

University of Idaho

2025-26 University Faculty Meeting Agenda

Meeting #2

Wednesday, December 3, 2025, 2:30 p.m. PT) / 3:30 p.m. (MT)
Zoom Only

President C. Scott Green Presiding

- I. Call to Order – President Green
- II. In Memoriam – President Green **Attach. #1**
- III. Meeting Logistics – Faculty Secretary Francesca Sammarruca
- IV. Quorum – Faculty Secretary Francesca Sammarruca
- V. Approval of Minutes (vote) – President Green
 - Minutes of the 2025-2026 UFM #1 (Sept. 17, 2025) **Attach. #2**
- VI. Special Orders – Faculty Senate Chair Tim Murphy
 - Proposed Changes/Additions to the Faculty-Staff Handbook (vote)
 - FSH 3515 – Periodic Performance Review of Tenured Faculty. **Attach. #3**
 - Proposed Non-curricular Changes to the University Catalog (vote)
 - UCC 165 – Proposal to establish an Office of Institutional Effectiveness. **Attach. #4**
 - Faculty Senate Resolution (informational/no vote)
 - Resolution for multifunctional website to meet faculty obligations and responsibilities **Attach. #5**
- VII. Announcements and Remarks – President Green
- VIII. Adjournment – President Green

IN MEMORIAM

Richard Davis

Associate Professor Emeritus

University of Idaho Library

September 2025

William Stellmon

Professor Emeritus

College of Agricultural and Life Sciences

August 2025

List compiled as of 11.13.2025

University of Idaho**2025 – 2026 University Faculty Meeting Minutes – Pending Approval**Meeting #1

Wednesday, September 17, 2025, at 2:30pm (PT) / 3:30pm (MT)
via Zoom

President Scott Green Presiding

- President Green called the meeting to order at 2:30pm (PT).
- President Green read the names of faculty who passed, as from information received by the Provost Office since the previous University Faculty Meeting. Faculty omitted will be recognized at the next University Faculty Meeting.
- President Green requested a moment of silence in honor of the colleagues who passed away.
- Meeting Logistics – Faculty Secretary Sammarruca
Secretary Sammarruca reviewed the criteria for eligible voting faculty (FSH 1520 II.1.) and the meeting protocol. She encouraged the faculty to raise their hands with questions and to keep the use of the chat function to a minimum.
- Quorum count: Faculty Secretary Sammarruca
 - 98 voting members of the faculty were required for a quorum. 145 eligible voters were counted and thus a quorum was present.
- Approval of minutes – President Green
 - The minutes of the 2024-2025 University Faculty Meeting #2 (May 7, 2025) were approved as distributed.
- Special Orders – Faculty Senate Chair Tim Murphy
 - The Provost read the names of the new members of the university leadership.
 - The Provost read internal changes in the administration.
 - College Deans read the names of new faculty and recognized those who were awarded promotion and/or tenure.
 - Faculty Senate Chair Tim Murphy recognized the faculty senators who completed their terms in 2024-25
 - Consent Agenda
The faculty approved the spring graduates by unanimous consent.
 - Proposed Changes/Additions to the University Catalog (vote)
 - UCC 163 Change to Admission Requirements

By the current admission standards, students with GPA between 2.30 and 2.59 are admitted into the VGP. Students with a GPA below 2.30 can appeal to the Admissions Committee. The main point of the proposed revisions is to allow students with GPA below 2.60 who have been admitted through VGP to appeal for direct admission. This would remove a double standard with respect to students with a GPA below 2.30, who can appeal to the Admissions Committee for direct admission.

There were no questions or comments.

Vote: 128/136 in favor; 8/136 opposed. Motion carries.

- Proposed Changes/Additions to the Faculty Staff Handbook (vote)

- FSH 4130 Standards Course Numbers

The purpose of these changes is to incorporate the shift to four-digit course numbers that have been implemented over the last couple of years. We add a course number for undergraduate research and reserve some particular course numbers for future use.

There were no questions or comments.

Vote: 141/143 in favor; 2/143 opposed. Motion carries.

- President's Remarks and Announcements:

As you are aware, earlier this month we held our annual State of the University address, in which we recapped another outstanding year and laid out our vision for the next five years under our new strategic plan. The full State of the University Address is available on our website under Presidential Communications. As a reminder, grant proposals for funding of strategic plan projects are due October 1.

Our numbers will not be official until census day next month, but we're expecting a record number of students on campus this fall. It is unlikely we'll meet our record number of freshman from last year due to our international student numbers being down. But this would be our ninth straight semester of enrollment growth, which is a big win as we hit the enrollment cliff this year. Students continue to seek out the U of I because they get an outstanding, yet affordable education.

Our enrollment success fuels our financial health. Our budget management has turned into an overwhelming strength thanks to the hard work of our employees and the thoughtful stewardship of our finances. Through the hybrid budget model and our P3 initiatives, we have added about \$15 million to invest in our strategic priorities over the past three years.

Last month, the governor announced a 3% budget reversion for fiscal year 2026. For the University of Idaho, this means a \$5 million reduction in state appropriations.

This is a state's funding issue, and recent reports on revenue projections indicate that these cuts will likely be permanent. It is in no way a reflection on the great work happening at the University of Idaho. Full details about the budget reduction and our plans to move forward are available in the memo sent out August 19.

Our research enterprise continues to grow and thrive thanks to the hard work of our employees. We once again set a record for research expenditures, topping \$140 million in 2024. As we deliver on our land grant mission of access for students and research for our state, we provide \$2.5 billion dollars in economic impact in Idaho each year.

We are national leaders in a wide variety of research, including water, soil health, agriculture, forestry, fire, and artificial intelligence. Despite significant challenges at the federal level, we continue to win grants. In recent months we received grants for our Center of Biomedical Research Excellence in Nutrition and Women's Health, the Institute for Modeling Collaboration and Innovation, and our INBRE program, which celebrates 25 years of research excellence this year.

On the topic of our website, our team has been working hard to address issues since the launch of our new site last month. If you identify issues, please reach out to Seth Vieux at sethv@uidaho.edu. We continue to work on the search functions in both .edu and intranet. They have improved and will continue to be refined. Faculty, emeritus faculty, and post-doc profiles are being added to the .edu site and are a UCM priority.

Our website gets over a million hits a month and is a major driver of enrollment. The new site is strongly outperforming the old site in virtually every measure we're tracking. Our quality assurance score, which measures the customer's journey on the site, jumped nearly 14 points to 91 out of 100. We're also seeing much higher scores in SEO, accessibility, and digital certainty.

We appreciate the great work of our faculty, and we look forward to building on our success over the next five years.

President Green opened the floor to question.

A faculty asked whether there is a plan in the works to provide a university vaccine clinic this fall.

Provost Lawrence responded that there has been discussion about that. It is more complicated than the COVID vaccine availability. The team that has managed those in the past is looking into the question, and we may expect some messaging about that soon. The provost will follow up as well.

- Adjournments

The agenda being completed, President Green adjourned the meeting at 3:40pm.

Respectfully Submitted

Francesca Sammarruca
Secretary of the University Faculty



POLICY COVER SHEET

For instructions on policy creation and change, please see
<https://www.uidaho.edu/governance/policy>

All policies must be reviewed, approved, and returned by the policy sponsor, with a cover sheet attached, to ui-policy@uidaho.edu.

Faculty Staff Handbook (FSH)

X Addition ☐ Revision* ☐ Deletion* ☐ Interim ☐ Minor Amendment

Policy Number & Title: **FSH 3515 PERIODIC PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF FACULTY**

Administrative Procedures Manual (APM)

☐ Addition ☐ Revision* ☐ Deletion* ☐ Interim ☐ Minor Amendment

Policy Number & Title:

*Note: If revision or deletion, request original document from ui-policy@uidaho.edu. All changes must be made using "track changes."

Policy originator: Bob Borelli, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair

Policy sponsor, if different from originator: Torrey Lawrence, Provost

Reviewed by General Counsel: ☒ Yes ☐ No Name & Date: Karl Klein 11/21/25

Comprehensive review? ☐ Yes ☐ No

1. **Policy/Procedure Statement:** Briefly explain the reason for the proposed change.

This policy establishes procedures for periodic performance review of tenured faculty in compliance with Idaho State Board of Education Policy II.G.

2. **Fiscal Impact:** What fiscal impact, if any, will this change have?

None.

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

None.

4. **Effective Date:** This policy shall be effective on July 1, or January 1, whichever arrives first after final approval (see FSH 1460 H) unless otherwise specified.

FSH 3515 – Periodic Performance Review of Tenured Faculty

Owner:

- **Position:** Vice Provost for Faculty
- **Email:** vprovf@uidaho.edu

Last updated:

A. Purpose. FSH 3515 contains all official University periodic performance review (PPR) procedures and supersedes any PPR procedure contained in college or unit bylaws.

B. Scope. This policy applies to all tenured faculty.

C. Definitions

C-1. Coordinator. The administrator tasked with coordinating the review process is typically the unit administrator. If the unit administrator is the reviewee, the coordinator role will fall to the dean. If a supervisor of the unit administrator is the reviewee, the review will be coordinated by the Vice Provost for Faculty.

C-2. Reviewee. The tenured faculty member whose performance is under consideration.

C-3. Tenure. Faculty tenure is defined in FSH 3500 A-3.

C-4. Unit. For purposes of this policy, “unit” is defined as in FSH 3500 A-1.e, and refers to the unit in which the reviewee holds a tenured position.

D. Policy

D-1. In general. The review must be conducted in terms of the tenured faculty member’s overall contributions to the unit and continuing performance of responsibilities as articulated in their position description. The review process is expected to be conducted with a spirit of fairness, integrity, and good faith.

D-2. Review period. The review is conducted at five-year intervals following the award of tenure or the reviewee’s most recent promotion, whichever is later. The review period shall be the five years preceding the PPR. In accordance with RGP II.G., there is an exception for associate professors in the promotion process. Generally, the promotion from the rank of associate professor to full professor is considered no earlier than the fifth full year after attaining the rank of associate professor, which is generally contemporaneous with the granting of tenure. In cases where a candidate submits an application for promotion from associate professor to professor rank in the same year that a PPR would otherwise be scheduled, the promotion review will fulfill the requirement for the PPR.

D-3. Satisfactory performance of tenured faculty. The basic standard for appraisal regarding the periodic performance review of tenured faculty shall be whether a reviewee satisfactorily performs the duties outlined in their position description. To ensure operational efficiency and fiscal responsibility, if a faculty member receives at least four satisfactory annual evaluations during the period under review, there is a rebuttable presumption that the faculty member will receive a finding of “satisfactory performance” under section E-9.a., unless there is clear and convincing evidence that a contrary determination is appropriate. Should a contrary determination be deemed appropriate, the unit administrator’s report under Section E-6.b must explain why the reasons justifying that contrary determination were not addressed during the relevant annual evaluations.

E. Procedure

E-1. Committee composition and selection

a. Faculty without administrative appointments

1. Composition. The PPR committee shall comprise three tenured faculty members from within the reviewee's unit. In cases considering the review of full professors, the committee shall include at least one full professor. If there are not enough tenured faculty of rank in the unit, then faculty outside the unit, but within a closely related unit, may serve on the committee. Committee members are subject to the procedures for disclosure and recusal contained in FSH 3500 B-6. If there are not sufficient tenured faculty members of rank available to serve on the committee, the unit administrator shall designate appropriate faculty members from other units whose areas of expertise are as closely related as possible to the work of the reviewee. One such member may chair the committee if there is not a tenured member from the unit available to serve as chair.

2. Nominations. The reviewee may nominate up to three tenured faculty members from within their unit by submitting their names to the coordinator; the reviewee may also nominate tenured members from other units should those members be qualified to evaluate the reviewee's performance with regard to their position description. The reviewee may also submit up to three names of faculty members who shall be excluded from serving on the committee.

3. Appointment of members. The coordinator shall appoint the committee, including, if provided, at least one named person from the reviewee's list of nominees. The committee members shall select a chair from their membership. When multiple faculty members in the same unit are up for review, the coordinator and the faculty members involved may determine whether a single committee can conduct all reviews or if separate committees should be formed for each individual review.

b. Faculty with administrative appointments

1. Composition. The PPR committee shall comprise three tenured faculty members, one of whom should be from the faculty member's unit, and one of whom should be a tenured faculty member holding a commensurable administrative position. In the case of unique administrative positions, such as a president, provost, or vice president, an administrator or executive at the rank of Dean or above should be included. Committee members are subject to the procedures for disclosure and recusal contained in FSH 3500 B-6.

2. Nominations. The reviewee may nominate up to three tenured faculty members from within their unit by submitting their names to the coordinator. The reviewee may also nominate tenured members from other units, provided those members are qualified to evaluate the reviewee's performance with respect to their position descriptions. The same process may be followed in the nomination of administrators, for which up to two may be nominated. The reviewee may also submit the name of one faculty member and one administrator who shall be excluded from serving on the committee.

3. Appointment of members. The coordinator shall appoint the committee, including, if provided, at least one name from the reviewee's list of nominees. The committee members shall select a chair from their membership.

E-2. Review materials. The review shall be limited to the materials described below.

a. Materials submitted by reviewee.

1. Mandatory: Updated curriculum vitae in U of I format.
2. Optional: A self-evaluation summary of each area of the reviewee's responsibilities and achievements relative to the reviewee's post-tenure work activities during the review period reflected in their annual position descriptions following the procedures in FSH 3050 B. The self-evaluation summary shall be limited to three pages and must address responsibilities in the position description and the reviewee's continued contribution to the unit where they hold tenure.

b. Materials submitted by coordinator. The coordinator shall provide the following materials:

1. Position descriptions for the review period.

2. The official record, as maintained by the provost's office, of annual evaluation materials for the review period, including any responses to annual evaluations submitted by the faculty member.
3. If teaching is included in the reviewee's position descriptions, copies of all the reviewee's student course evaluation summaries as described in FSH 2700 D-2 for the period under review.
4. If the previous PPR review required a formal performance plan to realign a tenured faculty member's performance with their current position description, the reports and performance plan from the unit, unit administrator, dean, and provost shall be included in these materials.

c. Clarification requests. The review committee may request clarification, including limited additional materials, from the reviewee or coordinator when necessary. However, such requests should be clearly warranted and limited in both scope and volume. In general, the materials outlined in sections E-2.a and E-2.b are expected to provide sufficient information for the review process.

E-3. Basis for evaluation. The review shall be based on the PPR review materials submitted as they pertain to the reviewee's position descriptions for the review period and unit and college criteria for PPR as articulated in the unit and college bylaws, if any.

E-4. Unit committee and administrator review. The committee and unit administrator shall each determine if the reviewee's performance is satisfactory or unsatisfactory by reviewing the responsibilities outlined in the position descriptions during the review period and determining if the reviewee's PPR materials meet their position descriptions and the PPR expectations defined in the unit and college bylaws, if any.

E-5. Unit committee's review and conclusion. After reviewing the reviewee's continuing performance in each of the responsibilities articulated in their position descriptions, the committee shall make a holistic assessment of the reviewee's performance as satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

- a. If the committee determines the performance to be satisfactory, the committee chair shall sign the attestation form as satisfactory and forward it to the unit administrator.
- b. If the committee deems the performance unsatisfactory, they shall write a report detailing the problem areas in relation to the position description, responsibility areas, and the criteria articulated in the unit and college bylaws, if any.

E-6. Unit administrator's review and conclusion. The unit administrator shall consider the report submitted by the unit committee in making a holistic determination as to whether the reviewee's performance has been satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

- a. If the unit administrator deems the reviewee's performance satisfactory, they shall sign the attestation form as satisfactory.
- b. If the unit administrator deems the performance unsatisfactory, they shall write a report detailing the problem areas in relation to the position description responsibility areas and the criteria articulated in unit and college bylaws, if any, and will make a recommendation about the outcome of the post tenure review. If the conclusion is incongruous with previous performance reviews during the review period, the unit administrator must justify the conclusion in the report.
- c. If the unit administrator disagrees with a finding of unsatisfactory performance by the unit committee, the unit administrator shall provide a report outlining how the reviewee does meet expectations based on the position description and annual evaluation materials for the review period. The report shall be limited to five pages. The reviewee may respond to the unit administrator's conclusion within five days of receipt if needed.

d. The coordinator shall provide the unit level decision and, if applicable, the committee's report and unit administrator's report to the reviewee for review.

E-7. Faculty response. Upon receipt of the unit committee's and unit administrator's decisions and, if applicable, reports, the reviewee may submit a response within five business days to the coordinator. This response will be included in materials forwarded to the dean, if distinct from the unit administrator, coordinator, and reviewee. If the dean or another executive is the reviewee, the materials are forwarded to the Vice Provost for Faculty.

E-8. Forwarding to the dean. The coordinator shall submit the materials, unit reports and any responses provided by the reviewee to the dean, if distinct from the unit administrator, coordinator, and reviewee. If the dean has another role in the review, the materials are forwarded to the Vice Provost for Faculty, who shall perform the duties assigned to the dean below.

a. If both the unit committee and unit administrator have signed the attestation form as satisfactory, the dean shall forward this finding to the provost.

b. If the unit administrator finds performance unsatisfactory or disagrees with a finding of unsatisfactory performance by the unit committee, the unit administrator shall send the report from Section E-6 above and all relevant materials to the dean. The dean shall forward the materials to the provost.

c. If the dean disagrees with a finding of unsatisfactory performance by the unit committee and the unit administrator, the dean shall provide a report outlining the ways in which the reviewee does meet expectations based on the position description and annual evaluation materials for the review period. The report shall be limited to five pages. The reviewee may respond to the dean's conclusion within five days of receipt if needed. The dean shall send the report and all relevant materials to the provost.

d. All materials from the review and recommendations (committee, unit administrator, and dean) will be submitted to the Office of the Provost by April 1.

E-9. Final decision and outcomes. With the unit committee and unit administrator review complete, the dean shall forward the findings to the provost.

a. Satisfactory performance. If the unit committee and unit administrator find the reviewee's performance to be satisfactory, then the PPR is complete.

b. Mixed review. If the review contains both satisfactory and unsatisfactory conclusions, then the provost shall review all of the materials and reports generated at the unit and college level and make the administrative decision of satisfactory or unsatisfactory based on review of all materials and recommendations listed above.

c. Unsatisfactory performance. If the reviewee's performance is found unsatisfactory by the unit committee and unit administrator, then one of the following outcomes will occur:

1. Performance plan. In the event of an unsatisfactory PPR, the unit administrator must submit a proposal for a performance plan to the college dean. This will be a formal plan designed to realign the reviewee's performance with their current position description. The performance plan is expected to be crafted in good faith with both unit administrator, if any, dean, and the reviewee. It shall include a commitment by the reviewee to improve and a commitment by the institution to provide adequate support towards that improvement. The dean shall approve the performance plan and submit it to the provost in writing for approval. If the unit administrator and dean, in consultation with the reviewee, cannot reach a reasonable agreement on a performance plan, all parties may seek a meeting (scheduled by the dean) with the Ombuds to discuss and

amend the proposed performance plan. The dean shall submit it in writing to the provost. Once received by the provost, the faculty member must receive the approved plan to begin implementation. This process must be completed by May 15 of the academic year in which the review is conducted.

2. Alternative resolutions. The reviewee may request alternative resolutions, which may be adopted in the discretion of the provost.

3. Termination. The provost may recommend termination, as outlined in FSH 3910, only after all efforts have been exhausted to support a faculty member's improvement in accordance with their performance plan.

The provost shall make the final administrative determination on which of these three outcomes will apply.

E-10. Appeal by faculty member. Unsatisfactory performance determinations may be appealed per FSH 3840.

E-11. Timeline

a. In general. In the January prior to the review year, the unit administrator shall provide written notification to each faculty member scheduled for review in the upcoming academic year. The faculty member may request an extension if appropriate. The PPR process will be conducted annually during the spring semester. The provost will communicate the review outcomes to the faculty member, unit administrator, and college dean before the end of the spring semester.

b. Extensions

1. Childbirth or adoption. A faculty member who becomes the parent of a child by birth or adoption, may request an automatic one-year extension of the timeline

2. Other circumstances. An extension of the timeline may be granted in other exceptional circumstances (RGP II.G.6.d.iv.2) that may impede a faculty member's progress toward achieving a satisfactory PPR, including but not limited to significant responsibilities with respect to elder or dependent care, child care, custody, disability or chronic illness, problems beyond the faculty member's control relating to their research or scholarly activities, or such other reasons deemed by the provost to be exceptional and likely to impede the faculty member's progress.

3. Length of extension. In most cases, extension of the time shall be for one year; however, longer extensions may be granted upon a showing of need by the faculty member. Multiple extension requests may be granted.

4. Option to shorten extension. A faculty member may choose to be considered for PPR on their original timeline, even if an extension has been granted.

5. Procedure for requesting an extension

a. The faculty member must request the extension from the provost in writing by the first week of the academic year in which the review process is scheduled to begin. The written request must include appropriate documentation of the childbirth, adoption, or other exceptional circumstance.

b. Except to obtain necessary consultative assistance on medical or legal issues, only the provost shall have access to documentation pertaining to a request related to disability or chronic illness. The provost shall, in their discretion, determine if consultation with the dean or unit administrator is appropriate.

c. The approval decision shall be made without regard to whether or not the faculty member takes a leave related to the same circumstances presented for the extension.

d. The provost shall notify the faculty member, unit administrator, and dean of the action taken. The reviewee may choose to provide information regarding the extension in their self-evaluation; otherwise, no information regarding the extension shall be included in the reviewee's dossier, unless such information already exists in the materials to be provided by the unit administrator. If

such information already exists in the materials, the reviewee may choose to have that information redacted. Committee and administrator reports shall not mention the extended timeline.

6. Effect of extension. No additional productivity is expected when a faculty member extends the timeline for PPR. For example, if a decision would customarily take place in the fifth year, and it is extended to the sixth year, the standard of performance would remain the same as for a decision made in the fifth year.

F. Related Policies

- [Idaho State Board of Education Policy II.G. Policies Regarding Faculty](#)
- [FSH 3500 Promotion and Tenure](#)
- [FSH 3910 Dismissal and Discipline of Faculty](#)
- [FSH 3840 Procedures for Faculty Appeals](#)

165: PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH AN OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

In Workflow

1. Registrar's Office (none)
2. Provost Q 1 (stoutm@uidaho.edu; gwen@uidaho.edu; sandeschlueter@uidaho.edu)
3. Registrar's Office (none)
4. Ready for UCC (none)
5. UCC (none)
6. Post-UCC Registrar (none)
7. Faculty Senate Chair (stoutm@uidaho.edu; cari@uidaho.edu; sandeschlueter@uidaho.edu; ceraligman@uidaho.edu)
8. Provost Q 2 (stoutm@uidaho.edu; gwen@uidaho.edu; sandeschlueter@uidaho.edu)
9. State Approval (stoutm@uidaho.edu; gwen@uidaho.edu; sandeschlueter@uidaho.edu)
10. NWCCU (stoutm@uidaho.edu; sandeschlueter@uidaho.edu; gwen@uidaho.edu)
11. Catalog Update (catalog@uidaho.edu)

Approval Path

1. Fri, 27 Jun 2025 17:01:48 GMT
Theodore Unzicker (tunzicker): Approved for Registrar's Office
2. Fri, 10 Oct 2025 16:10:33 GMT
Sande Schlueter (sandeschlueter): Approved for Provost Q 1
3. Mon, 13 Oct 2025 17:56:50 GMT
Theodore Unzicker (tunzicker): Approved for Registrar's Office
4. Wed, 15 Oct 2025 17:50:39 GMT
Theodore Unzicker (tunzicker): Approved for Ready for UCC
5. Tue, 21 Oct 2025 23:25:26 GMT
Anna Hall (annahall): Approved for UCC
6. Wed, 22 Oct 2025 18:58:27 GMT
Theodore Unzicker (tunzicker): Approved for Post-UCC Registrar

New Proposal

Date Submitted: Wed, 07 May 2025 17:59:52 GMT

Viewing: Proposal to Establish an Office of Institutional Effectiveness

Last edit: Fri, 10 Oct 2025 16:10:29 GMT

Changes proposed by: David Ma

Faculty Contact

Faculty Name	Faculty Email
David Ma	dma@uidaho.edu

Request Type

Add/Drop a Department/School/Unit/College

Effective Catalog Year

2026-2027

Title

Proposal to Establish an Office of Institutional Effectiveness

Request Details

This proposal recommends the establishment of an Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) at the University of Idaho, consolidating the current functions of Institutional Research and Assessment and Accreditation. This new structure aims to eliminate organizational ambiguity, improve efficiency, and better support the University's strategic planning, continuous improvement efforts, and evidence-based decision-making. By unifying these complementary functions under one umbrella, the University will reinforce a culture of data-informed excellence and institutional accountability.

Attach State Form

Office_IE_Academic_Programs_Short Proposal Form.pdf

Key: 165



SHORT PROPOSAL FORM

Academic Programs

Date of Proposal Submission:			
Institution Submitting Proposal:	University of Idaho		
Name of College, School, or Division:	Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives		
Name of Department(s) or Area(s):			
Official Name of Program or Instructional/Administrative Unit:	Office of Institutional Effectiveness		
CIP code or Modification of CIP Code (consult IR /Registrar):	N/A		
Method of Delivery: Indicate percentage of face-to-face, hybrid, distance delivery, etc.	N/A		
Implementation Date:	Spring 2026		
Geographical Delivery:	Location(s)	Moscow, ID	Region(s) N/A
Indicate (X) if the program is/has: (Consistent with Board Policy V.R.)	☐ Self-Support fee	☐ Professional Fee	☐ Online Program Fee

Indicate those that apply to this request:

- ☐ Undergraduate Certificate (30 credits or more)
☐ Graduate Certificate (30 credits or more)
☐ Specialized Certificate (Below \$250k/FY)

Proposed Action

- ☐ Addition of a certificate or degree to an existing program
☐ Addition of a certificate to an existing program
☐ Modification of existing academic programs
☐ Splitting an existing program into two or more programs
☐ Consolidating two or more programs into one stand-alone program
☐ Converting one program option into a stand-alone program
☐ Converting or transitioning a degree level type (i.e. BA to BS)
☐ Converting or transitioning a certificate type (i.e. TC to BTC)
☐ Establishing a dual degree from existing programs

Other

- ☐ New programs consisting of multiple certificates with similar coursework
☐ Program name changes related to Statewide Program Responsibilities (requires Board approval)
☐ Deviation from certificate or degree program credit definitions (Board Policy III.E.)
☒ Modification to existing academic instructional or administrative units

College Dean (Institution) _____ Date _____

Academic Affairs Program Manager, OSBE _____ Date _____

FVP/Chief Fiscal Officer (Institution) _____ Date _____

Chief Financial Officer, OSBE _____ Date _____

Provost/VP for Instruction (Institution) _____ Date _____

OSBE Executive Director or Designee _____ Date _____
Approval

This proposal form must be completed for certificates and program changes as provided in Board Policy III.G.3.b. *Actions Requiring a Short Proposal.*

1. Provide an overview of the changes that includes need and rationale for the proposed modification or change. Identify any existing program that this program will replace.

This proposal recommends the establishment of an Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) at the University of Idaho, consolidating the current functions of Institutional Research and Assessment and Accreditation. This new structure aims to eliminate organizational ambiguity, improve efficiency, and better support the University's strategic planning, continuous improvement efforts, and evidence-based decision-making. By unifying these complementary functions under one umbrella, the University will reinforce a culture of data-informed excellence and institutional accountability. Specifically, the creation of the OIE will resolve the confusion of organizational ambiguity by formally integrating assessment and accreditation functions with institutional research as peer activities within a unified office. This new structure will allow for a more transparent delineation of responsibilities and increased collaboration. Further, it will enhance campus understanding of each function's role in supporting institutional quality. An integrated office can better align data, assessment, and planning cycles; streamline access to actionable insights and analysis; and facilitate timely and strategic decisions at all levels of the University. Thus, the new office will improve the university's capacity to support stronger academic achievement, leading to higher retention and graduation rates and enhancing the work-readiness of UI graduates.

2. Discuss impact of proposed modification on student enrollment. Using the chart below, provide projected new enrollments for the proposed certificate or modified program:

Estimated New Enrollment			
Year	Fall	Spring	Summer
	Headcount	Headcount	Headcount
20xx-xx			
20xx-xx			
20xx-xx			
20xx-xx			
20xx-xx			

Not applicable

3. **Educator Endorsement/Certification Programs.** All new initial educator preparation programs that lead to an Idaho educator endorsement/certification require review and recommendation facilitated by the Office of the State Board of Education and approval from the Idaho State Board of Education.

Will this program include a new initial educator preparation program leading to an Idaho educator endorsement/certification?

Yes No X

If yes, on what date was the new program application endorsement/certification submitted to the Office of the State Board of Education (Educator Effectiveness Program Manager)

Date _____

All new program applications for endorsement/certification are submitted via CANVAS by the educator preparation provider dean, assistant dean, or director.

Not Applicable

4. Three-Year Plan. If this is a new proposed certificate (30 credits or more) or degree, is it on your institution's Board approved 3-year plan?

Yes ____ No ____

Not applicable

If yes, proceed to question 5. If no, please address A and B below:

- a. Which of the following statements address the reason for adding this program outside of the regular three-year planning process.

Indicate (X) by each applicable statement:

Not applicable

☐	Program is important for meeting your institution's regional or statewide program responsibilities.
☐	The program is in response to a specific industry need or workforce opportunity.
☐	The program is reliant on external funding (grants, donations) with a deadline for acceptance of funding.
☐	There is a contractual obligation or partnership opportunity related to this program.
☐	The program is in response to accreditation requirements or recommendations.
☐	The program is in response to recent changes to teacher certification/endorsement requirements.
☐	We failed to include it when we had the opportunity.
☐	Other:

- b. Provide an explanation for all statements you selected.

Not Applicable

5. Curriculum for the proposed program changes and its delivery.
- a. Summary of requirements. Provide a summary of program requirements using the following table.

Not applicable

Credit hours in required courses offered by the department (s) offering the program.	
Credit hours in required courses offered by other departments	
Credit hours in institutional general education curriculum	
Credit hours in free electives	
Total credit hours required for degree program	

- b. Curriculum. Provide the curriculum for the program, including a listing of course titles and credits in each.

Not Applicable

6. Resources Required for Implementation – Financial Impact and Budget.
 - a. Discuss organizational arrangements required within the institution to accommodate the proposed action, including administrative, staff, and faculty hires, facilities, student services, library, etc. Include a statement regarding total cost to students. If there is no financial impact as defined in Board Policy III.G.1.f¹, include a statement to indicate there is no financial impact. Completion of the budget form is required if there is a financial impact.

The creation of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) at the University of Idaho involves unifying the existing functions of Institutional Research and Assessment and Accreditation under a single administrative umbrella. This reorganization will streamline reporting lines and enhance operational coherence, but it does not require any new administrator, staff, or faculty hires. No changes to facilities, student services, or library resources are necessary.

There is no financial impact as defined in Board Policy III.G.1.f. This is an internal structural realignment of existing resources and personnel. Thus, there are no additional costs to students, and completion of the budget form is not required.

¹ Financial Impact shall mean the total financial expenditures, regardless of funding source, needed to support personnel costs, operating expenditures, capital outlay, capital facilities construction or major renovation, and indirect costs that are incurred as a direct result of establishing, modifying, or discontinuing a new instructional program, instructional unit, or administrative unit. *Revised per Board Policy III.G, June 2024.*

Resolution FS2526-1

Resolution for multifunctional website to meet faculty obligations and responsibilities
uidaho.edu

Whereas the University of Idaho is an R1 land-grant university.

Whereas an R1 institute of “very high research activity” bears a unique responsibility to an inherent set of internal and external stakeholders.

Whereas University of Idaho R1 stakeholders include, but are not limited to, current and prospective undergraduate students and their families; current and prospective graduate students and postdoctoral fellows; current and prospective faculty; current and prospective staff; alumni; donors; federal, state, and local granting agencies; researchers and educators from other institutions who partner with University of Idaho faculty and their respective programs; leaders in STEM and humanities fields from both the private and public sectors; accreditation and review bodies; individual external reviewers; and the Idaho State Board of Education.

Whereas an R1 university’s public-facing website necessarily functions to serve its stakeholders by disseminating correct, clear, and concise research and teaching information and data.

Whereas University of Idaho faculty create, oversee, and implement—through the processes of shared governance—key elements of field-specific curriculum development, delivery, and oversight.

Whereas University of Idaho faculty members within colleges, academic departments, academic programs, and research labs have specific and nuanced needs for communication to a broad range of stakeholders through a public-facing institutional website.

Whereas the Faculty Senate strongly believes that faculty have not been sufficiently consulted on the taxonomy or content of the current public-facing uidaho.edu, thus disregarding the core needs of faculty and their academic stakeholders and thus negating the spirit of shared governance.

Whereas the Faculty Senate strongly believes that the lack of faculty input and content management on the public-facing website uidaho.edu is a liability to the R1 stakeholders mentioned above.

Whereas the Faculty Senate strongly believes that the lack of faculty input and content management on uidaho.edu is a liability to current and future undergraduate- and graduate-level enrollments and retentions efforts.

Whereas the Faculty Senate strongly believes that the lack of faculty input and content management on uidaho.edu is a liability to research partnerships, grant applications and reporting, and academic standards across disciplines.

Whereas the Faculty Senate strongly believes that the lack of faculty input and content management on uidaho.edu is a liability to recruit high-quality faculty and researchers familiar with R1 practices and standards.

Whereas the Faculty Senate strongly believes that the lack of faculty input and content management on uidaho.edu is inconsistent with academic standards and practices at R1 land-grant universities. Therefore, be it

Resolved that the University Faculty (as opposed to University Communications) shall have the direct ability to create and control the taxonomy and content of all relevant information germane to the category of “academics,” such as degree information, academic program information, academic scholarship, academic grants, faculty profiles, and other areas of information relevant to academic stakeholders.

Resolved that all Deans and Vice Presidents shall have access to manage the taxonomy and content of dedicated subdomains within the website uidaho.edu, as is currently the case for the library.

Resolved, that University Communications and Marketing will provide resources and support to University Faculty, Deans, and Vice Presidents in managing the taxonomy and content of dedicated subdomains within the website uidaho.edu.

Resolved that Faculty shall retain autonomy and administrative control over public-facing information germane to fulfill their obligations as R1 and Land Grant educators, researchers, and experts within their respective academic fields.

Approved at Senate on October 28, 2025.