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
17. Blank
19. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
20. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
22. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
23. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
25. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
26. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design
27. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design
28. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design

- Potential Challenges?
  1. Blank
  2. Blank
  3. any changes to enrollment could off balance student to staff ratio
  4. Blank
  5. Blank
  6. Blank
  7. A) Feared loss of autonomy
     B) Each program acting as an armature: ie. Overarching curriculum decisions
     C) Question of amount of savings - program administrators are still needed for certain accredited programs
     D) Interdisciplinary Collaboration may be hindered
     E) Influence recruitment and retention – would all programs receive equal focus in recruiting efforts?
     F) Fiscal issues may impact Faculty Cohorts
     G) Impedes on total college integration
     H) Loss of discipline-based connections to alums, professional groups could impact fundraising, student activities and opportunities
     I) gives a logical line to cut in the future, not a unified group. one in the future may receive preference
8. Department 2 may have issues working through technology integration. Also, the name of the program is Virtual Technology & Design - not - Virtual Technology and Design.

9. The wide number of disciplines and faculty/curricular priorities in any configuration would be unwieldy. A two dept model is unnecessary and appears driven by a desire to consolidate chair positions in order to offer a higher stipend for each. The trade off benefits aren’t worth the trouble we shouldn’t determine chair stipends based on number of departments.

10. If one program is significantly larger than other(s) then the smaller program could feel marginalized. Personality differences in leadership could create challenges.

11. The restructure is unnecessary and detrimental to the college, its programs, faculty, staff, and students. The proposal creates two new administrative positions with no benefit. Under the restructure, faculty and staff would have a chair *and* a director with whom to address issues and opportunities. Program directors would ultimately have much the same responsibilities as they do currently but then have the additional administrative layer of a chair between themselves and the dean; faculty would have two such layers. The result will be a reduction in the clarity of each of the programs’ missions and goals and the unnecessary diffusion of leadership throughout the college. The restructure proposal is disruptive and counter-productive, all for a negligible cost savings, savings which could easily be accomplished by simply and equitably adjusting individual program administrative costs.

12. A. the two department option does not make any further saving comparing to the three department option.

   B. There will be many programs with different accreditation requirements are placed together within one department.

   C. Potentially, smaller unit in one department with larger unit may start to lose its autonomy and identity.

   D. The two department option makes our college look like a smaller unit in the eyes of the whole university community. This may bring potential risks when there is a push for reducing the college structures on campus during challenging times.

13. Blank

14. Blank

15. The only issue I can see with this is that Architecture is such a large program, that combining it with IAD and Larch would make it a large department. Therefore, making it more challenging to run (and over powering) than the other ones. I could also see it causing issues with the mentality of views. There is a certain attitude that some Architecture personnel have that might clash with IAD and Larch. In another way of thinking, it might encourage them to "play nice".

16. Personalities

17. We are one department now that is trying to function as 5 independent departments. The last all College meeting we held in 2020 discussing potential re-configuration we concluded that it would be in the College’s best interest to explore how to make one department work rather
than spend more money to divide programs. There has not been much effort to make this model work since the reformation of CAA and we should start here first.

The Department Chair of the 5 programs would function similarly to an Associate Dean level role working with the individual program heads to help administer our degree programs. All of our programs make significant impacts on the students experience but more work is needed to bring the faculty and curriculum together to reinforce this notion of design integration.

Challenges: Mutual Understanding across CAA, Academic Degree Bias, willingness to integrate. I see very little value in a two department model which has historically been the configuration of CAA prior to its dissolution into CLASS. I am not nostalgic and witnessed several issues of a two department model for power control of CAA resources. If we do go with a two department model I see no way around associating our Science based programs with each other from Art based programs which would significantly put Art in a disadvantage within the larger CAA. Integrated within one department shows we integrate Art into our Science and our Science into our Arts.

18. Blank

19. It is my understanding in conversation and from lived experience as former chair of VTD that VTD doesn't potentially want to combine with A+D because it might impact their grant-getting opportunities. While there is a wee modicum of truth in this, it was really more of a concern when Kyle was on faculty. I am not sure that is really a concern now.

Additionally, I think certain faculty view A+D as antiquated and a combination as problematic for their image. This, I argue, is short-sighted and not really true. There is actually some really interesting opportunities and A+D are eagerly using or want to use new media tools and techniques. A+D faculty have expressed genuine interest in working with VTD. Ironically, it is the VTD faculty unable to envision cool new opportunities.

For the other programs, I know that IAD and Landscape feel that they will be subsumed by Architecture and their needs will be lost.

20. At the college level, the challenge will depend greatly on the willingness of the Department Chairs to work constructively with the Dean to build and buy into a collective vision. Trust, respect and candid communication are key. At the department level, program rivalries could flare up until the anxiety of the unknown recedes. Department heads will have to lead faculty they don't know well. Trust will have to be developed. Faculty will take cues from their leaders on living into and developing the specifics of our new configuration. The potential for individual behavior undermining a collective vision exists. This is probably true no matter what our new configuration is. Inclusive visioning will be key. At the program level, I can imagine faculty venting concerns to the people they know best. Program directors will need to be good listeners and bring concerns to the Chairs.

21. CAA criteria for restructuring is mostly based in budget, number of faculty and students' numbers. Architecture has enough growth and demonstrated positive performance trend that it can stand as an autonomous Department-1. The TWO Department scenario diminishes autonomy of units merged and increases difficulty for a Department-2 Chair to manage the
diverse programs (all other units would need to be merged in order to keep Architecture as an autonomous unit). This scenario blurs the presence of leadership advocating for each merged program in CAA committees and diminishes the opportunities of diverse leadership in CAA and UofI overall.

22. The only potential problems I can imagine would be chain of command/administrative. How are decisions being made in relationship to each department. With two Chairs I could see some people feeling underrepresented. I really feel like this whole process really won’t change anything other than chain of command. If we have people in those positions that are willing to work with multiple departments and will listen and fight for the needs of department Heads under them I see no problems.

23. personality issues for some, differing tools, equipment, and space utilization in D2, leadership positions may have to develop the trust of newer managed programs

24. All three Arch disciplines continually stress that their professional accreditation standards have certain requirements for autonomy, though I have never seen any satisfactory evidence to this effect. Combining them will subvert this (if such policies exist). The coursework and scholarship adjacencies in VTD and Art + Design make sense for the design emphasis areas of the BFA program. However, the VTD program does not seem to see the value of fine arts coursework, despite the fact that guest speakers to the college routinely emphasize that the only students who are employable in these industries are those who can draw and paint as well as they think (despite whatever stellar technological acumen they might possess). Conversely, Art faculty might shy away from closer ties with designers and the design world. It also needs to be noted that there are gendered concerns within the college. VTD is a “boys club” of a male majority student population with 100% male faculty. IAD, conversely, has the opposite student population and nearly the same opposite faculty situation. Granted, there are long-standing intrinsic cultural biases around interior “decorating” being “woman's work” and “virtual games” being “for boys.” We know this is not true and it is less and less true with each passing graduating class. Still, this remains an elephant in the room within our college. More diverse faculty across the board will help shape, in time, a more diverse student population. On the topic of gender, VTD projects (at times subtly, and at other times more directly) a position that the fine arts are also “woman's work” and that combining with Art + Design will “feminize” their department.

25. Blank

26. I foresee some initial hiccups determining who is doing what as faculty and staff get more accustomed to the way programs have been doing things. Finding new efficiencies and grace for each other always takes some time to strengthen, fortify and trust. But with this 2 department model, all get to learn to adapt together and I’ve always appreciated our College's resilience when asked to do so. I truly believe we can make this work well!

27. college challenges: only two departments, this is not a viable college. Visibility for programs is undermined. If the issue is to reduce committee work, there is reality no committee work reduction here since the representation on key committees will still be needed, for instance: curriculum committee, recruitment and retention, design days, tenure and promotion: all these
will still need representation from every program; serious issues of inequity occur, across the board; a program with major student number and faculty number is more in control of major decisions, of budget, even of numbers of students allowed to persist through the gates to second year (and beyond) as happened before.

28. Some faculty may feel in this configuration that they are losing their programs autonomy.

- Potential Benefits
  1. Blank
  2. This structure aligns with our Boise offerings of the Architecture fields. Also with accreditation and possible new fee structure for Professional Fees.
  3. More organization less hierarchy – hopefully
  4. Blank
  5. Blank
  6. Blank
  7. This configuration seems to align practice-based professions with similar (however completely different) accreditation standards. This configuration also appears to aggregate smaller programs to benefit the college as a whole.

Pros:
  a) Logical Solution (JUSTIFICATION: combined strengths, similar definitions)
  b) Shared/Similar Accrediting bodies in the case of Art, Design, VTD; Arch, IAD, LA
  c) Boise programs retain connectivity
  d) Shared concepts, ideas – possibilities for recruitment, retainment, grad opportunities
  e) Opportunities for coordination/alignment (curriculum, seminars, organization, etc.)
  f) Organizes us in Arts and sciences (BS, BA .. etc)

8. Not sure

9. None. This is a bad idea

10. Unforeseen opportunities occur when two or more programs merge. Staffing efficiencies.

11. I see no benefits to the college restructure proposed.

12. Blank

13. Blank

14. Blank

15. A benefit for having all the architecture programs in one department is that all those programs are offered in Boise. So it will be easier to group them together and advertise them together because potential and current students can visually group those together based off the idea that they are all related to architecture, and are all offered in Boise. Easy to remember.

Another benefit is that they are all similar fields, therefore will be able to work in the same mindset/vocabulary than students would if they were in Art + Design and VTD. Art + Design and VTD have similarities as well. Ever since there was talk about creating departments, this has seemed like the best option for programs to separate out.
This could also open the doorway to collaboration within the programs. Many students already minor or double major within these programs, it would be nice to see them collaborate more on projects and classes.

16. Integration of Disciplines

17. Benefits: Potential Budgetary savings by reducing redundancies across programs. Leadership within the Chair position who can more effectively distribute support across programs more equitably and bring stronger alignments between existing programs. Nothing really changes for any of the programs, but support can be more effective. Potentially reduces internal program conflicts by providing needed CAA leadership targeting integrated teaching, research, and creative scholarship. Everyone is listened to.

18. Blank

19. - VTD students are already increasingly taking art classes or are art minors
   - There is a substantial number of students who want to explore and create work that borrows from both programs
   - Recruiters (even those that have been brought to campus by VTD faculty) tell us that students really need good foundational art skills. Technology skills can be more easily taught on the job especially if they are using propriety software.
   - Many design courses—especially Interaction and Experience—should be required for VTD students
   - A combination of A+D and VTD re-establishes gender parity among faculty and students.

For the other, professional programs, a combination might be essential for eliminating redundant courses and promoting efficiencies.

20. Cost savings and equitable distribution of work are major benefits. At the college level this configuration strikes a balance between having an Associate Dean (it's like having two Co-Associate Deans) along with program-specific leadership. The economy of consolidating certain kinds of work towards the Chairs easily reconciles with program autonomy. There is potentially more opportunity to see commonalities among programs with licensing in this model. Also, with Interior Architecture and Design students fully subscribing to the Architecture Minor, this model makes sense. There is potential to see and cultivate more common ground between Art and Design and Virtual Technology and Design. Both programs have a range from work that is entertaining, emotional, and expressive to the other end which is data driven, rhetorically more objective, and informed by human behavior.

21. This configuration is only based in preserving Architecture as an autonomous unit and leadership presence due to its successful performance and growth as such. I do no see any benefit on merging all other units in one Department so this scenario of TWO Departments does not seem reasonable.

22. Benefits are cost savings and aligning programs that are most similar. I see potential for more collaboration also. If programs across the college are able to see what and how other departments work and what their needs are, I could really see this helping all areas grow.
23. the logic, naming, and numbers balance seems entirely reasonable. saves money, perhaps? would love to have additional staff support or crossover

24. At many other universities across the country, the Arch disciplines are within a single department. It is a natural and logical way to organize them; students in all three programs will be entering a unified workforce and networking environment. They will all someday work together at the same studios. VTD and Art + Design share NASAD accreditation, which is a very rational and easy sell to upper administration. VTD and Art + Design students, too, will be entering a unified workforce and networking environment. They will all someday work together at the same studios. Even students who choose to pursue a fine arts emphasis within their BFA, the majority of these graduates will at some point hold design jobs (and, like most creative professionals, probably night owl as one kind of practicing artist or another).

25. Blank

26. Through this configuration, I see strength for student programing both in and outside of classes. I believe faculty research opportunities that lead to student events and integrative course work will thrive more in this mix. Department 1, as show here, celebrates what happens in most firms and will also allow architecturally-minded students at early stages to better understand where they best fit in pursuing a particular degree. Department 2 can better support student’s more varied professional approaches to general making, storytelling, innovation in imaging, and portfolio output.

27. This could be a school, a named opportunity for the school; however, the programs within ought to maintain their autonomy. it focuses on licensed professional programs. could have some further collaborations, but these collaborations in the curriculum already happen.

28. This configuration will benefit all of our students. Architecture/IAD/LA students will benefit. Potentially Art + Design & VTD can collaborate for the benefit of all of our students. Art +Design will benefit with access to VTD classes such as world building, character design and use of software. This will be highly beneficial for many of students in their career as illustrators and story tellers. VTD students can benefit from physical classes in 2d/3d (observational drawing, ceramics, etc...) Through the observational world students can better create a virtual world.

- 3-Department Configuration 1
  1. Architecture
  2. Architecture
  3. Architecture
  4. Architecture
  5. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
  6. Architecture
  7. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  9. Architecture
  10. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  11. Architecture
12. Architecture
13. Architecture, Landscape Architecture
14. Architecture, Landscape Architecture
15. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
16. Architecture, Art + Design
17. Architecture
18. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design
19. Architecture
20. Architecture
21. Architecture
22. Architecture
23. Architecture
24. Architecture
25. Architecture
26. Architecture
27. Architecture
28. Architecture

• 3-Department Configuration 2
  1. Art + Design, Virtual Technology and Design
  2. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
  3. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  4. Art + Design
  5. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  6. Art + Design
  7. Art + Design
  8. Art + Design
  9. Art + Design
  10. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
  11. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
  12. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
  15. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
  16. Virtual Technology & Design, Landscape Architecture
  17. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  18. Architecture
  19. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  20. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  21. Art + Design
  22. Art + Design
  23. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design
  24. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
  25. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
26. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design
27. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
28. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design

- 3-Department Configuration 3
  1. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture and Design
  2. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  3. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design
  5. Architecture
  7. Architecture
  8. Virtual Technology & Design
  10. Architecture
  11. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  12. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design
  13. Virtual Technology & Design
  14. Virtual Technology & Design
  15. Architecture
  16. Interior Architecture & Design
  17. Art + Design
  18. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design
  19. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design
  20. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
  23. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design
  25. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design
  26. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design
  27. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  28. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design

- Potential Challenges?
  1. Blank
  2. Blank
  3. Possible risk of hierarchy
  4. Blank
  5. Blank
  6. Each program must still be responsible for their own faculty evaluations, curriculum and budget.
  7. A) Added cost (3 chairs, Associate dean)
     B) More work for program chairs and associate dean
C) Not a unified group. one in the future may receive preference or be exposed to risk

8. Overall approval from the College.

9. This has been proposed at multiple points and there does not appear to be consensus among programs who will be joined together about how they would operate. At some point, the decision will have to be made and the combined departments will need to sort this out. The three department configuration should maintain the same stipend for chairs as the two department configuration. The work load in any scenario is worth the $15,000.

10. Personality differences in leadership could create challenges.

11. The restructure is unnecessary and detrimental to the college, its programs, faculty, staff, and students. The proposal creates three new administrative positions with no benefit. Under the restructure, faculty and staff would have a chair *and* a director with whom to address issues and opportunities. Program directors would ultimately have much the same responsibilities as they do currently but then have the additional administrative layer of a chair between themselves and the dean; faculty would have two such layers. The result will be a reduction in the clarity of each of the programs' missions and goals and the unnecessary diffusion of leadership throughout the college. The restructure proposal is disruptive and counter-productive, all for a negligible cost savings, savings which could easily be accomplished by simply and equitably adjusting individual program administrative costs.

12. Blank

13. Blank

14. Blank

15. The only challenge I see with this model is trying to coordinate three departments. Two are easier than three.

One other thing is it would mean there are two departments in Boise, and that might seem unnecessary for the amount of years we provide for students there. It might seem like we have more there than we do. That is just an assumption though.

16. I don’t think a 3 dept model will work

17. Budgetarily we will be adding three department Chairs with potentially some level of program head responsibilities for Department B. Faculty buy-in, marketing to make sure we can best explain our mission and vision under this new model. Power struggles between departments.

18. Blank

19. This 3-program model doesn't really take advantage of the connectivity that could happen within the professional programs. In particular, IAD and architecture. Also, one could argue that this doesn't prepare students for real-world work environments where everybody is working in the same office in collaborative manner regardless of discipline. This seems also to (perhaps) assuage certain personalities but the decision should be made based on what is really best for the students in the long term. Another issue is that when the next economic downturn happens, Architecture will be by itself and that may be somewhat problematic if numbers of students are important. Architecture’s boom may or may not last.

20. With this configuration, I can imagine Architecture acting a little too independently from the college. A respectful relationship between the Program Chair and the Dean would be key. A strong program level leader might help complement the dynamics in this program. At the department level, the challenges will be to navigate the unknowns in the new configurations. Developing trust and collective vision will be key. Asserting program autonomy will be key. Making a clear division of labor and responsibilities between Chairs and program level
leadership will be important. There is quite a bit of variation in the current culture of how each program distributes work.

21. As CAA restructuring seems only based on budget, number of students & faculty in units, criteria for a scenario merging the other programs (and keeping Architecture as a separate Department Unit) is based on selecting one of the two provided by feedback in the CAA document shared. It is going to be a challenge for a Department-3 Chair as proposed to address the diverse processes involved in these very distinct programs. To address the fact that some programs might be too small today (based on faculty and student numbers) to work as independent units (departments) due to costs involved in leadership, there should be a more clear threshold on what are the minimum requirements across the university. Each discipline has the potential to function better as an autonomous unit with leadership presence at the college level. The potential should be assessed beyond actual numbers and focus on future scenarios of growth and development for these disciplines in the state of Idaho/US/Global. Collaborations among disciplines emerge when there are common projects individuals agree on engaging with not through a forced merging process based on budget/efficiency priorities.

22. Really are we saving enough with this configuration and are we just creating more work for the administrators? Also there is less equality with students and faculty

23. less balance in numbers yet more identity (+ autonomy?) for certain programs territoriality issues?

24. Same comments apply as above

25. Blank

26. I worry that students needing to shifting their major in the territory of Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Interior Architecture and Design will have less support than they should in this arrangement (I believe the 2 Department Model addressed above is strongest). I also worry that Architecture (or any program not blended in this transformation), left alone, will feel even more diversive and uncollaborative, than they do now. AND I want to state that I don't actually believe Architecture dosen't or can't work well with others (they are actually quite collaborative), but in being allowed to be separate, we've all had the ability to become insular and avoidant of playing well with others. Strong leadership would be needed to force a sense of balance when one program gets to stay the same and others have to adapt. I think this would be a difficult, unneeded challenge to take on in this transition.

27. Need to change the name of the college, this is essential since now the name could be misleading on the outside; when a third department exists but the name of the college only for the other two departments it becomes an issue of invisibility and inequity. Can impact recruitment, retention, and recognition of the third department. Structural injustice or ill representation Some issues about one of the restructure due to faculty resisting it due to separation for arts and sciences. Need to avoid "stepchild" any program, there is a great likelihood for that to occur here. undermines some of the great rebranding efforts that have been ongoing and proven successful in terms of programmatic identity, recruitment, retention (for example as with IAD).

28. Architecture will have little incentive to collaborate with others.

- Potential Benefits?
  1. Blank
  2. Blank
  3. Better balance of responsibilities
4. Blank 
5. Blank 
6. Blank 
7. A) Added value for student success (well-rounded integrated education) – Preparing creative professionals 
   B) Allows for integration of other units (across the university e.g. theatre) 
   C) Maintains experience / knowledge base for accreditation, and administrative capacity for each program’s strategic planning 
8. Integrated projects between Architecture, IAD and Landscape. Opportunity for program growth and Identity branding (Art & Design - VTD) 
9. This arrangement balances faculty numbers, allows programs with fewer faculty to share service and administrative responsibilities, and limits the number of disciplines in each, without making any program unduly large in comparison to the rest of the college. 
10. Unforeseen opportunities occur when two or more programs merge. Large programs can operate more effectively without compromising smaller programs. Staffing efficiencies. 
11. I see no benefits to the college restructure proposed. 
12. A. Based on the existing circumstance, this may be the best way to balance our existing resources with our student sizes among different programs. 
   B. This option makes disciplines with similar needs and similar size together, which can make the use of resources more efficiently. 
   C. Smaller department size can reduce the chance of potential internal conflicts. The small units in a department will have better chance to retain its autonomy and identity. 
   D. The three department option provides more opportunity for more departments in the future when certain growth of our college can achieve. 
13. Blank 
14. Blank 
15. The benefits to this model is that all are about equal in amount of students per department. This means resources and funding would be similar for each, so there would be less arguments and disagreements with how they are dispersed. This would also help with the fact that Architecture is growing so much, and they would be able to just focus on them and not have to worry about another program. 
16. Blank 
17. CAA excels in three areas, Art, Architecture and Virtual Design that all focus on visual communication. We have four programs that are Science based with 1 program being Art based. This aligns programs to their associated academic responsibilities. Architecture is large enough to function as a small department and can retain autonomy. Art can continue to focus on BFA and MFA opportunities for the College since they are the only Art based degree program
and has different outcomes concerning service from the other programs. Associating LA, IAD and VTD (Virtual Technology and Design) together compliments each other through research and has natural meeting points for integration for students. Lighting, Environmental, Industrial design emphasis can be supported while sharing similar design affordances concerning space and place making. The students would be better aligned under this model (my opinion).

18. Blank

19. Landscape and IAD can be free from the constraints that a combination with Architecture might impose. Architecture could continue as it own entity.

20. This would be a smaller incremental step in our evolution. It might be less shocking to the system.

21. This configuration is only based in preserving Architecture as an autonomous unit and leadership presence due to its successful performance and growth as such and addressing the budget/efficiency priority concern defined by UofI & CAA leadership which limits to a 3 Department scenario. I do not agree on merging these three disciplines proposed in Department-C as they have better chances of potential of growth if left as autonomous units with leadership development (e.g. recent hires showing trends of contributing to program growth).

22. I honestly do not see how the three department configuration will benefit the college. I see us keeping the same old silos that we have always sworn this college doesn't have. We have talked about how being integrated has been a great selling point and how Alumni are proud of that. I don't feel like the idea of collaboration or integration is very strong in our college anymore

23. One doesn't want to get lumped and lost nor isolated and withered...

I don't know what the answers are, but I think paying program heads according to a students served metric is more equitable than the current model.

24. Same comments apply as above, although this arrangement better balances student and faculty numbers.

25. Blank

26. I think early on Landscape Architecture and Interior Architecture and Design will feel stronger in regard to having a seat at the table, but I also believe this feeling will be short lived and the perceived power of architecture will settle back and feel much the same as it does now soon enough.

27. The IAD + Env Design/Larc department can also have the great naming opportunity, can be the seed for a near-future school for the environment, with the potential of adding planning to the mix, and facilities management; this is a licensed professional department (the programs within are licensed professional programs), there are significant synergies and alignments between the two programs (IAD+Env Design/Landscape Architecture) including teaching alignments, service alignment, research/scholarship alignment, and professional
outreach. (certification/license, sustainable sites initiative, LEED, Well Building, stakeholder involvement, multiscalar, service-learning, place-based, ..etc. SYNERGIES - Human-centered focus and a shared body of knowledge
Shared- embodiments fo the land grant mission. Reviews and Professional Pool for sponsored professionally aligned studios; and Italy Studio. Discussions and some collaborative work have already begun.
Also, for BIAD + Env Design/Larc the multiscalar opportunity: scale from intimate to exponentially larger, can be an exciting opportunity to explore what else to add or investigate. Plus the shared theoretical and programmatic body of knowledge focusing on environmental design is a critical asset. This BIAD+LARC/Env design allows these programs to maintain their identity and cohesiveness to the internal and external stakeholders; currently exploring ideas about super studio across the two programs, build on collaborative and visionary efforts underway and on significant enrollment and recruitment success in BIAD, and enable IAD to have a direct path to related graduate degree. Can have a great opportunity for professional outreach locally and globally.
Accreditation for IAD (undergraduate-CIDA) and LARC (graduate-LAAP) can afford the interesting seamless scenario here too, and those two accreditation have more in common (especially about HLSW, research, etc) than with others.
VTD+ART share the same body of knowledge can broaden their offering by coalescing BA /Bs/BFA/Ms/MFA; can focus financials and efforts of faculty to deliver needed courses across the two related fields.

28. Blank

- Any Further Thoughts or Concerns? Indicate Preference Here
  1. 3 departments
  2. Prefer two Department Structure for CAA
  3. I prefer the 3-department configuration
  4. Concerns: too many to mention here.
  5. This process has gone on far too long.
  6. Of the choices, a 3 department configuration is preferable.
  7. Thank you for framing this. I’m slightly drawn towards the two-department model: IAD + LA + ARCH; VTD + A&D. However, whatever the configuration, I’m sure we’ll all adapt and adjust quickly. Thanks again and looking forward to next steps!
  8. 3 Department Model (Architecture, IAD, Landscape --- VTD --- Art&Design). Some of these combinations could drastically enhance or atrophy the growth and potential of the programs. I would highly recommend looking at this reorganization from a marketing standpoint. What combinations make the most sense internally and externally? How will incoming students find their people, their home, their community?
  9. I strongly prefer the 3 department arrangement.
  10. I prefer the three programs.
  11. I am against the restructuring of the college. Combining programs and adding a chair will not alleviate the critical necessity, nor responsibility, of directing each of those programs. The proposed addition of administrative chair positions is redundant, ineffective, and
unnecessarily disruptive. The anticipated cost savings are negligible and could easily be accomplished by more rational and equitable methods.

12. I consider the three department option offers more benefits than the two department option based on existing circumstance. It can reduce possible conflicts within our disciplines and also prepare us better for possible growth in the future. This structure can be easier and more efficient for the college to administer the resources according to different needs.

13. I trust the administration to develop a fair model. I defer to Randy and Dean Corry as to how to integrate other programs with Architecture.

14. Configuration 2

15. I would prefer to have the two departments rather than the three.

16. New configurations

17. At this stage we need to seriously make the one department model work. Two in my opinion is the most dangerous model to explore as it would significantly impact the Arts in a negative way. The only other option I see is the Three department model where we can "stay the same" for Architecture and Art, but allows for innovation and integration within Design for VTD, IAD and the Environmental Design program.

18. I prefer the program that makes the most sense for students in the courses and that faculty have the most overlap in helping students with discipline-specific skills and professional opportunity.

19. The issue of saving money is important and that is fundamentally why we are doing this exercise. But the opportunity changes like this afford shouldn't be discounted. As we move forward, it is best, I believe, to really explore beyond disciplines and look at the potential of where the markets will be in a few years. Junior faculty often are better at seeing this and are eager to make new things happen. They just want the administrative nod and they will make it work!

20. I believe we are ready for a two department model. This is my preference. With program level leadership, and respectful and collaborative leadership from the Chairs, I anticipate being able to maintain program autonomy that is required for individual curricular authority, program identity and accreditation.

21. I was surprised that this topic (on-going survey) was not mentioned during our CAA Spring meeting this semester. I am concerned the "Great Colleges to Work for Survey" process will be managed in a similar way as it was also allowed very few minutes in the CAA Spring meeting agenda for discussion. These are some of the most processes with topics that will have high impacts for years to come.

22. "B. 2 departments, split by Professional Designation-
Department 1: Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Interior Architecture and Design (app 415 students, 19 faculty)
Department 2: Art + Design, Virtual Technology and Design (approx. 209 students, 15 faculty)"

This make the most sense in every way. Anyone in marketing would love to be able to sell this.

23. I think 2 depts. makes the most sense (as listed by architectures and designs in titles)... would 2 dept heads become more like associate deans (which we need) but at the same time shunt a bulk of the work off to the relatively less well compensated program heads???
There would be so much less incentive to do that job (all the work in the trenches, yet always answering to another level and with less monetary compensation, or administrative rank.)

I would consider restructuring compensation levels to make program heads somewhat attractive and lessen some of the department head bonuses with the title/role being something of its own reward.

Some of our staff are outstanding, others, less so... I think more shared roles for what a person is suited toward could come of this (and I’ll offer details or suggestions if needed).

24. If the primary goal is to save money by reducing the number of program heads, then two departments is better than three. Honestly, this seems like a poor motivation for any kind of reorganization. Any such move should be made in the students’ interests, and the students’ interests only. That is why I have chosen these models; they make the most sense to me from the student perspective. Perhaps I am naive in this, but my primary focus is on the career viability of our graduates. That’s the only reason why I teach the material I teach in the first place. How hireable are our graduating seniors? Period. Combining the Arch disciplines should (with proper shepherding and modeling from faculty) produce more successful graduates. The same goes for a combined Virtual Technology, Art + Design department. What I think we need to be extremely, extremely cautious about is reorganizing for our faculty’s interests and (more pointedly) for the interests of any particular individuals. This new college structure might still be here in 20 years. It might outlast us all. It’s irrational and shortsighted to make any decisions whatsoever based on the individuals involved. People leave. People retire. People die. Whatever new organizational chart the college agrees upon, it should be conceived with every chair on it empty.

25. 2 departments

26. I prefer the 2 department configuration. We are already a small College expressing overwhelm in regard to having too much to do. At least with this structure 7 faculty will take on a leadership rule instead of the 8 faculty that would play roles in the 3 department configuration. We need as many faculty as we can really pursuing their research if we want to remain strong in a University seeking Research 1 status. The 2 department configuration taxes one less person.

27. The amounts of funds being saved are minimal across all scenarios.

This while at the same time administrative staff is removed from the department and is serving at the college; there are insurmountable responsibilities for a department head and a program head to complete, while also trying to address teaching, advising, outreach, and scholarship without the direct support of an administrative assistant.

Allow the programs that are willing to step in right now and change to do so without having to create major college reorganization, for instance, the ongoing IAD+LARC conversations can yield very interesting fruition if allowed to move forward without forcing another program in, or having to create upheaval, simply because the programs know there is something they themselves are working toward; this might mean we will have four departments, with expectations of growing being put on each of the departments Department heads or program heads also have an additional administrative role, for instance: associate dean of students, associate dean of faculty, associate dean of outreach/etc; this while reducing their teaching load and making them abide by the reduced
teaching load (no three courses, for instance, speaking from the personal story). This will
distribute the load, make us as a college very present in all of the important realms, does
not put the power in the hands of one associate dean or one department, and engage us all
in the collective of what we are here for the students, faculty, staff, and community.
curriculum, recruitment, accreditation remain in hands of programs.
Revisit a college core, that is vertical; also, Need to have the foundation be the human-
centered foundation, where art, culture, and other parts fo environment are integrated.
28. I prefer the 2 department option
Program Resource Requirements.

- Indicate all resources needed including the planned FTE enrollment, projected revenues, and estimated expenditures for the first four fiscal years of the program.
- Include reallocation of existing personnel and resources and anticipated or requested new resources.
- Second and third year estimates should be in constant dollars.
- Amounts should reconcile subsequent pages where budget explanations are provided.
- If the program is contract related, explain the fiscal sources and the year-to-year commitment from the contracting agency(ies) or party(ies).
- Provide an explanation of the fiscal impact of any proposed discontinuance to include impacts to faculty (i.e., salary savings, re-assignments).

### I. PLANNED STUDENT ENROLLMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. New enrollments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Shifting enrollments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Enrollment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. New Appropriated Funding Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Institution Funds</td>
<td>$28,280.00</td>
<td>$28,930.00</td>
<td>$29,040.00</td>
<td>$29,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. New Tuition Revenues from Increased Enrollments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other (i.e., Gifts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$28,280</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$28,930</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ongoing is defined as ongoing operating budget for the program which will become part of the base.*

*One-time is defined as one-time funding in a fiscal year and not part of the base.*
### III. EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Personnel Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Graduate/Undergrad Assistants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Research Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Directors/Administrators</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Administrative Support Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>$6,820</td>
<td>$6,930</td>
<td>$7,040</td>
<td>$7,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel and Costs</strong></td>
<td>$28,820</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$28,930</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2024 On-going</th>
<th>FY 2024 One-time</th>
<th>FY 2025 On-going</th>
<th>FY 2025 One-time</th>
<th>FY 2026 On-going</th>
<th>FY 2026 One-time</th>
<th>FY 2027 On-going</th>
<th>FY 2027 One-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Operating Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Professional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Materials and Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rentals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Materials &amp; Goods for Manufacture &amp; Resale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2024 On-going</td>
<td>FY 2024 One-time</td>
<td>FY 2025 On-going</td>
<td>FY 2025 One-time</td>
<td>FY 2026 On-going</td>
<td>FY 2026 One-time</td>
<td>FY 2027 On-going</td>
<td>FY 2027 One-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Capital Outlay</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Library Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Outlay</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2024</td>
<td>FY 2025</td>
<td>FY 2026</td>
<td>FY 2027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Capital Facilities</strong></td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction or Major Renovation</strong></td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Other Costs</strong></td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Repairs</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Total Other Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$28,820</td>
<td>$28,930</td>
<td>$29,040</td>
<td>$29,150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES:</strong></td>
<td>$28,820</td>
<td>$28,930</td>
<td>$29,040</td>
<td>$29,150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Income (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td>-$540</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Notes (specify row and add explanation where needed; e.g., “I.A.,B. FTE is calculated using…”):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Current General Education Funds within the College of Art and Architecture will shift to provide a $10,000 Administrative Stipend Per AY for the Department of Design Chair. Three Program Director Stipends per AY included for the three programs at $4,000 per program. A small increase in Fringe Benefits is factored in for FY25-27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*All other blank sections are not applicables since CAA is only changing administrative leadership structure all other program costs will remain the same.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Instructional and Administrative Units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Proposal Submission:</th>
<th>March 1, 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution Submitting Proposal:</td>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of College, School, or Division:</td>
<td>College of Art and Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Department(s) or Area(s):</td>
<td>Art and Architecture Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Proposed Unit</td>
<td>Department of Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Implementation Date:</td>
<td>July 1, 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicate whether this request is either of the following:**

- [X] New Administrative Unit (name change)
- [ ] New Instructional Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Dean</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Research (as applicable)</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Dean (as applicable)</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSBE Program Manager/IDCTE Director, Program Services</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FVP/Chief Fiscal Officer</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Administrator, IDCTE</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost/VP for Instruction</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Financial Officer, OSBE</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Academic Officer, OSBE</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBOE/Executive Director or Designee Approval</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Revised November 24, 2021*
1. What are the goals and objectives for the new unit?

The College of Art and Architecture (CAA) has a unique organizational structure within the context of the University: it is composed of one department (Department of Art and Architecture) that includes five programs (Architecture, Art + Design, Interior Architecture and Design, Landscape Architecture, and Virtual Technology and Design). This organization was implemented in 2012 to encourage collaboration and integration; however, this structure has not been efficient for important University procedures and processes, such as those initiated by the Registrar’s Office, Enrollment Management, the Provost’s Office, and Institutional Assessment. In order to address these inefficiencies and initiate a governance structure that dovetails with the University structure overall (aligning the units of CAA with the rest of the units across campus) and to address the budget reduction implemented in 2020, CAA proposes restructuring from one broad department (Department of Art and Architecture) into three focused departments.

Proposed Structure:

1. Department of Art and Architecture (existing, name change submitted)

2. Department of Architecture (new department)
   Architecture program

3. Department of Art + Design (new department)
   Art + Design program

In addition to increasing alignment and efficiency with university and college processes additional goals for the restructuring include: 1) relieve faculty from small units (3 and 5 persons) from numerous service commitments and allow an increased focus on teaching and scholarship, 2) increase leadership opportunities within programs and departments, and 3) reduce administrative costs (the five-program model was supported with five program head stipends equivalent to department chair stipends).

The three-department model requires three department chair stipends along with two modest program director stipends resulting in a savings of approximately $10,708 (from the original stipend of 15% of base salary per program head for a total of $61,292 in FY 2021. The savings amount is factored on the current base salary plus a 15% administrative stipend, which would be $65,708). Our new three-department model will cost an estimated $55,000.

This proposal is to change the name of the existing Department of Art and Architecture to the Department of Design. The department will have 15 faculty (12 instructional and 3 research focused). Administrative support is centrally provided by the college office.

Objectives are:

1. Greater efficiencies within the university system. Currently as one large department, university systems including Banner do not always acknowledge individual programs and data is not readily available. An attempt was made over three years ago to address this issue with various administrative offices on campus including the Registrar’s and Institutional Assessment. However, with the current operating systems it was not feasible to support CAA’s unique
needs.

2. With smaller faculty size leadership opportunities are limited to tenured faculty, and this change allows for a tenured faculty member to serve as a Department Chair (taking on the responsibility of university processes including Promotion and Tenure and Annual Evaluations) while an untenured faculty may serve as a Program Director and focus on curriculum design, content, and accreditation requirements.

3. Support CAA budget reduction (reducing total college leadership costs by $10,708).

2. **What is the relationship of the unit to the university’s mission and priorities? Is the unit involved in instruction and if so, to what extent?**

The programs of the Department of Design are central to the mission and priorities of the university with emphasis in providing innovative thinking, community engagement and transformative education. With hands-on studio programming, students become adept at problem solving through the design process.

The department also supports the university’s vision through expanding the institution’s reach and capacity for economic impact and accessibility to qualified students of all backgrounds.

The department is also integral to **CAA’s Vision and Mission:**

**Vision**
The College of Art and Architecture strives to empower the next generation of artists and designers to positively impact a rapidly changing world and one of the fastest growing states in the nation. We design with communities and industry partners, we conduct hands-on research, and we infuse our work with empathy, storytelling, placemaking and the utmost creativity.

**Mission**
Delivering on the university’s land-grant mission, the College of Art and Architecture contributes to the well-being of statewide and global communities through innovative design education that safeguards sustainability, economic resiliency, cultural vibrancy and the common good. Our faculty and graduates’ leading-edge work emerges from an arts foundation and strong commitment to design integration — and results in built, cultural, natural, and virtual environments that enrich our communities and our world.

The programs within the proposed Department of Design are involved with instruction and offer 3 undergraduate degrees and 1 graduate degree with a total of approximately 260 students majoring in programs within the department (7 graduate students and 253 undergraduate students). The programs in the Department of Design also instruct students outside of the department (students completing minors), and offers some general education coursework in the International, American Diversity and Approved Senior Experience categories.

3. **What is the demand for the unit’s services? What population will the unit serve?**

The **Interior Architecture and Design Program** (IAD) has statewide responsibility for Interior
Design education. Students learn to enhance life quality for all people through innovative, environmentally responsive, socially conscious, and culturally relevant design rooted in structural, scientific, architectural and design principles. Students learn to design interiors that protect the health, safety and welfare of occupants, and work with real-world partners to develop design solutions addressing critical needs and problems. One hundred percent of IAD students participate in community engagement and service-learning projects which translates to first-hand knowledge - tools and experience highly sought after in the workplace. The program offers the first two years of the degree at the U of I Boise Center and students also have the opportunity to complete a seamless BIAD/MArch degree as well.

The University of Idaho Landscape Architecture program draws students from around the world to study in one of the most diverse bioregions in the nation. Design studios present real-world projects where students and faculty work with community members to develop integrated design solutions that preserve and enhance rural and urban landscapes throughout Idaho and beyond. The program has statewide responsibility for landscape architecture education and both undergraduate and graduate students are sought after in both the Intermountain West and Pacific Northwest regions by leaders in the landscape industry.

Virtual Technology and Design graduates can apply their skills to a wide range of sectoral activities. In addition to a deep knowledge of digital tools and virtual technologies, VTD graduates are well trained to design and create applications for real life problems. The VTD program has been successful at teaching project management and leadership skills to students who will be involved in company projects in relationship to innovation, growth, and new business models. Graduates are storytellers capable of using the spectrum of digital media from flat to three dimensional models as well as immersive environments.

VTD graduates working at digital studios and large companies often create working demos and prototypes to communicate and present ideas and concepts. The content of products graduates develop range from education about safety, sustainable solutions to learn about environmental issues, apps and games for studios, gaming companies or entertainment. Their work can be found in virtual reality, animation studios, video gaming or internet companies. They have developed digital twins for simulation and training in the aerospace, maritime and energy utility sectors. Students are sought after in urban areas located in the Western states.

Degrees, Minors and Certificates within the department are:

- *Bachelor of Interior Architecture and Design* (B.I.A.D, CIDA accredited - the primary professional accreditation for the program, and is included in the institutional NASAD accreditation)
  
  Approximately 117 students

- *Interior Architecture and Design Minor* (18 credits)

- *Bachelor of Science in Landscape Architecture* (B.S.L.A.) changing to Bachelor of Science in Environmental Design (B.S.E.D.) beginning Fall 2023
  
  Approximately 21 students

- *Master of Landscape Architecture* (M.L.A, LAAB accredited degree)
Approximately 7 students

- Landscape Architecture Minor (18 credits)

- Bachelor of Science in Virtual Technology and Design (B.S.V.T.D., included in the institutional NASAD accreditation)

Approximately 115 students

- Virtual Technologies Undergraduate Academic Certificate (12 credits)

4. Describe the proposed unit’s organizational structure.

The unit will reside in the College of Art and Architecture and have one department chair and two program directors. *

*See attached CAA organizational chart.

5. What targets have been set to assess the proposed unit’s success in achieving objectives?

a. Institutional data sets from all areas including assessment, enrollment management, provost’s office, etc. will mirror other colleges in the university allowing for accurate comparisons.

b. Increased leadership opportunities and enhanced responsibilities with the department and program.

c. Continuing national accreditations from: 1) the Council for Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA), 2) the Landscape Architecture Accrediting Board (LAAB), and 3) the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD).

d. Budget reduction (reducing college leadership costs).

6. Briefly describe the processes that will demonstrate the quality of the unit.

• Development of student work that fulfills the standards of CIDA, LAAB, and NASAD accreditation assessment criteria
• Continued successful development and implementation of transformational learning experiences
• Successful increase in enrollment and percentage of degree completions
• Faculty success with the promotion and tenure process
• Winning regional, national, and international competitions
• Faculty recognized for their scholarship/research products
• Students securing employment within their field of choice
• Successful percentage of graduates completing NCIDQ and LARE certification exams for Interior Architecture and Design and Landscape Architecture

7. Indicate the number of students, businesses, industries, and/or other clients to be
served by this unit. Include a description of faculty participation and student involvement in the unit if applicable.

Approximately 260 students will be served by the Department of Design. The department will continue the statewide mission of two of the three programs to positively impact communities through service-learning/community outreach projects focusing on enhancing life quality through design; it will prepare, and graduate students poised to enter a thriving and competitive creative economy, and the interior architecture and design, landscape architecture, and virtual technology and design job markets.

Faculty are an integral part this preparation, offering rigorous discipline specific instruction and expertise in creative problem solving and “making” in design studios, virtual laboratories, and the classroom, developing transformative “real-world” learning experiences for students, and engaging in research focused on: environment and behavioral considerations of the built environment, the health, welfare, and safety of building and landscape users, the importance of interior and exterior materials, issues of sustainability, social consciousness, the power of rapidly changing technologies and human interface, scientific data modeling, and innovative AI design.

Students will be supported by faculty in developing required skills delivered through two professional curriculums and an evolving one. Students will participate in small- and large-scale research projects, service-learning opportunities, and entrepreneurial endeavors.

8. Financial Impact: Using the budget template, provide a narrative budget summarizing the needs and requirements for implementing the new unit.

This new unit will support increased efficiency, streamline university and college processes and result in a savings of $10,708 for the college (factored on the formula of 15% of program head base salary which today would equal $65,708). CAA chose to restructure based on academic needs, but also as part of our budget reduction plan in 2020.

Department Chair Stipends: 3 at $15,000 ea. = $45,000

Program Director Stipends for 3-unit department: 2 at $5,000 ea. = $10,000
Total Stipend Cost: $55,000

Previous program head stipends were 15% of the base faculty salaries of those serving in the positions for a total of $61,292 in FY21.

Refer to budget template for department and program budgets. Note: Fringe benefit costs are included in the attached budget template, but not included in the example above. A modest increase is included for each fiscal year represented.
## DEPARTMENT 1: ARCHITECTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orgn</th>
<th>Orgn Title</th>
<th>Vandal ID</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>V01212971</td>
<td>Teal, Randall</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Arch 151 Arch 361 Arch 423 Arch 499 Arch 520 Arch 574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>V01067601</td>
<td>Brehm, Matthew</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Arch 154 Arch 362 Arch 430 Arch 500 Arch 521 Arch 575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>V00646028</td>
<td>Carver, Owaine</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Arch 200 Arch 385 Arch 431 Arch 501 Arch 522 Arch 580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>V00007073</td>
<td>Haglund, Bruce</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Distinguished Professor</td>
<td>Arch 203 Arch 386 Arch 454 Arch 502 Arch 523 Arch 585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>V00806805</td>
<td>Hu, Xiao</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Arch 204 Arch 388 Arch 461 Arch 503 Arch 552 Arch 598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>V00503364</td>
<td>Lawrence, Scott</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Arch 243 Arch 400 Arch 463 Arch 504 Arch 553 Arch 599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>V00487886</td>
<td>Manrique Hoyos, Carolina</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Arch 253 Arch 405 Arch 466 Arch 505 Arch 554 Arch 599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>V00570103</td>
<td>Marshall, Anne</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Arch 254 Arch 410 Arch 466 Arch 510 Arch 556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>V00885543</td>
<td>Mead, Phillip</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Arch 257 Arch 411 Arch 464 Arch 511 Arch 558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>V00833746</td>
<td>Rakich, Amy</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Arch 266 Arch 416 Arch 475 Arch 514 Arch 568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>V00708592</td>
<td>Barakat, Hala</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Arch 353 Arch 421 Arch 483 Arch 516 Arch 570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## DEPARTMENT 2: ART & DESIGN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orgn</th>
<th>Orgn Title</th>
<th>Vandal ID</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00571516</td>
<td>Keim, Delphine</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Art 100 Art 205 Art 251 Art 322 Art 400 Art 495 Art 505 Art 598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00103062</td>
<td>Carter, Val</td>
<td>Instructor Faculty</td>
<td>Senior Instructor</td>
<td>Art 110 Art 211 Art 261 Art 323 Art 403 Art 497 Art 507 Art 599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00409540</td>
<td>Doyle, Joe</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Art 111 Art 213 Art 271 Art 330 Art 404 Art 498 Art 508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00659850</td>
<td>Gosse, Johanna</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Art 112 Art 216 Art 272 Art 340 Art 405 Art 499 Art 513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00553672</td>
<td>Gottwald, David</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Art 121 Art 217 Art 280 Art 350 Art 407 Art 500 Art 515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00404557</td>
<td>Isenbarger, Stacy</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Art 122 Art 221 Art 299 Art 360 Art 409 Art 501 Art 516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00864511</td>
<td>Johnson, Aaron</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Art 200 Art 222 Art 302 Art 370 Art 410 Art 502 Art 521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00486842</td>
<td>Sonnichsen, Michael</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Art 203 Art 231 Art 303 Art 373 Art 488 Art 503 Art 590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V01066717</td>
<td>Turner-Rahman, Gregory</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Art 204 Art 241 Art 321 Art 380 Art 490 Art 504 Art 597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>V00437001</td>
<td>McCleny, Lauren</td>
<td>Clinical Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Art 205 Art 243 Art 322 Art 380 Art 490 Art 504 Art 597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## DEPARTMENT 3: Department of Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orgn</th>
<th>Orgn Title</th>
<th>Vandal ID</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>867</td>
<td>Interior Architecture and Design</td>
<td>V00099906</td>
<td>Awwad-Rafferty, Rula</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>IAD 151 IAD 231 IAD 299 IAD 368 IAD 415 IAD 498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>867</td>
<td>Interior Architecture and Design</td>
<td>V00761104</td>
<td>De Silva, Tharique</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>IAD 152 IAD 244 IAD 332 IAD 400 IAD 417 IAD 499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>867</td>
<td>Interior Architecture and Design</td>
<td>V00004446</td>
<td>Anderson, Miranda</td>
<td>Clinical Faculty</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>IAD 200 IAD 254 IAD 344 IAD 403 IAD 443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>867</td>
<td>Interior Architecture and Design</td>
<td>V00844244</td>
<td>Conry, Shauna</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>IAD 203 IAD 181 IAD 351 IAD 404 IAD 451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>867</td>
<td>Interior Architecture and Design</td>
<td>V00437001</td>
<td>McCleny, Lauren</td>
<td>Clinical Faculty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>IAD 204 IAD 282 IAD 352 IAD 410 IAD 452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orgn</th>
<th>Orgn Title</th>
<th>Vandal ID</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>V00554101</td>
<td>Sini, Raffaela</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Larc 150 Larc 253 Larc 353 Larc 390 Larc 463 Larc 499 Larc 548 Larc 597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>V00984862</td>
<td>Alessa, Lillian</td>
<td>Research Faculty</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Larc 151 Larc 254 Larc 355 Larc 395 Larc 465 Larc 500 Larc 549 Larc 598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>V00430930</td>
<td>Klishay, Andrew</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Larc 154 Larc 288 Larc 358 Larc 400 Larc 480 Larc 501 Larc 554 Larc 599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Larc 200 Larc 289 Larc 363 Larc 403 Larc 481 Larc 502 Larc 555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Larc 203 Larc 289 Larc 364 Larc 404 Larc 488 Larc 503 Larc 556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Larc 204 Larc 299 Larc 365 Larc 440 Larc 489 Larc 504 Larc 558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Larc 210 Larc 310 Larc 380 Larc 441 Larc 491 Larc 510 Larc 562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Larc 251 Larc 340 Larc 382 Larc 453 Larc 495 Larc 512 Larc 564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Office 1</td>
<td>Office 2</td>
<td>Office 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRTUAL</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>Virtual</td>
<td>Technology and Design</td>
<td>V00553017</td>
<td>Gauthier, Jean-Marc</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRTUAL</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>Virtual</td>
<td>Technology and Design</td>
<td>V00008716</td>
<td>Cleveley, C.</td>
<td>Instructor Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRTUAL</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>Virtual</td>
<td>Technology and Design</td>
<td>V00011245</td>
<td>Anderson, John</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRTUAL</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>Virtual</td>
<td>Technology and Design</td>
<td>V00896441</td>
<td>Kurdi, Yomna</td>
<td>Regular Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRTUAL</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>Virtual</td>
<td>Technology and Design</td>
<td>V00776745</td>
<td>Bird, Rayce</td>
<td>Clinical Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRTUAL</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>Virtual</td>
<td>Technology and Design</td>
<td>V00782550</td>
<td>Lew, Roger</td>
<td>Research Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fall 2022

Academic Units

Architecture
Dr. Randall Teal
Program Head
11 Faculty
316 Students

Art + Design
Delphine Keim
Program Head
9 Faculty
95 Students

Interior Architecture & Design
Dr. Rula Awwad-Rafferty
Program Head
3 Faculty
117 Students

Landscape Architecture
Dr. Raffaella Sini
Interim Program Head
5 Faculty
28 Students

Virtual Technology & Design
Jean-Marc Gauthier
Program Head
5 Faculty
115 Students

Research Units

Integrated Design Lab
Damon Woods
Director

Center for Resilient Communities
Dr. Lillian Alesse
Dr. Andrew Kliskey
Co-Directors

Other CAA Units - Shop/Center

Computer Studio
Vacant

Design Resource Center
Miranda Anderson
Director

Technical Shops
David Schmidt
Director

Urban Design Center
NA

Prichard Gallery
Vacant

Administrative Support

Dean
Dr. Shauna Corry

Dean’s Office Staff
Kim Osborne, Director of Admin and Fiscal Operations
Joan Jones, Dean’s Assistant/Project Manager .50
Rebecca Cromwell, Recruitment and Retention Coordinator
Quinn Kendall, Administrative Assistant
Manda, Grants Specialist .50*
Amanda Myron, Admin/Faculty Specialist
Sandi Klingsler, Academic Program Coordinator
Technology Assistant
Lieslle .5 Web Coordinator *
Hannah Finkas-Gandor, Director of Development *
* split appointments or funding provided by other units

CAA Support Staff
Claire Brundage, Academic Advisor
Jen Smith, Career Advising Liaison *
Reilly Cisco, Technology Solutions Partner *
Maria, Marketing Manager *
David Johnson, Writer *
* funding provided by other units

Updated 09.02.2022
CAA leadership began the discussion to change our structure during Provost John Wiencek’s tenure. Our focus was on becoming more efficient in terms of college management and within the University system while supporting small programs in faculty service responsibilities (allowing for more time to devote to teaching or research). We began discussions with the faculty during our All-College meetings (held twice a semester) and an Ad Hoc Committee was developed by the faculty to explore restructure possibilities. Landscape Architecture assistant professor, Dan Cronan, and Virtual Design and Technology associate professor Jean-Marc Gauthier chaired the committee. Meetings were held with all faculty and staff invited to join and one of the meetings separated the junior faculty and the senior faculty to encourage open and honest communication. The committee leaders authored a report outlining strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT analysis), as well as structure models, and next steps that was shared college wide.

Beginning Fall Semester of 2021, Dean Corry convened three Town Hall Meetings to refine possible structure ideas and program leaders were requested to meet with each other (Art + Design called it speed dating) to see what synergies would develop or be capitalized on to help identify preferred structure models.

A snapshot of the refined structure models, leadership responsibilities for Department Chair and Program Director/Heads (accreditation requirements for all programs were reviewed for leadership requirements), administrative search processes following FSH, and possible financial models showing budgetary savings was distributed college wide along with a link to a Qualtrics survey.

The survey asked for feedback on the structure models (varying program combinations), and which model was preferred, a two department or three department model. Twenty-nine people responded to the survey (CAA has approximately thirty-nine faculty and twenty staff depending on the semester). The responses indicated an even split between the two or three department model with a few respondents indicating they preferred to stay the same. Discussions with current Program Heads revealed they preferred to have five departments, but with the choice narrowed down to either the two or three department model the majority preferred the three-department model. CAA Advisory Council discussed the proposed change during the Spring 2022 meeting and initially expressed concerns about program visibility, however after understanding that the programs would continue to be the focus of the website and all recruitment and marketing efforts, they understood the need for great efficiency.

Dean Corry reviewed the responses and process with Provost Lawrence and requested the college go forward with the three-department model informed by the Ad Hoc Committee report, the Town Hall meeting dialog, the survey responses, and discussions with Program Heads, faculty, and staff.

Supporting Documentation

- Ad Hoc Committee Report
- Town Hall Agenda
- Qualtrics Survey and Responses
- Process Information Sheet
CAA Town Hall AGENDA
9/10/20 – 1:00 pm – 2:30 pm
9/16/20 – 9:00 am – 10:30 pm
9/22/20 – 2:00 pm – 3:30 pm

1) Town Hall Goals and Focus – 5 minutes
   a) Goals and Objectives of the CAA Town Hall
      (i) Validate pros & cons, and guiding principles of each model
      (ii) Gather feedback from those who could not participate in the Ad Hoc Committee in Spring 2020

   b) Meeting Organization and Participation Request
      (i) “Raise hand” function in zoom

   c) Overview and Additional Comments per 3 CAA Models
      i) 1 Department Model
         (1) Pros and Cons
         (2) Guiding Principles
         (3) Additional Comment Period:
            **Prompt: How do we operate and how are we evaluated?

      ii) 2 Department Model
         (1) Pros and Cons
         (2) Guiding Principles
         (3) Additional Comment Period:
            **Prompt: How do we operate and how are we evaluated?

      iii) 3 Department Model
         (1) Pros and Cons
         (2) Guiding Principles
         (3) Additional Comment Period:
            **Prompt: How do we operate and how are we evaluated?

2) Discussion: What can we learn from our current situation?
   a) Leadership - How do you see leadership with each model?
   b) Integration – How might you see program integration with each model?
   c) Land Grant Mission - How do you envision teaching, research, and service with each of these models?

***Please take the opportunity to fill out the anonymous questionnaire in the link below:
https://uidaho.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_0H5plVmaWb44UQZ
I. CHARGE:
The Faculty of the College of Art & Architecture at the University of Idaho was charged with a need to
determine models of integration, with budgetary constraints, best-suited to meet the needs of all
programs: Architecture, Art and Design, Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture, and
Virtual Technology and Design. The following report describes the charge, the committee’s process, and
recommendations to move forward.

II. TIMELINE & CHARGE ITEMS: 04/23/2020 - 05/28/2020
1. Tasks identified - need for change and determination of change
2. Possibilities: Greater integration, depth of leadership opportunities, less committee work, etc.
3. Concerns: Loss of Autonomy, loss of identity, loss of voices heard from individuals within the
   College of Art & Architecture
4. Financial Considerations: extremely tight budget and reorganization is part of the plan
5. Timeline: 4.5 weeks; may require SBOE/NWCCU notification or approval; October 1 deadline if
   this approval is required

Figure 1. Conceptual Diagram of the CAA current model. This diagram illustrates the pillars of CAA and the integrated cores and foundations synthesizing strengths and opportunities within the College.
III. PROCESS
A Delphi Method was used to assess current understandings, evaluate threats and opportunities, and established consensus among committee members. The results of this process intend to inform ACT and the Dean of the College of Art & Architecture. The Delphi Method aims to iteratively collect feedback from committee members through iterative survey instruments and verbal statements made during committee meetings. This method was selected as it is a systematic method for obtaining, exchanging, and developing informed opinions on an issue which can potentially inform consensus from a group (Landeta, 2006; Kittell-Limerick, 2005; Listone, 1975).

Figure 2. Ad Hoc Committee Process Diagram. The Committee utilized the Delphi process to inform scenarios and their implications based on iterative survey instruments.

IV. SCENARIOS
a. SCENARIO 1: IMPLEMENTED INTEGRATION OF CURRENT MODEL
   i. Description: Improved Current Model with strategic planning; find/create efficiencies through improved integration
      • 5 programs
      • Eliminate $40K - $67K in stipend spending
      • Remainder of stipends pooled and shared 5 ways or other revision of stipend distribution
      • One Department w/ 5 program heads
   ii. Pros
      • Straightforward Solution
      • Retains Program Autonomy
      • Allows for self-determined program growth as identified in strategic planning efforts
   iii. Cons
      • Smaller programs may be endangered - perceived to be more so than is actually the case; small programs are not protected by department structure
      • Lack of depth
      • Larger amount of pressure on chairs - Lack of balance with Program head
      • Programs are Autonomous but separate in decision-making
iv. Guiding Principles: Improvements and Solutions to Address Issues & Weaknesses
**NOTE: Solutions are meant to inform decision-making and strategies forward. These solutions are not meant to be prescriptive but rather for aspirational guidance.**

- **FIRST STEP:** Need for implementation strategy for integration
  - Increased shared teaching/instruction – need for foundations – reassignment of roles, structures; expand cross-disciplinary course offerings and delivery where there is disciplinary overlap
  - Crucial to look at strengths of faculty, bylaws and policies that we have
- Need for addressing misconceptions/ issues with current model
- Potential for Associate Dean Roles (e.g. Assoc. Dean of Research, Assoc. Dean of Instruction, Assoc. Dean of Student Affairs, etc.)
  - Assoc. Dean can provide oversight over all programs
  - Provide insight for integration
  - Shared responsibilities
  - Mapping Benefits of Entire College
  - Possibly Rotating Roles/ Responsibilities – (e.g. college-based integration strategies)

- **BUDGET:** Sliding Scale of Stipends per Program
- Integrated Core Areas
  - New Degrees, Certificate Programs
  - Non-professional UG degree that could be a feeder to grad programs
- Need for keeping program autonomy & retaining/ operationalizing faculty resources
- Find cross- college efficiencies as a strategy

b. SCENARIO 2: TWO DEPARTMENT MODEL

i. **Pros**
- Logical Solution (JUSTIFICATION: combined strengths, similar definitions)
- Shared/Similar Accrediting bodies in the case of Art, Design, VTD; not true of Arch, IAD, LA
- Boise programs retain connectivity
- Shared concepts, ideas – possibilities for recruitment, retention, grad opportunities
- Opportunities for coordination/alignment (curriculum, seminars, organization, etc.)
- organizes us in Arts and sciences (BS,BA .. etc)

ii. **Cons**
- Feared loss of autonomy
- Each program acting as an armature: ie. Overarching curriculum decisions
- Question of amount of savings - program administrators are still needed for certain accredited programs
- Interdisciplinary Collaboration may be hindered
- Influence recruitment and retention – would all programs receive equal focus in recruiting efforts?
- Fiscal issues may impact Faculty Cohorts
- Impedes on total college integration
• Loss of discipline-based connections to alums, professional groups could impact fundraising, student activities and opportunities
• gives a logical line to cut in the future, not a unified group. one in the future may receive preference

iii. **Guiding Principles: Solutions/Stipulations**
• bylaws must be set, accreditation standards/ considerations
• Areas of Concentration, Emphasis Areas (SWARM Model) – but with teeth - “At Home” – Emphasis Area, Area of Concentration
• Consideration of what the home base is for accreditation standards
• Scheduled Thematic Seminars
• Crucial to look at strengths of faculty, bylaws and policies that we have
• Faculty fatigue consideration – Strategy to reduce teaching loads

**c. SCENARIO 3: THREE DEPARTMENT MODEL**

i. **Description:**
• Three Departments
• Each Department contains multiple Programs
• 3 chairs | multiple program heads | possible Associate Chair

ii. **Pros**
• Added value for student success (well-rounded integrated education) – Preparing creative professionals
• Shared balance – more equal representation of all programs
• Visibility and branding
• Allows for integration of other units (across the university e.g. theatre)
• Maintains experience / knowledge base for accreditation, and administrative capacity for each program’s strategic planning

iii. **Cons**
• Added cost (3 chairs, Associate dean)
• More work for program chairs and associate dean
• Not a unified group. one in the future may receive preference or be exposed to risk

V. **RECOMMENDATION for NEXT STEPS**

a. Proposal for Academic Year 2020 – 2021
i. Ad Hoc Committee as standing committee for **FALL 2020 & SPRING 2021**
ii. **PROPOSED AGENDA:**
   1. Analyze Risks, Opportunities and costs per Scenario
   2. Determine Implementation Strategy
   3. Create Phased Strategic Plan

Sources:


CAA Restructure Information: Moving from Programs to Departments 1/7/22

Thank you for everyone’s engagement in this process. It has been a long one, beginning with a desire to work more efficiently within the university and college by moving to departments, followed by the need to address our budget reduction. We are now nearing completion and looking forward to meeting our goals of:

1. Increasing efficiency within the University structure
2. Addressing our college need to decrease committee work, and enhance opportunities for leadership development
3. Budget Reduction commitment

Leadership:
Once a structure (2 or 3 department mode and the programs that make up each one) is determined we will follow the Faculty Staff Handbook and our CAA Bylaws for determining Department Chairs and Program Heads/Coordinators:

Department Chairs

**Determination Process**
Department Chairs are confirmed by the Dean based on nominations from the unit committee with approval by the Provost, See E-4. SELECTION OF PERMANENT ADMINISTRATOR. for detailed procedure.

Responsibilities

E-1. RESPONSIBILITIES. The administrator of a school, division, or department (i.e., the first organizational unit below the college level) is responsible for interpreting university and college objectives and policies for the faculty of the unit and, through leadership, ensuring faculty participation in formulating and carrying out the unit’s policies within the framework of the objectives and policies of the college and university. The role may be defined more specifically by the bylaws of each college, but it is understood that the general responsibility for leadership includes: assisting higher administration in the assignment (3240 A) and in the evaluation (3320 and 3340) of the services of each member of the unit’s faculty and staff; promoting effective leadership of personnel and management of departmental resources; providing leadership in the development and implementation of unit plans; providing for open communication with faculty and staff; fostering excellence in teaching, scholarship and outreach for faculty, students, and staff in the department; effectively representing all constituents of the department; and continuing personal professional development in areas of leadership.
- Manage and develop position descriptions, annual performance evaluations, third year reviews and tenure and promotion recommendations in consultation with Program Heads
- Schedule classes, assign teaching, and assign classrooms when appropriate in consultation with Program Heads
- Assign graduate research and teaching assistantships in consultation with Program Heads
- Recruitment and Retention Management with support from Program Heads
- Other (to be determined)

Program Heads/Coordinators (title to be determined)

**Determination Process**
Nominations are solicited from the Department Chair from the program faculty.
Program Faculty submit nominees (one or more can be submitted).
Department Chair makes the determination in consultation with the Dean and the Provost.

**Responsibilities to Include**
Overarching goal is to meet the autonomy needs of accrediting bodies.
- Program leadership and management including curriculum development and management
- Budget and Personnel Management (significant influence in budget management and personnel management to include input in evaluations, hiring, and termination)
- Recruitment and Retention Management
- Accreditation reports and management
- Assessment planning and management
- Facility needs
- Other (to be determined)

**Cost/Savings Estimates:**
Based on our original leadership cost of $61,000 (for the past two years we have saved approximately $35,000 per year by reducing all program head salaries to $7,000) as we go forward with the Department Model each Department Chair will receive either $15,000 or $10,000 depending on the configuration of the department.

*Cost Estimate for Two Department Structure*
Department Chair Stipends: $15,000 ea. = $30,000
Program Director (name TBD) Stipends: $2,500* ea. = $12,500
Total Cost: $42,500 – Previous Stipends were 15% of base faculty salary holding position- $61,292 for FY21- Savings of $18,792 for new model.

*Cost Estimate for Three Department Structure*
Department Chair Stipends: $10,000 ea. = $30,000
Program Director (name TBD) Stipends: $2,500* ea. = $12,500
Total Cost: $42,500 – Previous Stipends were 15% of base faculty salary holding position- $61,292 for FY21- Savings of $18,792 for new model.

*Summer funds available for Program Heads/Coordinators for accreditation reports/visit preparation*

**Possible Scenarios:**
The following are possible scenarios identified in our Town Hall and program meetings along with individual input. These scenarios are not listed in any order of preference nor do the titles reflect a name. Names of the departments will be submitted by the faculty of the departments and follow the curriculum change process.

*Current Department Demographics (based on Fall Semester 2021 Institutional Dashboard):*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>MSIAD Change</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art + Design</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAD</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LArch</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTD</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. **2 departments split by NASAD Accreditation**-
Department 1: Architecture and Landscape Architecture (318 students, 16 faculty)
Department 2: Art + Design, Interior Architecture and Design, Virtual Technology and Design (approximately 306 students, 18 faculty)

Or

B. **2 departments split by Professional Designation**-
Department 1: Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Interior Architecture and Design (approx. 415 students, 19 faculty)
Department 2: Art + Design, Virtual Technology and Design (approx. 209 students, 15 faculty)

Or

C. **3 departments split by feedback**-
Department 1: Architecture (283 students, 11 faculty)
Department 2: Art + Design (93 students, 10 faculty)
Department 3: IAD, Landscape Arch, and VTD (approx. 247 students; 13 faculty)

Or

D. **3 departments split by feedback**-
Department 1: Architecture (283 students, 11 faculty)
Department 2: Art + Design and Virtual Technology and Design (approx. 209 students, 15 faculty)
Department 3: IAD and Landscape Arch (approx. 131 students; 8 faculty)

**Anticipated Timeline:**

- **January 21**: Structure Determined, current Program Heads notify program faculty; All College Announcement
- **February 15**: Department names determined, and Curriculum changes submitted to Provost’s Office and Curriculum Committees
- **April 15**: Department Chairs and Program Heads/Coordinators Determined
- **June 1**: Approved by the SBOE
- **July 1**: Department Structure and Bylaws in effect
2021 CAA Restructuring Survey of Staff and Faculty

- 2-Department Configuration 1
  1. Blank
  3. Architecture, Landscape Architecture
  4. Architecture
  6. Blank
  7. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design
  9. Architecture
  10. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design, Interior Architecture & Design
  11. Architecture
  12. Blank
  13. Architecture, Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design
  15. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  16. Architecture, Art + Design
  18. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  19. Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
  21. Architecture
  22. Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
  27. Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
  28. Landscape Architecture, Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design

- 2-Department Configuration 2
  1. Blank
  2. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  5. Architecture
  6. Blank
  7. Architecture, Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design
  8. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
10. Architecture, Landscape Architecture
12. Blank
13. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
15. Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
17. Blank
19. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
20. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
22. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
23. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
25. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
26. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design
27. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design
28. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design

- Potential Challenges?
  1. Blank
  2. Blank
  3. any changes to enrollment could off balance student to staff ratio
  4. Blank
  5. Blank
  6. Blank
  7. A) Feared loss of autonomy
     B) Each program acting as an armature: ie. Overarching curriculum decisions
     C) Question of amount of savings - program administrators are still needed for certain accredited programs
     D) Interdisciplinary Collaboration may be hindered
     E) Influence recruitment and retention – would all programs receive equal focus in recruiting efforts?
     F) Fiscal issues may impact Faculty Cohorts
     G) Impedes on total college integration
     H) Loss of discipline-based connections to alums, professional groups could impact fundraising, student activities and opportunities
     I) gives a logical line to cut in the future, not a unified group. one in the future may receive preference
8. Department 2 may have issues working through technology integration. Also, the name of the program is Virtual Technology & Design - not - Virtual Technology and Design.

9. The wide number of disciplines and faculty/curricular priorities in any configuration would be unwieldy. A two dept model is unnecessary and appears driven by a desire to consolidate chair positions in order to offer a higher stipend for each. The trade off benefits aren’t worth the trouble we shouldn’t determine chair stipends based on number of departments.

10. If one program is significantly larger than other(s) then the smaller program could feel marginalized. Personality differences in leadership could create challenges.

11. The restructure is unnecessary and detrimental to the college, its programs, faculty, staff, and students. The proposal creates two new administrative positions with no benefit. Under the restructure, faculty and staff would have a chair *and* a director with whom to address issues and opportunities. Program directors would ultimately have much the same responsibilities as they do currently but then have the additional administrative layer of a chair between themselves and the dean; faculty would have two such layers. The result will be a reduction in the clarity of each of the programs’ missions and goals and the unnecessary diffusion of leadership throughout the college. The restructure proposal is disruptive and counter-productive, all for a negligible cost savings, savings which could easily be accomplished by simply and equitably adjusting individual program administrative costs.

12. A. the two department option does not make any further saving comparing to the three department option.

    B. There will be many programs with different accreditation requirements are placed together within one department.

    C. Potentially, smaller unit in one department with larger unit may start to loose its autonomy and identity.

    D. The two department option makes our college look like a smaller unit in the eyes of the whole university community. This may bring potential risks when there is a push for reducing the college structures on campus during challenging times.

13. Blank

14. Blank

15. The only issue I can see with this is that Architecture is such a large program, that combining it with IAD and Larch would make it a large department. Therefore, making it more challenging to run (and over powering) than the other ones. I could also see it causing issues with the mentality of views. The is a certain attitude that some Architecture personnel have that might clash with IAD and Larch. In another way of thinking, it might encourage them to "play nice".

16. Personalities

17. We are one department now that is trying to function as 5 independent departments. The last all College meeting we held in 2020 discussing potential re-configuration we concluded that it would be in the College's best interest to explore how to make one department work rather
than spend more money to divide programs. There has not been much effort to make this model work since the reformation of CAA and we should start here first.

The Department Chair of the 5 programs would function similarly to an Associate Dean level role working with the individual program heads to help administer our degree programs. All of our programs make significant impacts on the students experience but more work is needed to bring the faculty and curriculum together to reinforce this notion of design integration.

Challenges: Mutual Understanding across CAA, Academic Degree Bias, willingness to integrate. I see very little value in a two department model which has historically been the configuration of CAA prior to its dissolution into CLASS. I am not nostalgic and witnessed several issues of a two department model for power control of CAA resources. If we do go with a two department model I see no way around associating our Science based programs with each other from Art based programs which would significantly put Art in a disadvantage within the larger CAA. Integrated within one department shows we integrate Art into our Science and our Science into our Arts.

18. Blank

19. It is my understanding in conversation and from lived experience as former chair of VTD that VTD doesn't potentially want to combine with A+D because it might impact their grant-getting opportunities. While there is a wee modicum of truth in this, it was really more of a concern when Kyle was on faculty. I am not sure that is really a concern now.

Additionally, I think certain faculty view A+D as antiquated and a combination as problematic for their image. This, I argue, is short-sighted and not really true. There is actually some really interesting opportunities and A+D are eagerly using or want to use new media tools and techniques. A+D faculty have expressed genuine interest in working with VTD. Ironically, it is the VTD faculty unable to envision cool new opportunities.

For the other programs, I know that IAD and Landscape feel that they will be subsumed by Architecture and their needs will be lost.

20. At the college level, the challenge will depend greatly on the willingness of the Department Chairs to work constructively with the Dean to build and buy into a collective vision. Trust, respect and candid communication are key. At the department level, program rivalries could flare up until the anxiety of the unknown recedes. Department heads will have to lead faculty they don't know well. Trust will have to be developed. Faculty will take cues from their leaders on living into and developing the specifics of our new configuration. The potential for individual behavior undermining a collective vision exists. This is probably true no matter what our new configuration is. Inclusive visioning will be key. At the program level, I can imagine faculty venting concerns to the people they know best. Program directors will need to be good listeners and bring concerns to the Chairs.

21. CAA criteria for restructuring is mostly based in budget, number of faculty and students' numbers. Architecture has enough growth and demonstrated positive performance trend that it can stand as an autonomous Department-1. The TWO Department scenario diminishes autonomy of units merged and increases difficulty for a Department-2 Chair to manage the
diverse programs (all other units would need to be merged in order to keep Architecture as an autonomous unit). This scenario blurs the presence of leadership advocating for each merged program in CAA committees and diminishes the opportunities of diverse leadership in CAA and UofI overall.

22. The only potential problems I can imagine would be chain of command/administrative. How are decisions being made in relationship to each department. With two Chairs I could see some people feeling underrepresented. I really feel like this whole process really won’t change anything other than chain of command. If we have people in those positions that are willing to work with multiple departments and will listen and fight for the needs of department Heads under them I see no problems.

23. personality issues for some, differing tools, equipment, and space utilization in D2, leadership positions may have to develop the trust of newer managed programs

24. All three Arch disciplines continually stress that their professional accreditation standards have certain requirements for autonomy, though I have never seen any satisfactory evidence to this effect. Combining them will subvert this (if such policies exist). The coursework and scholarship adjacencies in VTD and Art + Design make sense for the design emphasis areas of the BFA program. However, the VTD program does not seem to see the value of fine arts coursework, despite the fact that guest speakers to the college routinely emphasize that the only students who are employable in these industries are those who can draw and paint as well as they think (despite whatever stellar technological acumen they might possess). Conversely, Art faculty might shy away from closer ties with designers and the design world. It also needs to be noted that there are gendered concerns within the college. VTD is a “boys club” of a male majority student population with 100% male faculty. IAD, conversely, has the opposite student population and nearly the same opposite faculty situation. Granted, there are long-standing intrinsic cultural biases around interior “decorating” being “woman’s work” and “Virtual games” being “for boys.” We know this is not true and it is less and less true with each passing graduating class. Still, this remains an elephant in the room within our college. More diverse faculty across the board will help shape, in time, a more diverse student population. On the topic of gender, VTD projects (at times subtly, and at other times more directly) a position that the fine arts are also “woman’s work” and that combining with Art + Design will “feminize” their department.

25. Blank

26. I foresee some initial hiccups determining who is doing what as faculty and staff get more accustomed to the way programs have been doing things. Finding new efficiencies and grace for each other always takes some time to strengthen, fortify and trust. But with this 2 department model, all get to learn to adapt together and I’ve always appreciated our College’s resilience when asked to do so. I truly believe we can make this work well!

27. college challenges: only two departments, this is not a viable college. Visibility for programs is undermined. If the issue is to reduce committee work, there is no reality no committee work reduction here since the representation on key committees will still be needed, for instance: curriculum committee, recruitment and retention, design days, tenure an promotion: all these
will still need representation from every program; serious issues of inequity occur, across the board; a program with major student number and faculty number is more in control of major decisions, of budget, even of numbers of students allowed to persist through the gates to second year (and beyond) as happened before.

28. Some faculty may feel in this configuration that they are losing their programs autonomy.

- Potential Benefits
  1. Blank
  2. This structure aligns with our Boise offerings of the Architecture fields. Also with accreditation and possible new fee structure for Professional Fees.
  3. More organization less hierarchy – hopefully
  4. Blank
  5. Blank
  6. Blank
  7. This configuration seems to align practice-based professions with similar (however completely different) accreditation standards. This configuration also appears to aggregate smaller programs to benefit the college as a whole.

  Pros:
  a) Logical Solution (JUSTIFICATION: combined strengths, similar definitions)
  b) Shared/Similar Accrediting bodies in the case of Art, Design, VTD; Arch, IAD, LA
  c) Boise programs retain connectivity
  d) Shared concepts, ideas – possibilities for recruitment, retention, grad opportunities
  e) Opportunities for coordination/alignment (curriculum, seminars, organization, etc.)
  f) Organizes us in Arts and sciences (BS, BA .. etc)
  8. Not sure
  9. None. This is a bad idea
  10. Unforeseen opportunities occur when two or more programs merge. Staffing efficiencies.
  11. I see no benefits to the college restructure proposed.
  12. Blank
  13. Blank
  14. Blank
  15. A benefit for having all the architecture programs in one department is that all those programs are offered in Boise. So it will be easier to group them together and advertise them together because potential and current students can visually group those together based off the idea that they are all related to architecture, and are all offered in Boise. Easy to remember.

Another benefit is that they are all similar fields, therefore will be able to work in the same mindset/vocabulary than students would if they were in Art + Design and VTD. Art + Design and VTD have similarities as well. Ever since there was talk about creating departments, this has seemed like the best option for programs to separate out.
This could also open the doorway to collaboration within the programs. Many students already minor or double major within these programs, it would be nice to see them collaborate more on projects and classes.

16. Integration of Disciplines

17. Benefits: Potential Budgetary savings by reducing redundancies across programs. Leadership within the Chair position who can more effectively distribute support across programs more equitably and bring stronger alignments between existing programs. Nothing really changes for any of the programs, but support can be more effective. Potentially reduces internal program conflicts by providing needed CAA leadership targeting integrated teaching, research, and creative scholarship. Everyone is listened to

18. Blank

19. - VTD students are already increasingly taking art classes or are art minors

- There is a substantial number of students who want to explore and create work that borrows from both programs

- Recruiters (even those that have been brought to campus by VTD faculty) tell us that students really need good foundational art skills. Technology skills can be more easily taught on the job especially if they are using propriety software.

- Many design courses–especially Interaction and Experience–should be required for VTD students

- A combination of A+D and VTD re-establishes gender parity among faculty and students.

For the other, professional programs, a combination might be essential for eliminating redundant courses and promoting efficiencies.

20. Cost savings and equitable distribution of work are major benefits. At the college level this configuration strikes a balance between having an Associate Dean (it's like having two Co-Associate Deans) along with program-specific leadership. The economy of consolidating certain kinds of work towards the Chairs easily reconciles with program autonomy. There is potentially more opportunity to see commonalities among programs with licensing in this model. Also, with Interior Architecture and Design students fully subscribing to the Architecture Minor, this model makes sense. There is potential to see and cultivate more common ground between Art and Design and Virtual Technology and Design. Both programs have a range from work that is entertaining, emotional, and expressive to the other end which is data driven, rhetorically more objective, and informed by human behavior.

21. This configuration is only based in preserving Architecture as an autonomous unit and leadership presence due to its successful performance and growth as such. I do no see any benefit on merging all other units in one Department so this scenario of TWO Departments does not seem reasonable.

22. Benefits are cost savings and aligning programs that are most similar. I see potential for more collaboration also. If programs across the college are able to see what and how other departments work and what their needs are, I could really see this helping all areas grow.
23. the logic, naming, and numbers balance seems entirely reasonable. saves money, perhaps?
would love to have additional staff support or crossover

24. At many other universities across the country, the Arch disciplines are within a single
department. It is a natural and logical way to organize them; students in all three programs will be
entering a unified workforce and networking environment. They will all someday work together at
the same studios. VTD and Art + Design share NASAD accreditation, which is a very rational and easy
sell to upper administration. VTD and Art + Design students, too, will be entering a unified workforce
and networking environment. They will all someday work together at the same studios. Even
students who choose to pursue a fine arts emphasis within their BFA, the majority of these
graduates will at some point hold design jobs (and, like most creative professionals, probably night
owl as one kind of practicing artist or another).

25. Blank

26. Through this configuration, I see strength for student programing both in and outside of classes.
I believe faculty research opportunities that lead to student events and integrative course work will
thrive more in this mix. Department 1, as show here, celebrates what happens in most firms and will
also allow architecturally-minded students at early stages to better understand where they best fit
in pursuing a particular degree. Department 2 can better support student’s more varied
professional approaches to general making, storytelling, innovation in imaging, and portfolio output.

27. This could be a school, a named opportunity for the school; however, the programs within ought
to maintain their autonomy. it focuses on licensed professional programs. could have some further
collaborations, but these collaborations in the curriculum already happen.

28. This configuration will benefit all of our students. Architecture/IAD/LA students will benefit.
Potentially Art + Design & VTD can collaborate for the benefit of all of our students. Art +Design will
benefit with access to VTD classes such as world building, character design and use of software. This
will be highly beneficial for many of students in their career as illustrators and story tellers. VTD
students can benefit from physical classes in 2d/3d (observational drawing, ceramics, etc...) Through
the observational world students can better create a virtual world.

• 3-Department Configuration 1
  1. Architecture
  2. Architecture
  3. Architecture
  4. Architecture
  5. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
  6. Architecture
  7. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  9. Architecture
  10. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  11. Architecture
12. Architecture
13. Architecture, Landscape Architecture
14. Architecture, Landscape Architecture
15. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
16. Architecture, Art + Design
17. Architecture
18. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design
19. Architecture
20. Architecture
21. Architecture
22. Architecture
23. Architecture
24. Architecture
25. Architecture
26. Architecture
27. Architecture
28. Architecture

- 3-Department Configuration 2
  1. Art + Design, Virtual Technology and Design
  2. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
  3. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  4. Art + Design
  5. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  6. Art + Design
  7. Art + Design
  8. Art + Design
  9. Art + Design
10. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
11. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
12. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
15. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
16. Virtual Technology & Design, Landscape Architecture
17. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design, Virtual Technology & Design
18. Architecture
19. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
20. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
21. Art + Design
22. Art + Design
23. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design
24. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
25. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
26. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design
27. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
28. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design

- 3-Department Configuration 3
  1. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture and Design
  2. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  3. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design
  5. Architecture
  7. Architecture
  8. Virtual Technology & Design
  10. Architecture
  11. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  12. Virtual Technology & Design, Art + Design
  13. Virtual Technology & Design
  14. Virtual Technology & Design
  15. Architecture
  16. Interior Architecture & Design
  17. Art + Design
  18. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design
  19. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design
  20. Interior Architecture & Design, Landscape Architecture
  23. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design
  25. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design
  26. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design
  27. Art + Design, Virtual Technology & Design
  28. Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture & Design

- Potential Challenges?
  1. Blank
  2. Blank
  3. Possible risk of hierarchy
  4. Blank
  5. Blank
  6. Each program must still be responsible for their own faculty evaluations, curriculum and budget.
  7. A) Added cost (3 chairs, Associate dean)
     B) More work for program chairs and associate dean
C) Not a unified group. one in the future may receive preference or be exposed to risk
8. Overall approval from the College.
9. This has been proposed at multiple points and there does not appear to be consensus among programs who will be joined together about how they would operate. At some point, the decision will have to be made and the combined departments will need to sort this out. The three department configuration should maintain the same stipend for chairs as the two department configuration. The work load in any scenario is worth the $15,000.
10. Personality differences in leadership could create challenges.
11. The restructure is unnecessary and detrimental to the college, its programs, faculty, staff, and students. The proposal creates three new administrative positions with no benefit. Under the restructure, faculty and staff would have a chair *and* a director with whom to address issues and opportunities. Program directors would ultimately have much the same responsibilities as they do currently but then have the additional administrative layer of a chair between themselves and the dean; faculty would have two such layers. The result will be a reduction in the clarity of each of the programs' missions and goals and the unnecessary diffusion of leadership throughout the college. The restructure proposal is disruptive and counter-productive, all for a negligible cost savings, savings which could easily be accomplished by simply and equitably adjusting individual program administrative costs.
12. Blank
13. Blank
14. Blank
15. The only challenge I see with this model is trying to coordinate three departments. Two are easier than three.
One other thing is it would mean there are two departments in Boise, and that might seem unnecessary for the amount of years we provide for students there. It might seem like we have more there than we do. That is just an assumption though.
16. I don’t think a 3 dept model will work
17. Budgetarily we will be adding three department Chairs with potentially some level of program head responsibilities for Department B. Faculty buy-in, marketing to make sure we can best explain our mission and vision under this new model. Power struggles between departments.
18. Blank
19. This 3-program model doesn't really take advantage of the connectivity that could happen within the professional programs. In particular, IAD and architecture. Also, one could argue that this doesn't prepare students for real-world work environments where everybody is working in the same office in collaborative manner regardless of discipline. This seems also to (perhaps) assuage certain personalities but the decision should be made based on what is really best for the students in the long term.
Another issue is that when the next economic downturn happens, Architecture will be by itself and that may be somewhat problematic if numbers of students are important. Architecture’s boom may or may not last.
20. With this configuration, I can imagine Architecture acting a little too independently from the college. A respectful relationship between the Program Chair and the Dean would be key. A strong program level leader might help complement the dynamics in this program. At the department level, the challenges will be to navigate the unknowns in the new configurations. Developing trust and collective vision will be key. Asserting program autonomy will be key. Making a clear division of labor and responsibilities between Chairs and program level
leadership will be important. There is quite a bit of variation in the current culture of how each program distributes work.

21. As CAA restructuring seems only based on budget, number of students & faculty in units, criteria for a scenario merging the other programs (and keeping Architecture as a separate Department Unit) is based on selecting one of the two provided by feedback in the CAA document shared. It is going to be a challenge for a Department-3 Chair as proposed to address the diverse processes involved in these very distinct programs. To address the fact that some programs might be too small today (based on faculty and student numbers) to work as independent units (departments) due to costs involved in leadership, there should be a more clear threshold on what are the minimum requirements across the university. Each discipline has the potential to function better as an autonomous unit with leadership presence at the college level. The potential should be assessed beyond actual numbers and focus on future scenarios of growth and development for these disciplines in the state of Idaho/US/Global.

Collaborations among disciplines emerge when there are common projects individuals agree on engaging with not through a forced merging process based on budget/efficiency priorities.

22. Really are we saving enough with this configuration and are we just creating more work for the administrators? Also there is less equality with students and faculty

23. less balance in numbers yet more identity (+ autonomy?) for certain programs territoriality issues?

24. Same comments apply as above

25. Blank

26. I worry that students needing to shifting their major in the territory of Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Interior Architecture and Design will have less support than they should in this arrangement (I believe the 2 Department Model addressed above is strongest). I also worry that Architecture (or any program not blended in this transformation), left alone, will feel even more diversive and uncollaborative, than they do now. AND I want to state that I don't actually believe Architecture dosen't or can't work well with others (they are actually quite collaborative), but in being allowed to be separate, we've all had the ability to become insular and avoidant of playing well with others. Strong leadership would be needed to force a sense of balance when one program gets to stay the same and others have to adapt. I think this would be a difficult, unneeded challenge to take on in this transition.

27. Need to change the name of the college, this is essential since now the name could be misleading on the outside; when a third department exists but the name of the college only for the other two departments it becomes an issue of invisibility and inequity. Can impact recruitment, retention, and recognition of the third department. Structural injustice or ill representation Some issues about one of the restructure due to faculty resisting it due to separation fo arts and sciences. Need to avoid "stepchild" any program, there is a great likelihood for that to occur here. undermines some of the great rebranding efforts that have been ongoing and proven successful in terms of programmatic identity, recruitment, retention (for example as with IAD).

28. Architecture will have little incentive to collaborate with others.

- Potential Benefits?
  1. Blank
  2. Blank
  3. Better balance of responsibilities
4. Blank
5. Blank
6. Blank
7. A) Added value for student success (well-rounded integrated education) – Preparing creative professionals
   B) Allows for integration of other units (across the university e.g. theatre)
   C) Maintains experience / knowledge base for accreditation, and administrative capacity for each program’s strategic planning
8. Integrated projects between Architecture, IAD and Landscape. Opportunity for program growth and Identity branding (Art & Design - VTD)
9. This arrangement balances faculty numbers, allows programs with fewer faculty to share service and administrative responsibilities, and limits the number of disciplines in each, without making any program unduly large in comparison to the rest of the college.
10. Unforeseen opportunities occur when two or more programs merge. Large programs can operate more effectively without compromising smaller programs. Staffing efficiencies.
11. I see no benefits to the college restructure proposed.
12. A. Based on the existing circumstance, this may be the best way to balance our existing resources with our student sizes among different programs.
   B. This option makes disciplines with similar needs and similar size together, which can make the use of resources more efficiently.
   C. Smaller department size can reduce the chance of potential internal conflicts. The small units in a department will have better chance to retain its autonomy and identity.
   D. The three department option provides more opportunity for more departments in the future when certain growth of our college can achieve.
13. Blank
14. Blank
15. The benefits to this model is that all are about equal in amount of students per department. This means resources and funding would be similar for each, so there would be less arguments and disagreements with how they are dispersed. This would also help with the fact that Architecture is growing so much, and they would be able to just focus on them and not have to worry about another program.
16. Blank
17. CAA excels in three areas, Art, Architecture and Virtual Design that all focus on visual communication. We have four programs that are Science based with 1 program being Art based. This aligns programs to their associated academic responsibilities. Architecture is large enough to function as a small department and can retain autonomy. Art can continue to focus on BFA and MFA opportunities for the College since they are the only Art based degree program
and has different outcomes concerning service from the other programs. Associating LA, IAD and VTD (Virtual Technology and Design) together compliments each other through research and has natural meeting points for integration for students. Lighting, Environmental, Industrial design emphasis can be supported while sharing similar design affordances concerning space and place making. The students would be better aligned under this model (my opinion).

18. Blank

19. Landscape and IAD can be free from the constraints that a combination with Architecture might impose. Architecture could continue as its own entity.

20. This would be a smaller incremental step in our evolution. It might be less shocking to the system.

21. This configuration is only based in preserving Architecture as an autonomous unit and leadership presence due to its successful performance and growth as such and addressing the budget/efficiency priority concern defined by UofI & CAA leadership which limits to a 3 Department scenario. I do not agree on merging these three disciplines proposed in Department-C as they have better chances of potential of growth if left as autonomous units with leadership development (e.g. recent hires showing trends of contributing to program growth).

22. I honestly do not see how the three department configuration will benefit the college. I see us keeping the same old silos that we have always sworn this college doesn't have. We have talked about how being integrated has been a great selling point and how Alumni are proud of that. I don't feel like the idea of collaboration or integration is very strong in our college anymore.

23. One doesn't want to get lumped and lost nor isolated and withered...

I don't know what the answers are, but I think paying program heads according to a students served metric is more equitable than the current model.

24. Same comments apply as above, although this arrangement better balances student and faculty numbers.

25. Blank

26. I think early on Landscape Architecture and Interior Architecture and Design will feel stronger in regard to having a seat at the table, but I also believe this feeling will be short lived and the perceived power of architecture will settle back and feel much the same as it does now soon enough.

27. The IAD + Env Design/Larc department can also have the great naming opportunity, can be the seed for a near-future school for the environment, with the potential of adding planning to the mix, and facilities management; this is a licensed professional department (the programs within are licensed professional programs), there are significant synergies and alignments between the two programs (IAD+Env Design/Landscape Architecture) including teaching alignments, service alignment, research/scholarship alignment, and professional
outreach. (certification/license, sustainable sites initiative, LEED, Well Building, stakeholder involvement, multiscalar, service-learning, place-based, ..etc.

SYNERGIES - Human-centered focus and a shared body of knowledge
Shared- embodiments fo the land grant mission. Reviews and Professional Pool for sponsored professionally aligned studios; and Italy Studio. Discussions and some collaborative work have already begun.

Also, for BIAD + Env Design/Larc the multiscalar opportunity: scale from intimate to exponentially larger, can be an exciting opportunity to explore what else to add or investigate. Plus the shared theoretical and programmatic body of knowledge focusing on environmental design is a critical asset. This BIAD+LARC/Env design allows these programs to maintain their identity and cohesiveness to the internal and external stakeholders; currently exploring ideas about super studio across the two programs, build on collaborative and visionary efforts underway and on significant enrollment and recruitment success in BIAD, and enable IAD to have a direct path to related graduate degree. Can have a great opportunity for professional outreach locally and globally.

Accreditation for IAD (undergraduate-CIDA) and LARC (graduate-LAAP) can afford the interesting seamless scenario here too, and those two accreditation have more in common (especially about HLSW, research, etc) than with others.

VTD+ART share the same body of knowledge can broaden their offering by coalescing BA /Bs/BFA/Ms/MFA; can focus financials and efforts of faculty to deliver needed courses across the two related fields.

28. Blank

- Any Further Thoughts or Concerns? Indicate Preference Here
  1. 3 departments
  2. Prefer two Department Structure for CAA
  3. I prefer the 3-department configuration
  4. Concerns: too many to mention here.
  5. This process has gone on far too long.
  6. Of the choices, a 3 department configuration is preferable.
  7. Thank you for framing this. I’m slightly drawn towards the two-department model: IAD + LA + ARCH; VTD + A&D. However, whatever the configuration, I’m sure we’ll all adapt and adjust quickly. Thanks again and looking forward to next steps!
  8. 3 Department Model (Architecture, IAD, Landscape --- VTD --- Art&Design). Some of these combinations could drastically enhance or atrophy the growth and potential of the programs. I would highly recommend looking at this reorganization from a marketing standpoint. What combinations make the most sense internally and externally? How will incoming students find their people, their home, their community?
  9. I strongly prefer the 3 department arrangement.
  10. I prefer the three programs.
  11. I am against the restructuring of the college. Combining programs and adding a chair will not alleviate the critical necessity, nor responsibility, of directing each of those programs. The proposed addition of administrative chair positions is redundant, ineffective, and
unnecessarily disruptive. The anticipated cost savings are negligible and could easily be accomplished by more rational and equitable methods.

12. I consider the three department option offers more benefits than the two department option based on existing circumstance. It can reduce possible conflicts within our disciplines and also prepare us better for possible growth in the future. This structure can be easier and more efficient for the college to administer the resources according to different needs.

13. I trust the administration to develop a fair model. I defer to Randy and Dean Corry as to how to integrate other programs with Architecture.

14. Configuration 2

15. I would prefer to have the two departments rather than the three.

16. New configurations

17. At this stage we need to seriously make the one department model work. Two in my opinion is the most dangerous model to explore as it would significantly impact the Arts in a negative way. The only other option I see is the Three department model where we can "stay the same" for Architecture and Art, but allows for innovation and integration within Design for VTD, IAD and the Environmental Design program.

18. I prefer the program that makes the most sense for students in the courses and that faculty have the most overlap in helping students with discipline-specific skills and professional opportunity.

19. The issue of saving money is important and that is fundamentally why we are doing this exercise. But the opportunity changes like this afford shouldn't be discounted. As we move forward, it is best, I believe, to really explore beyond disciplines and look at the potential of where the markets will be in a few years. Junior faculty often are better at seeing this and are eager to make new things happen. They just want the administrative nod and they will make it work!

20. I believe we are ready for a two department model. This is my preference. With program level leadership, and respectful and collaborative leadership from the Chairs, I anticipate being able to maintain program autonomy that is required for individual curricular authority, program identity and accreditation.

21. I was surprised that this topic (on-going survey) was not mentioned during our CAA Spring meeting this semester. I am concerned the "Great Colleges to Work for Survey" process will be managed in a similar way as it was also allowed very few minutes in the CAA Spring meeting agenda for discussion. These are some of the most processes with topics that will have high impacts for years to come.

22. "B. 2 departments, split by Professional Designation-
Department 1: Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Interior Architecture and Design (app 415 students, 19 faculty)
Department 2: Art + Design, Virtual Technology and Design (approx. 209 students, 15 faculty)"
This make the most sense in every way. Anyone in marketing would love to be able to sell this.

23. I think 2 depts. makes the most sense (as listed by architectures and designs in titles)... would 2 dept heads become more like associate deans (which we need) but at the same time shunt a bulk of the work off to the relatively less well compensated program heads???
There would be so much less incentive to do that job (all the work in the trenches, yet always answering to another level and with less monetary compensation, or administrative rank.)

I would consider restructuring compensation levels to make program heads somewhat attractive and lessen some of the department head bonuses with the title/role being something of its own reward.

Some of our staff are outstanding, others, less so... I think more shared roles for what a person is suited toward could come of this (and I'll offer details or suggestions if needed).

24. If the primary goal is to save money by reducing the number of program heads, then two departments is better than three. Honestly, this seems like a poor motivation for any kind of reorganization. Any such move should be made in the students’ interests, and the students’ interests only. That is why I have chosen these models; they make the most sense to me from the student perspective. Perhaps I am naive in this, but my primary focus is on the career viability of our graduates. That’s the only reason why I teach the material I teach in the first place. How hireable are our graduating seniors? Period. Combining the Arch disciplines should (with proper shepherding and modeling from faculty) produce more successful graduates. The same goes for a combined Virtual Technology, Art + Design department. What I think we need to be extremely, extremely cautious about is reorganizing for our faculty’s interests and (more pointedly) for the interests of any particular individuals. This new college structure might still be here in 20 years. It might outlast us all. It’s irrational and shortsighted to make any decisions whatsoever based on the individuals involved. People leave. People retire. People die. Whatever new organizational chart the college agrees upon, it should be conceived with every chair on it empty.

25. I prefer the 2 department configuration. We are already a small College expressing overwhelm in regard to having too much to do. At least with this structure 7 faculty will take on a leadership rule instead of the 8 faculty that would play roles in the 3 department configuration. We need as many faculty as we can really pursuing their research if we want to remain strong in a University seeking Research 1 status. The 2 department configuration taxes one less person.

26. The amounts of funds being saved are minimal across all scenarios. This while at the same time administrative staff is removed from the department and is serving at the college; there are insurmountable responsibilities for a department head and a program head to complete, while also trying to address teaching, advising, outreach, and scholarship without the direct support of an administrative assistant.

Allow the programs that are willing to step in right now and change to do so without having to create major college reorganization, for instance, the ongoing IAD+LARC conversations can yield very interesting fruition if allowed to move forward without forcing another program in, or having to create upheaval, simply because the programs know there is something they themselves are working toward; this might mean we will have four departments, with expectations of growing being put on each of the departments Department heads or program heads also have an additional administrative role, for instance: associate dean of students, associate dean of faculty, associate dean of outreach/etc; this while reducing their teaching load and making them abide by the reduced...
teaching load (no three courses, for instance, speaking from the personal story). This will distribute the load, make us as a college very present in all of the important realms, does not put the power in the hands of one associate dean or one department, and engage us all in the collective of what we are here for the students, faculty, staff, and community. Curriculum, recruitment, accreditation remain in hands of programs.

Revisit a college core, that is vertical; also, Need to have the foundation be the human-centered foundation, where art, culture, and other parts of environment are integrated.

28. I prefer the 2 department option
Program Resource Requirements.
- Indicate all resources needed including the planned FTE enrollment, projected revenues, and estimated expenditures for the first four fiscal years of
- Include reallocation of existing personnel and resources and anticipated or requested new resources.
- Second and third year estimates should be in constant dollars.
- Amounts should reconcile subsequent pages where budget explanations are provided.
- If the program is contract related, explain the fiscal sources and the year-to-year commitment from the contracting agency(ies) or party(ies).
- Provide an explanation of the fiscal impact of any proposed discontinuance to include impacts to faculty (i.e., salary savings, re-assignments).

I. PLANNED STUDENT ENROLLMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. New enrollments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Shifting enrollments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. New Appropriated Funding Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Institution Funds</td>
<td>$28,280.00</td>
<td>$28,930.00</td>
<td>$29,040.00</td>
<td>$29,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. New Tuition Revenues from Increased Enrollments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other (i.e., Gifts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$28,280</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$28,930</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ongoing is defined as ongoing operating budget for the program which will become part of the base. One-time is defined as one-time funding in a fiscal year and not part of the base.
### III. EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Personnel Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Graduate/Undergrad Assistants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Research Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Directors/Administrators</td>
<td>22000</td>
<td>22000</td>
<td>22000</td>
<td>22000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Administrative Support Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>6820</td>
<td>6930</td>
<td>7040</td>
<td>7150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Total Personnel and Costs** | $28,820 | $28,930 | $29,040 | $29,150 | $0
### B. Operating Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Professional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Materials and Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rentals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Materials &amp; Goods for Manufacture &amp; Resale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Operating Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Capital Outlay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Library Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Capital Outlay**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2024</td>
<td>FY 2025</td>
<td>FY 2026</td>
<td>FY 2027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>One-time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Capital Facilities**

**Construction or Major Renovation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E. Other Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilites</th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Repairs</td>
<td>FY 2024</td>
<td>FY 2025</td>
<td>FY 2026</td>
<td>FY 2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>FY 2024</td>
<td>FY 2025</td>
<td>FY 2026</td>
<td>FY 2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Other Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EXPENDITURES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$28,820</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$28,930</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Income (Deficit)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-$540</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All other blank sections are not applicables since CAA is only changing administrative leadership structure all other program costs will remain the same.*
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1. **Policy/Procedure Statement:** Briefly explain the reason for the proposed addition, revision, and/or deletion.
   This APM is being deleted because the procedures and definitions contained in it have been incorporated into the revised 90.35 APM.

2. **Fiscal Impact:** What fiscal impact, if any, will this addition, revision, or deletion have?
   
   None

2. **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 D) unless otherwise specified in the policy.
A. General. It is occasionally desirable for non-UI affiliates to have access to UI facilities. For example, WSU graduate students may participate in research programs located on the UI campus. The Vandal Card system is used to control door access to a number of locations across campus, including some that non-UI affiliates may require access to. The Vandal Card office may issue a temporary ID card to non-UI affiliates under certain circumstances to provide access to those locations.

B. Sponsorship. The temporary ID for a non-UI affiliate must be requested by the Dean or department head of the college or department that the cardholder will be working with. This request must be in writing and signed by the Dean, Associate Dean, Vice President or Director only. Signature authority may not be delegated for temporary card requests. This request should also include an indication of when the association with the non-UI affiliate is expected to end.

C. Expiration. The temporary ID must have an expiration date specified, no more than 12 months from the time of its issuance. This expiration date will be printed on the face of the temporary ID.

D. Reissuing. If a temporary ID expires, another may be issued, but a new written and signed request from the Dean or department head is required, just as in the initial issuance.

E. Photo ID. The non-UI affiliate must bring an acceptable photo ID with them and present it to the Vandal Card office staff for verification at the time of card issuance. No ID card will be issued without proper photo ID. The various forms of acceptable photo ID are discussed in APM chapter 90.35 section C. [ed. 12-10]
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1. **Policy/Procedure Statement:** Briefly explain the reason for the proposed addition, revision, and/or deletion.

   This function is no longer in existence at the U of I.

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 D) unless otherwise specified in the policy.

   January 1.
A. **General.** The University of Idaho's Business Technology Incubator (UIBTI) is designed to facilitate the commercialization of technology by providing first-class, affordable space and an array of support services for young, growing, high-tech companies, especially companies created as spin-offs from UI technology and research.

B. **Conference Room Reservations.** The tenant companies in the Incubator are afforded first priority on use of the Incubator conference room. However, the room is available for use as a University conference room under the following conditions:

B-1. **Priority.** Incubator tenants have first priority for use of the conference room. If the conference room has been scheduled for non-tenant use, and the meeting has been publicly advertised (such as a public workshop scheduled by Conference Services), incubator staff will find meeting space elsewhere for tenants. However, if the conference room has been scheduled for non-tenant use and the meeting has not been publicly advertised, tenants have priority use of the conference room if notice is given 24 or more hours in advance.

B-2. **Scheduling.** The conference room may be scheduled by calling the Incubator’s receptionist at (208) 883-4703.

C. **Tours.** The staff of the incubator is pleased to provide tours of the facility at any time. Although scheduling of tours of preferred, drop-in visitors are welcome.
To:        President Scott Green  
From:  University of Idaho Staff Compensation Committee  
Date:  December 7, 2022  
Re:  FY24 Staff CEC Allocation Recommendations

Dear President Green,

In anticipation of a Change in Employee Compensation (CEC) allocation to our General Education Base budget for FY2024, the Staff Compensation Committee seeks to fulfill its role under FSH Policy 1640.81 and provide recommendations on the distribution of the CEC. The priority of the committee is to advocate for equity, transparency, and consistency in compensation; with a long-term goal to see all staff attain their calculated target salary. The target salary utilizes local and national market rates in combination with an employee’s years of service, education, and years in position to compute an individualized equitable salary. To achieve meaningful progress towards meeting target salaries, the committee recommends a tiered approach by (1) implementing a COLA/ATB1 increase based on staff’s individualized target rates, and (2) merit-based increase for exemplary performers.

Since August 2022, the Committee has conducted bi-weekly meetings to discuss issues related to staff compensation and to determine a set of principles for allocating CEC. We considered input from individual staff members as well as through information obtained from the CEC Distribution Survey deployed on September 22, 2022 (Exhibit 1). The survey results revealed that staff found COLA/ATB increases most equitable; however, had a stronger preference for target-based increases over COLA/ATB, with meritorious pay receiving the lowest ranking for both equity and preference. While staff indicated CEC dollars should be used for a merit pool, they “strongly agreed” it should take into consideration an employee’s target annual pay.

Thus, we are also seeking adoption of a performance-based compensation policy inclusive of qualifiers and procedural steps to assist supervisors in allocating merit pay in a way that is meaningful, defensible, and articulated. If your preference is that this policy go through official channels, we ask for your assistance in ensuring this agenda item can be prioritized so that it can be voted on prior to fiscal year end.

On November 9, 2022 the Committee presented these principles to Staff Council who voted in support of the Committee’s principles (21 in favor and 0 opposed).

---

1 COLA/ATB increase

---

Exhibit 1: CEC Distribution Survey Results
If the state legislature approves CEC funds, the committee agrees on the following reductions prior to allocation of the CEC to employees:

- **Faculty Promotion and Tenure:** The Committee supports recognizing the achievements of faculty through promotion and tenure (P&T) increases in salary. As a principal, the Committee believes that P&T increases should be funded through a source other than the CEC. However, in recent years the state legislature has not provided this funding, and therefore, the Committee supports use of CEC monies to fund P&T. The committee is requesting proportionate CEC funding for staff, to be utilized as a merit pool for exemplary performers.

- **Meritorious Pay for Staff who Perform at an Exemplary Level:** The committee requests to have a proportional dollar amount allocated to staff for meritorious pay. Since survey results depicted staff’s desire to have merit pay as a tertiary goal, the committee is advocating for this allocation despite the practice being contrary to market-based compensation. To be eligible for merit pay, one would need to have (1) been employed with the University of Idaho before December 31, 2022, (2) completed a satisfactory annual evaluation with supporting statements of their exemplary contributions throughout the fiscal year, and (3) successfully completed annual required training. (Exhibit 2).

- **RA and TA compensation:** Although we receive some state funding for graduate student appointments (primarily TAs), it has been static for many years. It has been proposed that a portion of the CEC funds be allocated to GenEd-funded graduate student appointments. Attracting and retaining the best and brightest graduate students is paramount to reaching our goal of Carnegie Highest Research (RI) status; we endorse using a proportional amount of CEC funds as the previous year to advance graduate student competitiveness.

- **Exempt Staff Minimums:** Increasing exempt staff’s minimum salary to meet the salary requirement dictated by federal law, specifically the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA).

Following these reductions, the committee recommends taking the following steps:

- **Increases for staff farthest from Annual Target Pay:** Increase staff positions to at least 80% of their Annual Target rate or higher, depending on what is attainable with the allocated funds.

- **ATB percentage allocation based on Annual Target rate:** Specifically, this would mean calculating an increase based on the computed target rate which encompasses the individual’s market rate in conjunction with their years of service, years in position, and education. Historically, the ATB increase was based on the employees’ current rate of pay. If applied, this would allow those behind target to incrementally increase while allocating a lesser amount for those above their target rate of pay, helping to lessen the gap of disparity. Additionally, we endorse using most current salary data to assess market pay, as opposed to previous years where salaries were calculated using a three-year weighted average.

- **COLA increase to offset inflation:** The committee seeks endorsement to utilize the remaining funds to provide staff with a flat rate increase. Based on historical data, a $500 lump sum payment to each staff member appears feasible; however, if there is a surplus in
funds the committee supports an increased rate. Again, this is contrary to best practice for maintaining a market-based compensation system; however, the Consumer Price Index for 2022 has increased exponentially and had significant impacts on everyone.

Alternatively, while not advocated for by the committee and not reflective of the survey results, given the limitations set by the President for having 1/3 of the funding reserved for meritorious pay, the following comment is being included:

If a 1/3 of funding is required for merit, the committee advocates that the amount that would be decreased to account for that allocation would be the COLA, opposed to decreasing the amount allocated to increasing compensation for staff farthest from Annual Target Pay, or decreases to the amount allocated for the ATB based on Annual Target Pay. This is reflective of the survey results, as Annual Target Pay was identified as the primary goal. It’s also advised that the communication for the merit pool in this case include that supervisors should consider Annual Target rates when providing increases.

In previous years, the Idaho State Legislature has instituted statewide requirements and we want to formally acknowledge the needed latitude to adhere to any requirements set forth by that governing agency.

We want to reiterate the intentions of the Staff Compensation Committee, which is to be the voice of staff when discussing matters relevant to compensation. When accomplished, it serves to increase morale, lessen turnover and attrition, and retain those highly skilled staff who are instrumental in the operations of the University of Idaho. We kindly ask that you take into consideration the proposal outlined above and welcome you to ask questions should any arise.

Sincerely,

Staff Compensation Committee Members:

Omni Francetich – Chair  
Theresa Albright – Voting Committee Member  
Eric Anderson – Voting Committee Member  
Jennifer Baillargeon-Hauck – Voting Committee Member  
Amber Feldman – Voting Committee Member  
Elissa Keim – Voting Committee Member  
Marty Lunt – Voting Committee Member  
Michelle Mattoon – Voting Committee Member  
Sara Moore – Voting Committee Member  
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Exhibit 1: CEC Distribution Survey Results
Q2 - Are you a faculty or a staff member?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Are you a faculty or a staff member?</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1,145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Choice Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>29.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>70.07%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Showing rows 1 - 3 of 3
Q3 - Which category does your position best fit into?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What does your position best fit into?</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Choice Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Service/Maintenance</td>
<td>8.88% 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Skilled Trade</td>
<td>5.54% 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-Faculty Exempt</td>
<td>41.19% 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>22.73% 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>22.16% 156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Showing rows 1 - 6 of 6
Q4 - What is your employee status?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>What is your employee status?</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Choice Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>50.79% 357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>49.22% 345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Showing rows 1 - 3 of 3
Q5 - Are you a supervisor to a board-appointed position?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Are you a supervisor to a board-appointed position?</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1,049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Choice Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.32% 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>75.69% 794</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Showing rows 1 - 3 of 3
**Q6 - How many years have you been employed at the University of Idaho?**

![Bar Graph]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How many years have you been employed at the University of Idaho?</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>15.34%</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>At least 1 year, less than 5 years</td>
<td>28.19%</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>At least 5 years, less than 15</td>
<td>38.42%</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>At least 15 years or more</td>
<td>25.11%</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Showing rows 1 - 5 of 5
Q7 - Which campus do you work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Which campus do you work? - Selected Choice</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Choice Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>82.00% 958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>5.21% 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cœur d'Alene</td>
<td>0.85% 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Idaho Falls</td>
<td>1.14% 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>McCall</td>
<td>0.28% 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10.42% 110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Showing rows 1 - 7 of 7
Q10 - Please rank the following options in order of equity – that is, the most fair and impartial to the least equitable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Merit Increases</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>COLA / ATB</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Target Annual Pay</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Merit Increases</td>
<td>19.32%</td>
<td>29.04%</td>
<td>51.64%</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>COLA / ATB</td>
<td>44.39%</td>
<td>31.51%</td>
<td>24.29%</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Target Annual Pay</td>
<td>30.44%</td>
<td>39.49%</td>
<td>24.11%</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Showing rows 1 - 3 of 3
Q11 - Please rank the following options in order of which should take preference in distributing CEC funds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>COLA / ATE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Target Annual Pay</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Merit increases</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>COLA / ATE</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>27.10%</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Target Annual Pay</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>28.49%</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Merit increases</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>44.38%</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Showing rows 1 - 3 of 3
Q12 - Should a portion of the CEC funding be set aside each year to provide merit increases for outstanding performance? In this situation, there would be less funding available for use in bringing employees closer to their target annual pay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Choice Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>55.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>44.76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q13 - How much do you agree or disagree with the following statement? Some employees are closer to their Target Annual Pay relative to others, e.g. one employee may be at 50% of their target, whereas another employee might be at 110%. Allocation of CEC funding should consider these differences even though it means those at or above 100% of Target Annual Pay may receive a smaller percentage increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Deviation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Choice Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Strongly Agree</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>40.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Somewhat agree</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>31.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Strongly disagree</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statement? Some employees are closer to their Target Annual Pay relative to others, e.g. one employee may be at 50% of their target, whereas another employee might be at 110%. Allocation of CEC funding should consider these differences even though it means those at or above 100% of Target Annual Pay may receive a smaller percentage increase.
A. MARKET COMPENSATION. Salaries shall be determined with reference to locally and nationally validated market salary rates pursuant to a model developed by Human Resources and shall be communicated annually.

B. PERFORMANCE COMPENSATION. If funds are available for performance increases, the following process shall be followed for determining compensation for performance:

B-1. Basis. Performance increases shall be based on the performance of responsibilities in the staff member’s position description. Staff members must meet or exceed expectations and have defensible comments articulating how the staff member exceeded requirements.

B-2. Recommendations. The relative number of staff within both academic and non-academic units shall be considered in determining the number of recommendations for each unit if the number of such recommendations is limited.

B-3. Unit Administrator’s Report. The unit administrator shall write a report to the Dean and/or Vice President recommending staff for performance increases.
   a) The report shall briefly state the reasons for each recommendation and prioritize the recommendations.
   b) The recommendations shall be closely related to and supported by annual performance evaluations.
   c) The unit administrator may recommend how funds should be distributed.

B-4. Administrative Consultation. The Dean or Vice President shall confer with the unit administrators and other relevant administrators regarding how to best allocate performance increases within the unit to advance the strategic objectives of the university.

B-5. Recommendation. Based on the unit administrators’ reports, the Dean or Vice President shall recommend performance increases to the Provost and/or President.

B-6. Future Performance. Unit administrators shall meet with any staff member who wants to discuss their salary to encourage conversation about future performance.
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