

**University of Idaho  
2007-2008  
FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA**

**Meeting #3**

**3:30 p.m.  
Tuesday, September 11, 2007  
Ag Science 104; PF/UIRP; IF4 (TAB321b); Boise 450C**

**Order of Business**

- I. Call to Order.**
- II. Minutes.**
  - Minutes of the 2007-08 Faculty Council Meeting #2, August 28, 2007
- III. Chair's Report.**
- IV. Provost's Report.**
- V. Other Announcements and Communications.**
  - Facilities Improvements (Brian Johnson)
  - Advising (Bill McLaughlin)
- VI. Committee Reports.**
  - University Curriculum Committee:
    - **FC-08-001:** NOI: Discontinue Bachelor of Science in Computer Science at Idaho Falls
- VII. Special Orders.**
- VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.**
- IX. New Business.**
- X. Adjournment.**

**Professor Don Crowley, Chair 2007-2008, Faculty Council**

Attachments: Minutes of 2007-2008 FC Meeting #2, August 28, 2007  
FC-08-001

University of Idaho  
**FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES**

**2007-2008 Meeting #2, Tuesday, August 28, 2007**

**Present:** Adams (w/o vote), Baker (w/o vote), Crowley, Fritz, Guilfoyle, Haarsager, Hubbard, Keim-Campbell, McCaffrey, McCollough, McDaniel, Mihelich, Miller, Munson, Odom, Rowland, Schmiege, Sullivan, Ch. Williams, Ci. Williams, Wilson

**Absent:** [student members not yet appointed]

**Observers:** 4

A quorum being present chair Crowley called the meeting to order at 3:35. He noted that this was rather a historic occasion as, for the first time, a Faculty Council meeting was being video-conferenced to Boise, Idaho Falls, and Post Falls. With us by video were liaisons John Crepeau from Idaho Falls and David Newcombe from Post Falls. The liaison with the Boise Center has yet to be named. The goal is to provide better communication on governance matters between Moscow and the centers.

**Minutes:** The minutes of the last meeting of the 2006-2007 council were approved without formal motion with one abstention. It was moved and seconded (Munson, Miller) to approve the minutes of the first meeting of the 2007-2008 council. The motion carried unanimously.

**Chair's Report:** Apologizing for being so distracted by being interviewed by ABC news concerning the situation Idaho's senior senator finds himself in, the chair announced that he had forgotten the cookies the chair normally brings to keep councilors' blood-sugar at appropriate levels. The chair opened the discussion with thoughts of what membership on council signifies noting that service on Faculty Council can be frustrating and tiring. We may think we are spinning our wheels at times and it is certainly true that many of our actions are purely advisory. However, through service on Faculty Council we can influence our working environment and help set the university's agenda. The current administration has said quite clearly that it wants our input. We should not be shy about disagreeing if we need to. He also noted that Faculty Council members are elected to represent some constituency and as representatives we must keep them apprised of issues engaged in by council. The chair cautioned members of the need to be careful in voicing not just our own concerns, but those which arise from our constituencies. It remains, however, that we also represent the university as a whole and need to make decisions with the entire university in mind.

Communication remains an issue. As council members we have the obligation to let people know what is going on, to replace wherever possible rumors with facts. We have many important issues to discuss. As we noted at our retreat, there is a particular need to be clearly informed and involved about the plans for the Sandpoint campus; the proposal is an exciting one, but we need to help shape it. We have set our September 18<sup>th</sup> meeting to have Larry Branen, vice president for north Idaho, with us so we can begin the process of asking questions and formulating plans

concerning the expansion. Today we have updates from teams I and II of the strategic plan groups. As we did last year we must share our thoughts about the continuing development of the plan's goals. We will need to return to the list we began to form at our retreat and work on ways those issues may be addressed by council.

**Provost's Report:** The provost also greeted the liaison members of council from Idaho Falls and Post Falls, noting that it was a good beginning to bridging the gap between faculty at various locations around the state. He further noted how impressed he was in traveling around the state with the quality of the university's faculty wherever they were located. He noted that a lot had happened this summer, particularly with regard to the university's expansion into Sandpoint. Ongoing negotiations really came together and the university ultimately signed a gift agreement for about \$35 million with the Wild Rose Foundation. The donor, Dennis Pence of Coldwater Creek wanted to move fast, and the administration could not wait for the faculty to get back to sign the deal. The curricula to be offered at Sandpoint have been painted in broad brush strokes but it will be up to the faculty to work them out. We have a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to create something great from the ground up. Professor McCollough noted that the new EMBA being offered at Sandpoint and Coeur d'Alene was off to a fast start this past week.

The provost noted that the NWCCU had been here two years ago; they gave us conditional accreditation then. They came back last year and will return this year (Oct. 17-18) hopefully for a final round. The provost said he thought the institution was in good shape: we have, for instance, done much in the fiscal area. Another area NWCCU pointed out as needing work was our board-mandated mission statement. At the last State Board of Education meeting a new mission statement was passed. Only a few items are different.

In response to a question, he said that the Yardley report would be coming soon. Part of the delay was our inability, because of the press of other issues, to get data to them in a timely fashion and part of the delay was attributable to the illness of one of the principals in the summer. Once it is here we will need to figure out how to take it and improve. Margrit von Braun, dean of the College of Graduate Studies reported that the Yardley folks had interviewed faculty in every one of our graduate programs. They were doing discipline-based cohort comparisons with other universities. Their report will show us how we are viewed from the outside.

**Confirmation of the Secretary of Faculty Council:** Professor Crowley nominated the Faculty Secretary, Douglas Q. Adams, as secretary for the 2007-2008 Faculty Council. It was moved and seconded (Miller, Ch. Williams) to approve his appointment. The motion carried unanimously.

**2006-2007 Annual Report of Faculty Council's Activities:** The secretary briefly reviewed the report on council's 2006-2007 activities and accomplishments. It was noted that it made an impressive list and that it was a good corrective to the rather narrowly focused view that arises in individual meetings. The secretary noted that all action items were tracked on the annual report as far as board action—if that action should be required. In some areas the board has delegated the decision-making authority to the institutional presidents. At times the full process could be a slow one: he instanced the development of compassionate leave and readjustment of the tenure clock. The 2005-2006 council had developed such a proposal which had been approved by the

university faculty and the president. Only at its August 2007 meeting had the board finally acted on it and approved it.

**Strategic Plan, Goal I Update:** Jeanne Christiansen, vice provost for academic affairs, and Bruce Pitman, dean of students, reviewed the work their team had accomplished in the preceding year. The team's primary goal was the development of learning outcomes for the university as well as at the program level for both graduate students and undergraduates. They had come to Faculty Council a couple of times last fall with university-level learning outcomes and the final draft had been affirmed by council in October. They could now report that there were established learning outcomes for all degree programs, academic affairs programs, library, and student affairs programs. They could also report that most programs had posted assessment plans—only some ten to twelve programs were still working on developing assessment plans.

For 2007-2008 the team's focus would be on promoting integrative learning activities. They would develop recommendations for broad community discussion and seek to refine and focus university experiences for students and discover how we may promote a different level of engagement with our students, whether in the realm of civic engagement, internships, or other engagements leading to transformative learning. Another area of focus would be continued attention and support to assessment activity. They have developed a first template of materials to advertise learning outcomes. Finally, they have set their third focus on academic advising, looking to implement a plan that will improve the consistency, accuracy, quality, and timeliness of advising for both graduate and undergraduate students.

**Strategic Plan, Goal II Update:** Margrit von Braun and Scott Wood, interim dean of the College of Science, presented an update on Team II's work. They focused on two items they hoped to get in place this year. The first was the introduction of university distinguished professorships which would be awarded to faculty members, presumably full professors, who had a history of excellence in at least two areas of teaching, research, and outreach. The title would carry with it, for the first five years, a stipend of \$5,000 a year (which some questioned as very low). In response to questions, he noted that the team thought this was potentially a good area for donors. Team II also reported briefly on the workshop on the Lifecycle of Interdisciplinary Scholarly and Creative Activities that they held last March. They are working with Jean Christiansen to develop a brief workshop to share the findings of last spring's workshop with department heads and directors, and to further explore possible barriers to faculty to work outside of the departmental boundaries. Team II also presented two metrics for Goal 2 reflecting both the % of assistantships at market salary and the progress made in finalizing the position descriptions to better reflect the Strategic Plan. Teams II and III intend to work together to present a combined draft to Faculty Council on inclusive language regarding interdisciplinarity and outreach/engagement.

**Report from Committee on Committees:** Professor Crowley, immediate past chair of the Committee on Committees, presented the list of the committee's nominations for appointment to the various Faculty Council committees. He praised the hard work of the Committee on Committees and particularly the work of Ms. Ann Thompson who worked to such good purpose on providing the committee with its needed materials. It was moved and seconded (Wilson, Odom) to approve the nominations. The motion carried unanimously.

**Election of a Freshman Council Member to the President’s Athletics Advisory Council:** It was moved and seconded (Crowley, Miller) to nominate Patrick Wilson to represent Faculty Council on the President’s Athletic Advisory Council for a three-year term. There being no further nominees, it was moved and seconded (McCaffrey, McDaniel) to close nominations. The motion carried with one abstention. Professor Wilson was elected unanimously.

**Election of a Freshman Council Member to the University Budget and Finance Committee:** Professor McCollough, currently chair of the UBFC, presented a brief history of the committee and its work of providing faculty oversight of the university’s budget, noting that the university had learned a tough lesson about the need for that oversight. It was moved and seconded (Munson, McCaffrey) to nominate Jack Miller to represent Faculty Council on the UBFC for a three-year term. There being no further nominations, it was moved and seconded (Sullivan, Ch. Williams) to close nominations. The motion carried unanimously. Professor Miller was elected unanimously.

**Election of a Freshman Council Member to the Campus Planning Advisory Committee:** Professor Munson, current senior Faculty Council member on the CPAC, presented a brief history of the committee’s work, noting that in his first year it had been completely inactive but in his second year (last year) it had been very much active in making recommendations to the administration concerning faculty and department proposals for changing the use of various facilities. He expected the committee would also play a role in the infrastructure renewal that would occur if the Board of Regents approved the large bond issue the administration was proposing. It was moved and seconded (Guilfoyle, Odom) to nominate Sharon Fritz to represent Faculty Council for a three-year term on CPAC. There being no further nominations, it was moved and seconded (Ch. Williams, Ci. Williams) to close nominations. The motion carried unanimously. Professor Fritz was elected unanimously.

**Confirmation of Sabbatical Leaves for 2008-2009.** It was moved and seconded (Miller, McDaniel) to approve the list of sabbatical leaves presented by the provost, on the advice of the Sabbatical Leave Selection Committee. The motion carried unanimously.

**Adjournment:** The council’s agenda having been completed, the chair adjourned the meeting at 5:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Q. Adams,  
Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Council

## UI Capital Project Overview

Faculty Council - 11 Sep 2007

\$200M+ in deferred capital needs across campus

\$16M total in alteration and repair projects contributed by State in FY07/FY08 (normally only \$2M/year)

UI looking to finance several key projects through bond measure(s). Projects endorsed by executive leadership include:

- Energy Saving Performance Contract (\$35M)
  - Lighting and building level HVAC enhancements
  - Chilled water storage facility
  - Wood chip drying & storage
  - Tunnel extensions and repairs
- Brink-Phinney Renovations (\$25M)
- Wallace Complex Renovations (\$20M)
- Research infrastructure improvements (\$20M)
- Kibbie Life Safety improvements (\$14M)

The first bond sale is targeted for 31 Oct 2007, subject to Regents' authorization. The energy saving measures will be funded under this first initiative, and carried out over approx 3 year period.

A later bond sale (early 2009) will finance other projects, where construction work might not be anticipated before summer 2010.

Brink-Phinney and Wallace renovations are a major undertaking and will take substantial planning and coordination. For example, entire floors or wings of Brink-Phinney may be renovated at one time, requiring temporary alternative office arrangements. Swing space could be established in one or more of the following locations:

- Alumni Residence Center
- Leased temporary structures
- Commercial leased spaces

\$300M fundraising campaign is also being undertaken. Project priorities are being established with heavy input from the Deans. The project list has to yet to be fully developed. Current priorities include:

- Sandpoint Initiative
- Kibbie Renovations

# **Undergraduate Student Advising Summit Report**

## **A Jointly Sponsored Activity by:**

The Associated Students of the University of Idaho

And

The University of Idaho Faculty Council

## **Conducted:**

Student Union Building

April 25, 2007

**Final Report Completed June 30, 2007**

**Group Memory**  
**Undergraduate Student Advising Summit**  
**Joint ASUI and Faculty Council Effort**  
**Student Union Building, April 26, 2007**

**Joint Report from ASUI and Faculty Council**  
Assembled by William J. McLaughlin and Verified by Participants  
June 2007

**ASUI and Faculty Council Jointly Invited Session Participants**

Participants were agreed upon by the conveners of the Summit; Heather Pearson, Humberto Cerrillo, and William McLaughlin. They were selected because of their long-time experience in advising and mentoring, the roles they continue to play in advising and mentoring, their commitment to quality, and because they reflect a broad spectrum of units and thinking on the topic across the University of Idaho.

- Heather Pearson, ASUI Director of Academics (Undergraduate Student)
- Humberto Cerrillo, ASUI President (Undergraduate Student)
- Cyndi Faircloth, Former Staff Member of Center for Academic Advising and one of original co-founders of UI-ACADA (Staff)
- Kris Roby, General Studies Advisor (Staff)
- Karen Gillespie, College Advising Specialist, College of Business and Economics (Staff)
- Jeannie Harvey, Director of Women's Center (Strategic Planning Team 4 Co-chair)
- Nick Sanyal, Member of Faculty Council's Teaching and Advising Committee and Past Chair of UI-ACADA (Associate Professor)
- Janice Fletcher, Chair of Faculty Council's Curriculum Committee and recent Recipient of UI Outstanding Advising Award (Professor)
- Dean Pantajja, Faculty Member of Center for Academic Advising (Professor)
- Bill McLaughlin, Chair of Faculty Council (Professor) – Session Facilitator

**Session Objectives**

1. Identify advising concerns from the perspective of undergraduate students, faculty advisors and staff advisors
2. Determine whether, or whether not advising concerns of undergraduate students, faculty advisors and staff advisors overlap
3. Review recent recommendations on advising made by the **University of Idaho Academic Advising Association** to Faculty Council in 2006, the Strategic Enrollment Management Committee's (SEM) sub-committee ideas on advising, and listen to other ideas currently under discussion by student, faculty and staff groups
4. Generate undergraduate advising themes and corresponding advising recommendations as well as the relevant decision-making group(s) to which they should be directed

## Session Ground Rules

- Commit to listen carefully and ask questions to understand
- Be respectful of others, regardless of their views and outlooks
- Be candid and present your ideas in a concise way
- Commit to make statements to explain positions and educate others
- Allow the ideas of partners and participants to be expressed without interruptions
- Try not to force your perspectives on others, but rather clearly explain why you believe them
- Allow the facilitator to keep events on schedule, operating by the ground rules, and in accordance with the agreed to agenda.
- Speak up if you feel the facilitator is manipulating the group

## Session Agenda

CONTENT	PROCESS	TIME	OUTPUT
Introductions, purpose, ground rules	Round robin by each individual followed by facilitator presentation	5:10 – 5:30 PM	Get to know one another and how we will operate as a group
Identification of advising concerns from multiple perspectives	Colored sheets one perspective at a time	5:30 – 6:45 PM	List of concerns by perspective
Group identification of overlapping concerns	Review set of concerns as a group to identify overlaps	6:45 – 7:30 PM	Overlapping concerns
Review recent advising recommendations	Group discussion and sharing	7:30 – 8:00 PM	Shared knowledge of recommendations made by others
Develop recommendations by thematic area targeted at a particular campus decision-making group	Work in sub-groups to develop recommendations and then share with the entire group	8:00 – 9:00 PM	Tactical recommendations to promote policy discussions & change
Closure	Presentation	9:00 – 9:05 PM	Feeling of accomplishment

## **Identifying Advising and Mentoring Concerns**

Participants were asked to write on colored sheets of paper the concerns about advising and mentoring that they have heard about from the perspectives of the three major groups involved; faculty advisors, staff advisors, and undergraduate student advisees. Each participant generated their ideas for each perspective. Next in a round robin fashion each individual shared their ideas with the group. This process was followed for each of the three perspectives targeted. The results follow and are organized by perspectives and within a perspective by concern categories. The language used at the session follows and edits were only made to clarify.

The generated concerns were grouped by the participants and categories were assigned names. Some of these have been refined in the post session analysis.

### **Undergraduate Student Concerns about Advising and Mentoring:**

#### **Advisors Having Inadequate Knowledge of University Procedures and Rules**

- Graduation
  - Filing timelines
  - Requirements
- Need to know the options and consequences of all alternatives
- Getting into programs (i.e. Architecture, IBC)
- Getting correct information in timely fashion (Not feeling like you are getting the ‘runaround’)
- Advisors don’t always know needed sequencing of classes and this impacts long-term planning
- Students and advisors not totally understanding degree audit
- Special issues with transfer students

#### **Students Not Knowing Their Rights or Understanding the Purposes of Advising**

- Need to know their rights as an advisee
- How to responsively interact with an advisor
- Often do not understand the purpose of the core
- Don’t understand the purpose of taking required course
- Don’t realize that it’s their responsibility to seek advising and that poor advising often has unintended consequences

#### **Inadequate Systems and Processes**

- Inadequate follow up and follow through
- Continuity is important

#### **Accessibility and Available Time with Advisors When We Need It**

- Availability of advisor when needed
- Accessibility to an advisor for more than scheduling courses
- Contact time often too limited
- Not enough quality time spent with advisor

#### **Lack of Quality Relationships**

- Joint and sound problem solving
- Mentorship (developing a meaningful student-advisor relationship)

- Students often do not feel comfortable telling an academic advisor about personal problems that affect their academic performance
- Desire a polite, respectful, non-threatening relationship
- Students need one primary advisor with whom they click

#### Lack of Advisors Who Really Know About the Total Opportunities Available to Students

- Getting help/advice about student support resources
- Scholarships
- Growth opportunities
  - Intellectually
  - Socially
  - Interdisciplinary
- Help with “total” college experience-classes, student development opportunities, career opportunities and job placement
- Opportunities for special experiences (leadership, study abroad, internships, etc)
- Connection to internship programs and employment opportunities
- Campus jobs for students
- Information about a career or field and how to use “my degree”

#### **Staff Concerns about Advising and Mentoring:**

##### Error Prone Computer Systems

- Computer Errors
- Banner errors

##### Lack of Feeling Empowered or Respected

- Lack “clout” outside their department
- Not consulted on changes that affect students and/or the advising process
- No rewards (for a job well done)
- Not feeling appreciated for my part of advising
- Advising tasks unloaded from faculty to staff members, who are assumed to have more time

##### Too Many Advisees to Do a Quality Job

- May have too many advisees to spend necessary amount of time with each
- Too many advisees
- Student overload: staff overwhelmed, not able to provide quality advising
- Overload: unmanageable numbers of advisees especially at University level Advising Center and in other centralized college or department situations on our campuses
- Overload: not enough time and it just becomes processing

##### Lack of Direct Connection to Profession/discipline

- Advisors need to ability to evaluate a “good fit” major or program for a curious/lost student
- Need more information to be able to personalize a program
- Sometimes unable to look at the undergraduate’s whole college experience, only capacities to deal with 1<sup>st</sup> stop issues
- Advisors need to be able to make students aware of broad opportunities on campus
- Advisors often don’t know about goal setting strategies that would help students

- Often not able to connect students with internships, job opportunities, in-depth things about the discipline or profession
- Often asked to do more than they can/should

#### Lack of Certain Kinds of Knowledge

- Little or no knowledge of programs outside of content areas (e.g., study abroad, CORE, student service leadership programs, Women's Center, TRIO) and who to contact
- Lack of understanding majors outside of immediate department and who to contact
- How to transition undergraduates from staff to faculty advisors
- Who is responsible for what (in departments and across campus)?
- Policy or requirements change and there often is little or no consistency in how these are applied across students

#### Lack of Big Picture on Program's Curriculum or Desired Outcomes

- May not have "big picture" of careers in specific disciplines
- Ensuring accurate information, especially relating to aspects outside the university
- Usually experts on degree audits/policies, but often do not have expertise in content of curriculum
- Limited connection to curricular decision-making

#### Time Issues

- Making time for student needs versus getting assigned jobs done
- Multiple job duties (in addition to advising) – How to prioritize

#### Student Responsibility Is Lacking

- Students don't understand their role/responsibilities
- Students not engaged in their education
- Students not listening or responding to contacts (email, phone, etc)
- Inaction (doesn't follow advice)
- Procrastination (in registration and advising appointments)

#### Dealing with Transfer Students

- Transfer students: from other schools or programs, so what gets waved and why
- Transfer articulation process completed that is correct and available in a timely fashion
- Need easy access to "Updated" curriculum guides

#### **Faculty Concerns about Advising and Mentoring:**

##### Dealing with Parents

- Parents call and want information and there is a guilt feeling when you can't share information about their child for whom they are paying the tuition

##### Systems and Procedures are Inadequate

- Trouble using technology and university-wide systems
- No easy way to get the correct information (even when you find information, how do you know it is right)
- Lack of consistency in advising within colleges, departments and programs

- What are the Goals and do they need to be somewhat consistent among colleges, departments and programs?
- What should an undergraduate look like when they graduate?
- Course offerings are limited and irregular, and this makes scheduling a “hunting puzzle”
- Records are often not complete (no total repository electronic or paper that includes all interactions)

#### Student’s Do Not Understand or Take Their Responsibilities in Advising Seriously

- Students find a way to ignore advice
- Students circumvent advising by seeing other advisors (looking for the easy way)
- Students do not understand the purpose of advising
- Students don’t “live up” to their responsibilities
- Students not responsive or responsible
- Lack of student engagement in advising (coming prepared to talk, coming with their ideas)

#### How to Build the Best and Most Meaningful Relationships with Students

- How to connect with students: ‘I’m awkward he/she is awkward, what do I do?’
- Students changing advisors within a department
- How to direct students from grade-chasing to enthusiasm about content
- Self-advice or “buddy” systems based advice-- should student peers play a role?

#### Advising and Mentoring Time and Unreasonable Load Expectations

- We have made it too complex
- Advising loads are inequitably distributed (sometimes by department design, by student choice, because not all faculty are equally knowledgeable or skilled)
- Not a good use of faculty time because it is not recognized
- Unrealistic expectations
  - number of advisees
  - new professors without adequate training (many long-timers also need training)
- Small percentage of job descriptions but a large load
- Load: Too many (especially for those who advise and mentor well)
- Multiple obligations: time vs. number of students
- Lack of time and too many advisees
- Too many jobs—lack of focus/effort in advising
- Time, time, time, especially when it does not count for much in the professor’s evaluations and advancement

#### Lack Training and Professional Development

- Professional development: how does advising and mentoring help undergraduates?
- Need more training on how to do it
- Not trained in counseling to help students with mental health problems
- Counseling students out of programs
- Handling Freshman/Sophomore who are bombing grade-wise
- Strategies to break bad news
- FERPA requirements
- Financial aid knowledge is often inadequate on the part of the professor

- Knowledge about more than just particular content area, where do I learn about study abroad, honors, clubs, etc.
- Need more training
- Training/development—money to do more

#### Little or No Recognition

- It's not my job! (Attitude of some professors)
- Little or no recognition for many hours spent with their advisees (especially in Promotion and Tenure processes)
- Advising and mentoring undervalued
  - Students seek only block-removal
  - No compensation (\$)
- No "reward" (professionally) for doing the job
- Not part of Promotion and Tenure "no incentive"
- Inadequate Promotion and Tenure criteria on advising and mentoring (evaluate criteria)
- Not reflected in annual position description (load does not equal weight) or performance evaluation
- Different load differentials across campus —full "equity"
- Pressure to research/publish is "rewarded" (but advising isn't)
- Advising is not, or very limited a part of the tenure process and takes away from research expectation
- Research vs. Advising

#### Having Right Knowledge to Provide Correct Information

- Clerical aspects of advising take more time than the academic part
- All faculty members do not have the same knowledge especially important when complex issues arise
- Regulations and policies seem complicated and hard to understand
- Getting information and remembering it all (regulations policies, core, etc)
- Degree audit is too complicated
- Understanding content as new programs are added
- Unexplained changes in processes that you find out about after giving a student what you thought was good advice

#### Faculty Rights

- Faculty members don't know their rights as advisors
- Faculty members are not sure of their responsibilities

#### No Coherent Vision of Advising and Mentoring (Is it not the same as teaching?)

- Teaching and advising as the same genre of faculty role
- What do we mean by advising versus mentoring?
- When do I send undergraduates to someone else for advice?
- How do we handle transfer students and who takes the lead?

#### **Institutional Level Concerns about Advising and Mentoring:**

What Is the Role of Advising and How Does It Facilitate Our Purpose as an Institution?

- What should undergraduate advising accomplish and look like?

-Should there be consistency across colleges and programs in what a student gets in terms of advising and mentoring? (Advising and mentoring have and have-nots; some colleges have professional advisors and others do not)

-Need clear and strong commitment from administration regarding importance of advising at UI

-Need UI mission/vision statement on advising and the intended student learning from it

#### What Is Advising versus Mentoring?

-Update faculty/staff handbook

-Knowing best practices

-Be willing to match advising and mentoring styles to desired program culture

-Funding for professional development

#### Knowing Who Is Doing What on Campus

-Cross-sharing of information

-Need for enhanced awareness of CAPP, TAAP, AAC, CTC, etc. services

-Role of program staff who do not have a designated/official advising role

-Role of program staff who have a designated/official advising role

-Role of faculty who have a designated/official advising/mentoring role

-One size may not fit all units

#### Ineffective Systems

-Lack of effective off-campus advising systems

-Too little money dedicated to assisting advisors to make their job easier and more effective

#### Lack of Adequate Support Services in Registrar's Office

-Need better direction on knowing who "go to" for various issues and questions

-Too few employees in registrar's office

-In summer, lack of department/program faculty members to help advise and this creates problems for the registrar's office, student recruitment folks, etc.

### **Identification of Key Overlapping Areas (First Cut by Participants)**

The participants were then asked to look across the categories to identify area that overlapped among the three groups involved in advising at the University of Idaho. The following list of overlapping areas was identified:

- Inadequate advising policy, inconsistently defined procedures & process, and recognition programs at university, college, and program levels
- Limited advising and mentoring capacities among faculty and staff concerning knowledge of advising and mentoring best practices, UI procedures, UI requirements, and purpose
- Poorly developed advising information network (Access to records, inability to track interactions, timing, information sharing across actors involved in advising, and which unit does which function, etc.)
- Inadequate time and human resources (Faculty and staff) allocated to advising and mentoring

- Limited understanding by students of the role of advising and mentoring in their university experience

## **Recent Advising Information and Recommendations**

The facilitator with the help of participants then presented recent recommendations on advising and mentoring made on campus. This was done as an effort to not re-invent the wheel.

### **PowerPoint to Faculty Council 2006: (See attached PowerPoint Presentation) UI Academic Advising Association (UI ACADA) Recommendations for Improving Academic Advising to Faculty Council 2005-06:**

The University of Idaho Academic Advising Association (UIACADA) is an allied member of the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA). We adopted our bylaws in February 2004. As a professional association, we have members involved in all aspect of academic advising, from associate deans to undergraduate students. Our membership, currently at 35, includes faculty and staff advisors from across campus. We compliment the work of the Center for Academic Advising and our members are active at regional and national levels of NACADA.

Our current objectives include:

- Increasing advising effectiveness;
- Aiding the development of greater understanding of the role of advising in student learning;
- Strengthening University-wide recognition of the significance of advising;
- Advocating for high-quality academic advising services for students and implementing an advising assessment process to ensure continuous improvement;
- Providing a network of advisors and other student affairs professionals to foster collaboration; and
- Providing opportunities for professional development for academic advisors and student support personnel.

Since 2004, UIACADA has sponsored an annual Advising Symposium—a one-day, on-campus, advisor development opportunity. Through on and off campus interactions with resident and national experts, including the keynote speakers at our two symposia, and through partnering with ASUI on their current drive to pursue excellence in academic advising, we realize that in order to increase advising effectiveness on campus several actions need to be taken.

The University must **fund a system of academic** advising that includes the following elements:

#### **1. Recruiting and training of high quality academic advisors:**

- Update FSH language to direct and reflect current practices.
- Provide regular training for faculty and staff academic advisors.
- Adopt *institutional* Learning Goals & Outcomes for Advising.

#### **2. Assessment:**

- Implement a university-wide academic advising assessment tool.

### **3. Reward and recognize quality advising and advisors:**

- Explicitly recognize academic advising as part of the job description for faculty and staff.
- Ensure that advising plays a more substantial and equitable role in the faculty P&T process and the annual evaluation of classified staff and exempt employees who provide academic advising.

## **Strategic Enrollment Committee Advising Sub-Committee Recommendations 2005-06:**

### **1. Analyze Capacity Needs In Order To Develop A Course Planning Model.**

- From anecdotal accounts, the availability of courses for new students and continuing undergraduates is a serious issue which seems to impact retention of students and enrollment of new freshmen and transfer students. Because students may not be able to navigate the “wait list” system they may be leaving to enroll elsewhere. In order to understand the issue and begin planning for offering the right number of sections at the right time, the University must have an accurate capacity analysis. However, we do not currently have the systems or data in place to accurately do this analysis. In the next six months we propose to develop our plan for carrying out the analysis and developing a course planning model. These analyses can be used in conjunction with resource allocation plans to more effectively use University resources and provide classes to students as needed.

### **2. Develop an institutional mission statement for academic advising and update the Faculty Staff Handbook to reflect current practices and institutional expectations.**

- The UI Academic Advising Association presented a draft mission statement to Faculty Council during a presentation September, 2005. The draft (attached) has not been acted upon at this point. The need for an institutional mission statement has been discussed by the UI Academic Advising Association (UI ACADA) for several years. A consultant from the National Academic Advising Association hired by the Center for Academic Advising made that recommendation in February, 2004. Once an institutional mission statement has been developed and adopted, the Colleges and Departments will be able to follow up and develop their own statements to align with the institutional direction.

### **3. Require all colleges and departments to include “Advising” in an annual action plan in which they discuss quality of the advising experience, methods to assess the outcomes, and next steps to improve the process.**

- To ensure that advising is taken seriously, the Provost should hold the Deans accountable through an annual process, and the Deans should, in turn, hold the Department Heads accountable. Advising should be given the same level of focused scrutiny and accountability as “diversity.” Far more than course selection and registration, all students deserve high quality advising that helps students plan and link together their desired educational experiences, which contribute to the UI transformational experience. Required action plan components should include:

- a. Advising outcomes. These should first be developed at the university level and then tweaked for each academic curriculum
- b. Advising model describing the quality of the student experience and including the student to faculty/staff ratio
- c. Results from assessment of advising
- d. Suggestions for improvement and action plan for the coming year to include advising development activities for faculty and staff.

**Content Analysis to Construct Final Overlapping Categories**

The major concern themes were identified by sorting the concern categories, developed by the participants, into thematic areas based on their similarity. These groupings were then named in terms of a theme. For more details as to the specific items given by the participants in a concern category see the sections above titled, “Undergraduate Student Concerns..., Faculty Concerns..., Staff Concerns..., and Institutional Level Concerns... The themes that emerged from the content analysis were cross-checked with those rapidly identified by the participants during the session as a way to cross-check. The match was very similar (see Key Overlapping Areas Section above).

**Table 1.** Emerging Advising and Mentoring Themes from the Perspectives of Faculty, Staff, Undergraduate Students, and the Institution as Identified by Summit Participants.

<b>Emerging Advising and Mentoring Concern Themes</b>	<b>Item Categories Listed from Faculty (F), Staff (S), Undergraduate Student (ST), and Institutional (I) Perspectives:</b>
<i>The purpose of advising and mentoring and how they are defined are unclear to faculty, staff, and undergraduate students and their parents</i>	
	What is advising versus mentoring (I)
	Understanding the purpose of advising (ST)
	What is the role of advising and how does it facilitate our purpose as an institution (I)
	There is no coherent vision of advising and mentoring (F)
	Dealing with parents (F)
<i>Advising and mentoring is not being used to an optimal level to build relationships</i>	
	Lack of quality relationships (ST)

	How do we build the best and most meaningful relationships with students (F)
	Dealing with parents (F)
	Students not knowing their rights (ST)
	Faculty not knowing their rights (F)
	Student's do not understand or take their responsibilities in advising seriously (F)
	Student responsibility is lacking (S)

<b>Emerging Advising and Mentoring Concern Themes</b>	<b>Item Categories Listed from Faculty (F), Staff (S), Undergraduate Student (ST), &amp; Institutional (I) Perspectives:</b>
<i>Advisor loads often are too large, advisors have inadequate time for advising and mentoring, and the advisor's time is often not available when the advisee needs it</i>	
	Advising and mentoring time and unreasonable load expectations (F)
	Time issues (S)
	Too many advisees to do a quality job (S)
	Accessibility and available time with advisors, especially when we need it (ST)
	Lack of adequate support services in Registrar's Office (I)
<i>Lack of Capacity Building on Advising and Mentoring for Identified Topics</i>	
	Lack training & professional development (F)
	Knowing who is doing what on campus (I)
	Having right knowledge to provide correct information (F)
	Lack direct connection to profession or discipline (S)
	Advisors having inadequate knowledge of university procedures and rules (ST)
	Lack of advisors who really know about the total opportunities available to students (ST)
	Lack of certain kinds of knowledge (S)
	Dealing with transfer students (S)
	Lack of big picture of program's curriculum or desired outcomes (S)
<i>Lack of adequate systems and easy to</i>	

<i>use procedures</i>	
	Systems and procedures are inadequate (F)
	Error Prone Computer Systems (S)
	Inadequate systems and processes (ST)
	Ineffective systems (I)
<i>There often is a lack of recognition and empowerment of advisors</i>	
	Little of no recognition (F)
	Lack of feeling empowered or respected (S)

**Recommended Actions by Overlapping Advising and Mentoring Theme:**

The table below lists suggested actions that could be taken to improve the advising and mentoring situation on the UI campuses. It was clear from the participant’s discussion that taking a single action will not address the complexity of the concerns we face. Rather, selecting a package of actions that cut across university, college, program, and individual boundaries offers the most hope to address the complexity and interconnectedness of the concerns associated with undergraduate advising and mentoring.

These suggested actions should be seen as a starting point and as the University enhances its efforts in this area new actions are very likely to emerge.

**Table 2.** Recommended Actions to Begin Addressing 2007 Identified Advising and Mentoring Themes at the University of Idaho. From the Joint Report of ASUI and Faculty Council - June, 2007.

	<b>University Level</b>	<b>College/Unit Level</b>	<b>Program Level</b>	<b>Individual Level</b>
<b>2007 Identified Overlapping Advising Themes</b>	<i>Proposed Actions for Consideration</i>			
<i>The purpose of advising and mentoring and how they are defined are unclear to faculty, staff, and undergraduate students and their parents</i>	<p>ASUI Senate and Faculty Council approve the joint report and implementation of its actions in 2007-08</p> <p>Faculty Council and provost jointly initiate a review of advising and mentoring policies with a goal to more clearly define items and to identify at what levels various aspects of advising and mentoring should take place, are most cost effective, and will address the issues raised in this report (Summer 2007)</p> <p>Faculty Council amends the Faculty/Staff Handbook to clearly reflect the role of advising and mentoring in administrators, faculty, and staff position descriptions, performance evaluations and Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (Fall 2007)</p>	<p>Colleges/Management Units need to adjust their by-laws, and promotion and tenure guidelines in the area of advising and mentoring to reflect University Level changes and enhancements (2007-08)</p> <p>College/Management Unit leadership teams need to clearly define their advising and mentoring policies and the role of faculty, staff, and students (e.g., staff advise freshman, faculty take over in Junior year, all students have a peer advisor) (Spring 2008)</p>	<p>Position description headings need to clearly define advising and mentoring and unit leaders need to check to see that faculty and staff are adequately addressing these areas (Beginning with position descriptions submitted in for 2008)</p>	<p>Faculty, staff, and students and students' parents need to revisit the University and their college level policies on advising and mentoring and make sure they understand them</p> <p>All faculty members will participate in at least one new faculty orientation or other university or off-campus capacity building session sessions dealing with advising and mentoring once every two years.</p>

	<p>Provost's Council in conjunction with leaders in the areas of recruitment, financial aid, etc. need to re-exam the role of a University-level advising center and align its fit with the decided roles for colleges and programs including academic, student service, and recruitment programs (Summer/Fall 2007)</p> <p>Team 4 should develop student learning outcomes for advising and mentoring to serve as a standard for the University's agreed-to vision of undergraduate advising and mentoring (Fall 2007)</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<b>University Level</b>	<b>College/Unit Level</b>	<b>Program Level</b>	<b>Individual Level</b>
<b>2007 Identified Overlapping Advising Themes</b>	<i>Proposed Actions for Consideration</i>			
<i>Lack of Capacity Building on Advising and Mentoring for Identified Topics</i>	<p>Develop capacity building programs (online and face-to-face) for faculty, staff, and students involved in advising and mentoring – CTI in conjunction with Vice Provost and Teaching and Advising Committee (Beginning Fall 2007 and continuing)</p> <p>Recognize Deans/Unit Leaders who promote capacity building in advising and mentoring when awarding salary increments (2008-09)</p> <p>Vice Provost sponsors speakers on these topics at least annually (2007-08)</p> <p>Provosts and Deans promote and help build the image of UI ACADA (Starting Fall 2007)</p>	<p>Implement capacity building programs in advising and mentoring (online and face-to-face) for faculty, staff, and students involved in advising by requiring it as an accountable item of Associate Deans, equivalent co-curricular leaders, and Department or Unit Leaders (2008 position descriptions and thereafter)</p> <p>Deans will provide funding to encourage program level retreats that focus on advising and mentoring at least once every three years (Funding available from the college beginning in 2008-09 and reoccurring thereafter)</p>	<p>Reward and recognize faculty, and staff, who engage in capacity building programs (on or off campus) on advising and mentoring via the employee performance evaluation processes (Starting with the 2008 position description and annual evaluation)</p> <p>Reward faculty who participate in UI ACADA activities (or some other regional or national advising organization) via the faculty and staff performance evaluation processes (Starting with the 2008 position evaluation and annual evaluation)</p>	<p>Include time for taking capacity building programs on advising and mentoring in your job description, annual plan of work, or if you are a student involved in advising, in your schedule of activities</p>

	<b>University Level</b>	<b>College/Unit Level</b>	<b>Program Level</b>	<b>Individual Level</b>
<b>2007 Identified Overlapping Advising Themes</b>	<i>Proposed Actions for Consideration</i>			
<i>Lack of adequate systems and easy to use procedures</i>	<p>Academic Associate Deans for Colleges or equivalent position on non-Moscow campuses and other appropriate co-curricular unit leaders, and the registrar need to meet to provide input to the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs on systems and procedures that would enhance the advisor-advisee relationship and facilitate more effective advising and mentoring (2007-08)</p> <p>The Teaching and Advising Committee needs to actively work with the Registrar's Office to ensure changing needs for access to data and ease of using data are continually addressed (Initiate Fall 2007 and ongoing annual function of the Committee)</p>	<p>Academic Associate Deans for Colleges or equivalent position on non-Moscow campuses and co-curricular unit leaders with similar level responsibilities need to promote the use of up-to-date systems and procedures as they become available (Beginning 2007-08 and continuing)</p> <p>Each college's or campuses procedures will be transparent to faculty, staff, and undergraduate students and their parents via the University website (March 2008)</p>	<p>Department Heads/unit leaders will commit one department/unit meeting a year to discuss advising and mentoring policies, issues and concerns (Beginning 2007-08 and continuing on an annual basis)</p>	<p>Faculty and staff will commit to attend the department/unit advising/mentoring meeting annually as a required part of their position (Beginning 2007-08 and continuing on an annual basis)</p>

	<b>University Level</b>	<b>College/Unit Level</b>	<b>Program Level</b>	<b>Individual Level</b>
<b>2007 Identified Overlapping Advising Themes</b>	<i>Proposed Actions for Consideration</i>			
<i>Advisor loads often are too large, advisors have inadequate time for advising and mentoring, and the advisor's time is often not available when the advisee needs it</i>	<p>The Provost in conjunction with appropriate leaders and stakeholders throughout our campuses should explore the potential to build a website to reduce selected advising and mentoring pressures (those appropriate) on faculty and staff (Fall 2008)</p> <p>The registrar's office needs additional human resources to better service faculty and staff advisors (Fall 2007 or shortly thereafter)</p> <p>Faculty and staff advisors need to be updated via e-mail as changes related to advising take place in the Registrar's Office (Begin the Spring of 2008)</p>	<p>At the college and program level college leadership teams shall establish advising and mentoring targets that set clear expectations for faculty and staff involvement in this area in accordance with the percentage of their portion allocated to advising and mentoring (These need to be available so they can be used in the 2008 annual position description)</p>	<p>Department Chairs or Unit leaders will be able to justify faculty and staff evaluations on advising and mentoring to Deans or their designee using at least two sources of evidence (Starting with 2008 annual evaluations)</p>	<p>Advisors need to spend a part of at least one extended advising session a semester with each advisee reminding them of the purpose of advising and mentoring and revisiting the student's academic and career goals, and responsibilities in the advising relationship.</p>

	<b>University Level</b>	<b>College/Unit Level</b>	<b>Program Level</b>	<b>Individual Level</b>
<b>2007 Identified Overlapping Advising Themes</b>	<i>Proposed Actions for Consideration</i>			
<i>Advising and mentoring is not being used optimally to build relationships between advisors and advisees</i>	<p>The Freshman Orientation program needs to continue to introduce students to the importance and purpose of advising and work with Departments and colleges to reinforce the message</p> <p>The University CORE Program needs to build the role of advising and all of the advising and mentoring units that are available to students into each CORE Discovery course and the program (Fall 2007 and continuing)</p> <p>The University should acquire software that makes advisors times available for appointments easily found, provides a way for students to schedule appointments with advisors via the net, and sends students an evaluation form after the advising/mentoring session takes place (Fall 2008)</p>	<p>Colleges/Programs and other student oriented units will develop a vision statement describing their idea of advising and mentoring relationships provided by their unit (Fall 2007)</p> <p>Resident Hall, Greek Programs, and other student services will transmit in their programming the role and importance of the total advising program that is available to assist undergraduate students on the various campuses (Spring 2008)</p>	<p>Program leaders (academic, student service, academic affairs) will conduct at least one face-to-face interactive session with students to assess advising (this may or may not be a part of a program's student learning outcomes assessment program)</p> <p>Program leaders will administer a questionnaire on advising and mentoring to all undergraduate students every other year and report the trends to their Dean or Other Administrator as part of their annual performance evaluation (At least once every two years beginning in 2009-10)</p>	<p>Students need to take the responsibility to evaluate their advisor at least once annually</p> <p>Advisors of freshman or other students in the CORE need to participate in CORE events designed to bring all actors and units in the UI advising and mentoring system (At least once a year beginning in 2008-09)</p> <p>All students will have one primary advisor through whom ALL other advisors/advice MUST filter/be approved (Spring 2008)</p>

	<b>University Level</b>	<b>College/Unit Level</b>	<b>Program Level</b>	<b>Individual Level</b>
<b>2007 Identified Overlapping Advising Themes</b>	<i>Proposed Actions for Consideration</i>			
<i>There often is a lack of recognition and empowerment of advisors</i>	The provost should require DigitalMeasures or some other approach to capture data on advising and mentoring (amount and quality) on an annual basis so it is available in a consistent form for annual evaluation processes (Data available for the 2008 annual evaluation)	If not in place, colleges and/or management units need to develop faculty, staff, and student awards in the area of undergraduate advising and mentoring (Spring 2008)	<p>Program/unit leaders will use the position descriptions and performance evaluations to promote and reward individuals who improve their capacities and efforts in advising and mentoring</p> <p>Departments or programs using student peer advising programs will develop award programs to recognize their outstanding, involved students</p>	Faculty and staff will commit to include advising and mentoring goals and objectives in their position description at a level commensurate with the percentage of their position description allocated to advising and mentoring (2008 Position Description)

## **Closing Comments**

This collaborative effort has attempted to bring together ideas and thoughts that have evolved at the University of Idaho over the last 5-7 years. The participants, faculty, staff, and undergraduate students were selected to reflect the scope and many aspects of advising and mentoring of undergraduate students. We focused on undergraduate students and attempted to think about the issues and concerns that emerged in terms of all of our campuses.

As with all collaborative efforts the participants are responsible for the things included, those left out, the good ideas, and the not so good ones. Our intent was to be inclusive and to think about the institution and where we need to move in the area of undergraduate advising and mentoring.

In conclusion, the purpose of this effort is to provide an action plan to begin to move a long-time, important, and complex discussion from the never ending talking stage to one of action. Although this analysis is not perfect, it does provide concrete actions for others to critique, improve upon, and most important to us take action on.

As work continues on this important area we would encourage efforts to include UI ACADA members as well as Members of the Faculty Council Teaching and Advising Committee. Individuals who volunteer their time in these two groups often have both interest and a wealth of knowledge and historical perspective on the topic. Other stakeholders that should not be overlooked are persons responsible for the advising and mentoring functions on UI campuses outside of Moscow where needs and issues are often very different.

Another issue raised but not discussed in great depth was the potential to mentor our PhD candidates in the area of advising. In the process of doing this we as an institution take on the responsibility to produce doctoral students who are much better equipped to step into a position in higher education. Such a program also is a way to expand human resources available for advising on our campuses.

A special thanks to the ASUI leaders who promoted accomplishing this effort in 2007.

**IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
ACADEMIC/PROFESSIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION  
NOTICE OF INTENT**

**To initiate a  
New, Expanded, Cooperative, Discontinued, program component or Off-Campus Instructional  
Program or Instructional/Research Unit**

Institution Submitting Proposal: University of Idaho

Name of College, School, or Division: College of Engineering

Name of Department(s) or Area(s): Computer Science

Indicate if this Notice of Intent (NOI) is for an Academic or Professional Technical Program  
Academic X Professional - Technical \_\_\_\_\_

A New, Expanded, Cooperative, Contract, **Off-Campus Instructional Program** or Administrative/Research Unit  
(circle one) leading to:

Transfer the Bachelor of Science in Computer Science program at IFCHE from the University  
of Idaho to Idaho State University  
(Degree or Certificate)

Proposed Starting Date: The completion date for the transfer is  
August 1, 2007

**For New Programs:**

**For Other Activity:**

Program (i.e., degree) Title & CIP 2000 \_\_\_\_\_

- Program Component (major/minor/option/emphasis)
- Off-Campus Activity/Resident Center
- Instructional/Research Unit
- Addition/Expansion
- Discontinuance/consolidation
- Contract Program
- Other: Transfer Program at IFCHE from the University of Idaho to Idaho State University

**Aicha Elshabini, Dean** 4/25/07

College Dean (Institution) \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

VP Research & Graduate Studies \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Chief Fiscal Officer (Institution) \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

State Administrator, SDPTE \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Chief Academic Officer (Institution) \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Chief Academic Officer, OSBE \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Before completing this form, refer to Board Policy Section III.G. Program Approval and Discontinuance.**

1. Briefly describe the nature of the request e.g., is this a new program (degree, program, or certificate) or program component (e.g., new, discontinued, modified, addition to an existing program or option).

This request is for approval of the agreement between the University of Idaho and Idaho State University with regards to the Bachelor of Science in Computer Science (**CS**) program at **Idaho Falls Center for Higher Education (IFCHE)**. Per this agreement, the University of Idaho will transfer this program at IFCHE to Idaho State University in a phased arrangement. The purpose of this transfer is to allow the University of Idaho (**UI**) to focus on the graduate CS program at IFCHE and to allow the Idaho State University (**ISU**) to integrate the BSCS program at IFCHE into its undergraduate CS program. This transfer would allow both units to focus on their areas of strength at IFCHE. The agreement also contains commitments for cooperation and coordination by UI and ISU in both the graduate and undergraduate programs in Computer Science. The full text of this agreement is attached to this NOI.

2. Provide a statement of need for program or a program modification. Include student and state need, demand, and employment potential. **Attach a Scope and Sequence, SDPTE Form Attachment B, for professional-technical education requests.** (Use additional sheets if necessary.)

Enrollment in the BSCS program at IFCHE has been steady at 30 – 40 students over the last few years. Several of these students work for DOE or its contractors at the lab. Others are pursuing degrees through the IFCHE programs taking CS courses from UI and other courses from ISU or BYUI. Students from other disciplines often take CS courses as electives. Because of the predominant part-time nature of the CS majors, the number of graduates from the program **is** low. None-the-less, the CS program is an important element in the suite of programs offered at IFCHE.

3. Briefly describe how the institution will ensure the quality of the program (e.g., accreditation, professional societies, licensing boards, etc.).

Currently, the UI's BSCS program at IFCHE is accredited by the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) through September 07 as an extension of UI's CS program at Moscow. Idaho State currently has an ABET accredited program in Computer Science at **their-its** campus in Pocatello. Program accreditation will remain in place throughout the transfer period.

4. Identify similar programs offered within the state of Idaho **or in the region** by other colleges/universities. If the proposed request is similar to another program, provide a rationale for the duplication. This may not apply to PTE programs if workforce needs within the respective region have been established.

Currently, there are three CS programs in the Southeastern Region of Idaho. In addition to ISU's

**program in Pocatello and UI's program at IFCHE, BYU Idaho has a new BS program in computer science at its campus at Rexburg.**

Enrollment and Graduates (i.e., number of majors or other relevant data)  
 By Institution for the Proposed Program  
 Last three years beginning with the current year and the 2 previous years

Institution	Relevant Enrollment Data			Number of Graduates		
	Current	Previous Year	Previous Year	Current	Previous Year	Previous Year
BSU						
CSI						
EITC						
ISU	80	80	89	4	5	11
LCSC						
NIC						
UI (IFCHE)	27	8	21	4	3	4

Degrees offered by school/college or program(s) within disciplinary area under review

Institution and Degree name	Level	Specializations within the discipline (to reflect a national perspective)	Specializations offered within the degree at the institution
BSU	B. S.	Computer Science	
	M. S.	Computer Science	
CSI	A.S.	Computer Science	(Transfer Program)
EITC	A.A.S.	Computer Network Technology	
ISU	B.S.	Computer Science	
LCSC	B.S.	Computer Science	Web-based Emphasis Information Science
NIC	A.S.	Computer Science	(Transfer Program)
	A.A.S.	Computer Information Technology	
UI	B.S.	Computer Science	

	M.S.	Computer Science	
	Ph.D.	Computer Science	

5. Describe how this request is consistent with the State Board of Education's policy or role and mission of the institution. (i.e., centrality).

**Both ISU and UI are comprehensive universities offering a wide range of programs. Both are authorized by the State Board to offer BS degrees in Computer Science. ISU is not currently authorized to offer graduate programs in Computer Science, although plans for a graduate program are being developed consistent with the SBOE eight year plan. Approval of this program transfer will in no way preclude ISU from initiating graduate programs in its SBOE approved region. The UI is authorized to offer graduate programs at IFCHE, including the MS and Ph.D. in Computer Science. Thus, having ISU offer the BSCS and UI offer the M.S. and Ph.D. at IFCHE is consistent with Board policy.**

6. Is the proposed program in the 8-year Plan? Indicate below.

Yes  No

If not on 8-year plan, provide a justification for adding the program.

8. Resources--Faculty/Staff/Space Needs/Capital Outlay. (Use additional sheets if necessary.):

**The CS program at ISU has capacity to absorb the IFCHE program using the existing faculty. Thus, additional personnel will not be necessary beyond those required for ABET accreditation of the current program. The IFCHE BSCS program has generated approximately \$96,000 in student fees over the three academic years 2003-04, 2004-05 and 2005-06 (an average of approximately \$32,000 per year). This should be sufficient to support the expenses incurred by ISU in incorporating the IFCHE program into its current operation.**

Estimated Fiscal Impact	FY _____	FY _____	FY _____	Total
<b>A. Expenditures</b>				
1. Personnel				
2. Operating				
3. Capital Outlay				
4. Facilities				
<b>TOTAL:</b>				
<b>B. Source of Funds</b>				
1. Appropriated-reallocation				
2. Appropriated – New				
3. Federal				
4. Other:				
<b>TOTAL:</b>				
<b>B. Nature of Funds</b>				
1. Recurring *				
2. Non-recurring **				
<b>TOTAL:</b>				

\* Recurring is defined as ongoing operating budget for the program, which will become of the base.

\*\* Non-recurring is defined as one-time funding in a fiscal year and not part of the base.