2023 – 2024 Faculty Senate – ~~Pending Approval~~
Meeting # 26
Tuesday, March 26, 2024, 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm
Zoom only

Present: Barannyk, Blevins, Buchen, Chapman, Gauthier (Chair), Haltinner (Vice Chair), Justwan, Kenyon, Kirchmeier, McKenna, Miller, Mischel, Mittelstaedt, Murphy, Pimentel, Ramirez, Raney, Roberson, Rinker, Sammarruca (w/o vote), Schiele, Schwarzlaender, Shook, Strickland, Thaxton, Tibbals.
Absent: Maas (excused), Miller, Mischel.

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

Approval of Minutes (vote):
   The minutes of the 2023-24 Meeting #25, March 19, 2024, were approved as distributed.

Chair's Report:
   • Important reminder: Senators whose terms end in 2023-24 should ask their units/colleges to conduct elections for AY 24-25 Senate seats.
   • Apologies for the communication glitch about admissions. Regarding the data that was shared with you, please be assured that the data was shared at the time it was available.

Provost's Report:
   • Two searches are in progress.
      ○ Last week, we had two candidates for the position of Dean of the College of Law, and two more will visit this week . The schedules can be found at https://www.uidaho.edu/provost/administrative-searches .We encourage people to participate. After our last interview, we will ask for people's feedback.
      ○ The other search is for a new director of General Education. Dean Panttaja has been in that role for quite some time and he's going to step down. Please share this information with your colleagues. https://www.uidaho.edu/provost/administrative-searches
   • University of Phoenix: Addressing a previous question from Steve Shook, the Provost pointed to the University of Phoenix website: The University of Phoenix transaction requires a conduit issuer, and as such, we approached a number of different national conduits. Arizona Industrial Development Authority (AzIDA) is a conduit issuer of municipal revenue bonds with the ability to assist private and public borrowers across the country. National Finance Authority (NFA) in New Hampshire is also a conduit issuer. While AzIDA declined to participate, NFA agreed to participate in the financing. The AzIDA decision has no impact on our transaction.
   • A Senate Bill regarding the University of Phoenix passed the Senate State Affairs Committee this morning. See https://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2024/legislation/S1450/. The Provost will provide an update next week.
   Discussion:
   A senator inquired about an article in the Idaho Education News, which reported that the Alumni Association was asked by the President to hire a lobbyist. They noted that the university is not allowed to hire lobbyists. Provost Lawrence replied that the Alumni Association can do so, and it's common.

Committee Reports:

- Proposed changes to the Administrative Procedures Manual (non-voting)
  - APM 45.35 - University of Idaho Unmanned Aircraft Systems ("UAS") – Kay Dee Holmes, Assistant Director, Research Integrity, Office of Research Assurances, Attach. #2
    Standardized and updated formatting; Clarification on existing requirements; Address policy gaps & remove unnecessary language.
    Discussion:
    In response to a question from Chair Gauthier, Kay Dee Holmes confirmed that the policy applies only to UAS used for university business.

  - APM 20.60 - Unrelated Business Income Tax – Amanda Bauer, Controller, Ali Pearce, General Accounting Manager, Attach. #3
    Describe other UI policies or procedures related to or like this proposed change, or that will be impacted by it.
    There were no questions.

  - APM 35.66 - Laboratory Decommissioning – Samir Shahat, Executive Director, University Safety Officer, Radiation Safety Officer, Arch Harner, Assistant Vice President for Research Administration, Office of Research and Economic Development, Russell McClanahan, Biosafety and IRIC Facility Manager, Office of Research Assurances Attach. #4
    This policy was developed in collaboration with the Office of Research Assurances. It provides requirements for the removal of hazardous materials and equipment from laboratory spaces when the Principal Investigator (PI) or laboratory supervisor is leaving the University of Idaho, moving to another campus building, relocating to another laboratory within the same building, or disposing of or transferring laboratory equipment that is no longer needed. This policy also applies to the removal of all hazardous materials and equipment from laboratory spaces prior to renovation.
    There were no questions.

Announcements and Communications:

- Admissions Recommendations – Jean-Marc Gauthier, Faculty Senate Chair, Torrey Lawrence, Provost and Executive Vice President, Kristin Haltinner, Vice Chair of Faculty Senate, Dean Kahler, Vice Provost for Strategic Enrolled Management. Attach. #5.
  (Please see attachment #5 for the full content of the presentation.)
  Chair Gauthier started the presentation with some background and context for the decision to be made, and a brief timeline of recent decisions/actions. Vice Chair Haltinner reviewed the authority structure in shared governance, and the different options that have been proposed. The Provost addressed important aspects to keep in mind when making admissions criteria decisions: Our mission of access and our responsibility to admit students who are ready for college; reliability of GPA vs. test scores; impact of changing admissions standards; SBOE direct admission policy. Dean Kahler proceeded to present data on possible enrollment implications. Vice Chair Haltinner shared data on retention rates in relation to high school GPA. She concluded with an overview of the different options for senate to consider.
  Discussion:
  Senator Steve Shook expressed serious concerns about the projected implications for enrollment shown in the presentation. It is impossible to make this projection, because the students admitted post-COVID did not have to submit a test score, and we assume they had no

scores to submit. Chair Gauthier recognized that this is a problem with the data we have. Steve Shook also argued that Proposals #1 and #2 in Attachment #5 are not very different. UCC looked at the data and noticed that 96% of the students at the 2.6 GPA level had SAT score of 800. What data drives the choice of a 2.8 GPA vs. 3.0? Chair Gauthier pointed to the analyses from SEM. Steve Shook replied that UCC came up with different conclusions.

A senator argued that there is no point in the proposal to extend the emergency action for one more year. Nothing major will have changed in one year. Vice Chair Haltinner said that option is kind of a back-up plan, in case we cannot find common ground.

A senator brought up the issue of student success. The senate rep for her college conducted a survey about which set of requirements would be best. Most of the college agreed with reverting back to the original criteria prior to COVID, and expressed concern about what the GPA wasn't showing us about student aptitude. Her college is also seeing issues with engagement. The advising office reported many students on probation or disqualification in these last few years, the highest ever seen at her college. This senator does not see a test requirement as restricting access. Also, given that the GPA is not a consistent indicator because it differs across schools – there are non-accredited institutions, home-schooled students etc. – most of the constituents in her college agreed that reverting to the pre-COVID requirements would be best, if we want students to be successful. The senator also inquired about the Vandal Gateway program (VGP) with respect to student success and retention rates, because VGP is tied to the admission standards we are discussing. She also suggested looking at the question of admittance versus enrollment, and what we can do to make sure that admitted students enroll as well.

Vice Chair Haltinner pointed to the VGP update presented to senate on January 16, when the VGP team shared data for the past 1.5 years. The team were pleased with the improvement in academic standing from the first to the second year.

Back to the issue of potential impact on enrollment from reverting to the pre-COVID criteria, a senator asked how many of the 779 students who would have not been admitted by the 2019 criteria did not submit a test score. Vice Chair Haltinner provided the number, 720 students. Of those, 587 had GPA of 3.0 and above. In other words, most of them would be admissible to the University without any additional information.

A senator expressed concerns about procedural issues. A seconded motion from UCC is before senate, yet other proposals are being submitted and discussed. This senator is very reluctant to overrule the recommendation of a committee that has spent considerable time on this question and is entrusted with the responsibility for it. The senator is concerned that we are bypassing UCC in considering alternatives to what they have recommended to us. The UCC recommendation should be sent back to them. Chair Gauthier explained that there was never any intent to bypass UCC. FSL was under the impression the UCC was not willing to reconsider their recommendations. Hence, alternative options were developed.

Steve Shook announced his intent to propose a friendly amendment unanimously approved by UCC, to drop the test score requirement for students with GPA of 3.0 and up.

A senator said that he wouldn't be ready to vote without first discussing the financial impact of potentially admitting fewer students. Steve responded that the number of students who are admitted has no financial impact. It's those who are enrolled that have financial impact, and, once they're enrolled, those who are retained. They looked at retention rates from Institutional Research and observed that the retention rate decreases as GPA and SAT scores decline.

There was some additional discussion on the pros and cons of dropping the test score requirement. Those tests are still paid for, although no longer required by the state, so, financial barrier is not an issue. If we drop it, are we going back to a situation where we have less

information? Requiring test scores would be beneficial for us – moving forward, it would give us additional data if we analyzed the relationship between GPA and standardized test scores on retention in the future. Test scores can be important as an additional parameter when awarding scholarships.

There was a question about the role of the VGP in the UCC proposal. Steve Shook responded that VGP is not part of the general catalog. There is a link under admissions requirements that takes you to CLASS. It is not an official part of the general catalog because it's a pilot program. Therefore, UCC did not evaluate VGP as it relates to standards for admission. Provost Lawrence followed up with an additional aspect: the VGP admission criteria were approved through those emergency measures last year. So, we do need to address VGP criteria this semester, although not necessarily as a permanent measure. The third year of the pilot is next year, but admissions criteria must be decided a year and a half in advance.

A senator suggested that perhaps we should take a broader institutional approach to this decision – identify what's best for us as an institution, rather than react to what others are doing.

The senator who raised the issue of possible financial impact on faculty lines, jobs, etc. underlined the importance of having such information. Dean Kahler and Vice Chair Haltinner said they can put it together. Steve Shook reiterated that it's not possible to obtain a reliable estimate from the data.

The amendment to the UCC motion is seconded by Bob Rinker (seconded earlier by David Pimentel, who withdrew his action).
Vote: 13/21 yes; 8/21 no. Amendment passes.

Motion to table (Tibbals, Chapman). Vote: 19/20 yes; 1/20 no. Motion passes.

Adjournment:
The agenda not being completed, the Chair entertained a motion to adjourn. So moved (Justwan, Barannyk). The meeting was adjourned at 5:01pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

University of Idaho
2023 – 2024 Faculty Senate Agenda

<u>Meeting #26</u>

Tuesday, March 26, 2024 at 3:30 pm
Zoom Only

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes
    - Minutes of the 2023-24 Faculty Senate Meeting #25 March 19, 2024 **Attach. #1**

III. Chair's Report
    - Reminder to launch elections for AY 24-25 Senate seats

V. Provost's Report

VI. Committee Reports
    - Proposed changes to the Administrative Procedures Manual (non-voting)
        o APM 45.35 - University of Idaho Unmanned Aircraft Systems ("UAS") – Kay Dee Holmes, Assistant Director, Research Integrity, Office of Research Assurances **Attach. #2**
        o APM 20.60 - Unrelated Business Income Tax – Amanda Bauer, Controller, Ali Pearce, General Accounting Manager **Attach. #3**
        o APM 35.66 - Laboratory Decommissioning – Samir Shahat, Executive Director, University Safety Officer, Radiation Safety Officer, Arch Harner, Assistant Vice President for Research Administration, Office of Research and Economic Development, Russell McClanahan, Biosafety and IRIC Facility Manager, Office of Research Assurances **Attach. #4**

VII. Announcements and Communications
    - Admissions Recommendations – Jean-Marc Guthier, Faculty Senate Chair, Torrey Lawrence, Provost and Executive Vice President, Kristin Haltinner, Vice Chair of Faculty Senate, Dean Kahler, Vice Provost for Strategic Enrolled Management **Attach. #5**
    - Dependent Benefit Task Force Update – Kristin Haltinner, Vice Chair of Faculty Senate

VIII. New Business

IX. Adjournment

Attachments
    - **Attach. #1** Minutes of the 2023-24 Faculty Senate Meeting #25 March 19, 2024
    - **Attach. #2** APM 45.35
    - **Attach. #3** APM 20.60
    - **Attach. #4** APM 35.66
    - **Attach. #5** Admissions Recommendations

University of Idaho
Faculty Senate

2023 – 2024 Faculty Senate – Pending Approval
Meeting # 25
Tuesday, March 19, 2024, 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm
Zoom only

Present: Barannyk, Buchen, Chapman, Gauthier (Chair), Haltinner (Vice Chair), Justwan, Kenyon, Kirchmeier, Maas, McKenna, Miller, Mischel, Mittelstaedt, Murphy, Pimentel, Ramirez, Roberson, Rinker, Sammarruca (w/o vote), Schiele, Shook, Schwarzlaender, Tibbals.
Absent: Strickland (excused), Raney (excused), Blevins, Thaxton

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

Approval of Minutes (vote):
The minutes of the 2023-24 Meeting #24, March 5, 2024, were approved as distributed.

Chair's Report:
- Many thanks to our today's guests, Teresa Amos, Terry Soule, David Paul and Dean Kahler. Later in the meeting, they will engage with us in important conversations.
- A reminder of the exhibit of the AI/ML Task force from Monday, April 1, until Saturday, April 13. In the Reflections Gallery in the ISUB Building. We have received a large number of posters and videos. So, it's going to be a bigger than expected exhibit.

Provost's Report:
- The census date for spring was last week, and we are up overall 5.8% compared to last spring. Congratulations to everyone on this big accomplishment!
- We have four finalists visiting Moscow and Boise for the Dean opening in the College of law. For more information on the candidates and public events, visit https://www.uidaho.edu/provost/administrative-searches

- The SUCCESS Team is hosting a Town Hall tomorrow, at 3:30 PST. More at https://uidaho.zoom.us/j/84282522599?from=addon.

- March Faculty Gathering: Thursday, 4:30 to 6:30, in the Vandal ballroom, hosted by the College of Science. Please RSVP at https://forms.office.com/r/rYZ95ku7Dg.

- The College of Engineering is hosting a gathering in Idaho Falls, Tuesday, April 9, from 4:00 to 6:00.

- University of Phoenix: Not much new to report. We continue to work with the legislators, who plan to adjourn the session next Friday.

- Senator Shook sent some questions about Phoenix, following up on the discussion we had just before spring break:
  o Would you be able to provide a rough estimate of UI's total Phoenix cost to date, and from which UI fund lines were they paid for? Answer: When we received the questions, the updated number was $11.3 million. This includes expenses paid to date. As more

work continues, especially with the legislature, expenses continue to increase. They are being paid using UI resources. We established a separate fund, so that all Phoenix expenses would go into one place and be tracked easily. This is how we tracked similar costs for the P3 utility project a few years ago, as well as the P3 housing project.

- o How much is the decline in the UI reserve fund from these Phoenix expenses? <u>Answer:</u> The University doesn't have a single reserve fund. Reserves are held across the entire institution. Some are held centrally, but most of them are held in colleges or other units across campus. The university has cash reserves set aside and long-term investment accounts. While these transaction costs have impacted cash balances, there has not been any impact on the long-term investment accounts.
- o Will less reserves result in holdbacks for academic units, increased quote taxes on colleges or department funds, or hiring freezes? <u>Answer:</u> No. Lower reserves do not automatically result in any of those things. They just result in lower reserves on our balance sheet, by as much as we spend.
- o Is there a contingency plan for the costs already incurred, should the transaction not go through? <u>Answer:</u> We're hopeful it will close, and there's still a lot of work going on to find a path forward with the legislature. If it does not, the University will need to address the costs incurred. But we've been paying as we go, so, it will just take us longer to meet the State Board requirement for reserves. And obviously the State Board was in the middle of this transaction and knew that these costs were being incurred.
- o Senator Shook had another question, about changes in Arizona bonding authority. Will that affect the bonding itself and the total cost of the bonds? <u>Answer:</u> I'll need to follow up and confirm. I heard there was a change, but I don't think it will create a real problem in the process.

Committee Reports (voting):

- Proposed changes to the Faculty Staff Handbook
  - o FSH 1640.58 Ubuntu – Kristin Haltinner, Vice Chair of Faculty Senate, Attach. #3. Past chairs and members of Ubuntu have indicated that the committee membership was not working. The EDU had five ex officio seats and it was very burdensome for their offices to staff. We revised this to one voting seat chosen by the Chief Diversity Officer. The name for the Center for Disability Access and Resources needed to be updated. Given the importance of this office's participation, we also shifted them from ex officio to a voting member. IPO was also shifted to a voting membership. The faculty roles, undergraduate student roles, graduate student role, and remaining ex officio members remained the same. The committee also lacked clear term expectations, so these were added.
    Vote: 17/19 yes; 2/19 no. Motion passes.

- Proposed changed to the University Catalog
  - o UCC 533 Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning (AI/ML) Undergraduate Certificate – Terence Soule, Department Chair, Computer Science, Attach. #4.
    AI/ML is changing the world on a grand scale. We are seeing its transformational impacts on public health, manufacturing, agriculture, financing, urban systems and smart communities, social welfare, criminal justice, environmental sustainability, and national security. This certificate is intended to train students to understand AI/ML fundamentals, master algorithms, and be able to use state-of-the-art tools to develop AI/ML solutions for real-world problems. The certificate leverages the expertise from

faculty in several departments to give students a strong interdisciplinary background. It is designed to give undergraduate students from a range of fields the set of skills they need to succeed in the AI/ML arena.

Discussion:

After some minor clarification, the senators were ready to vote.

Vote: 19/19 yes. Motion passes.

- o UCC 534 Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning (AI/ML) Graduate Certificate – Terence Soule, Department Chair, Computer Science, Attach. #5.

  Basically, they're the same. Many of our courses are 400/500 level. So, the graduate certificate includes the 500-level version of the same courses. The two certificates are separate.

  Discussion:

  A senator inquired whether CS prerequisites are required for the courses in the certificate. Terence responded that some courses have CS prerequisites, others may have Math prerequisites, but, overall, there is a good number of options.

  Another senator asked whether students are educated about ethical use of AI/ML. Terence said that CS majors are informed, but he cannot be sure about students from other majors.

  Vote: 20/20 yes. Motion passed.

Announcements and Communications:

- Admissions Standards Proposal from UCC – David Paul, Chair of UCC.

  David Paul gave a brief overview of the recent discussions at UCC. They wanted to make a data-based decision about what is best. The data presented at UCC shows that lower high school GPA and lower SAT scores are associated with lower retention rates. Therefore, they felt there is no benefit to students by having lower admission standards. They also discussed the ethical aspects of admitting students who aren't successful and still must pay for it. They also felt the pre-pandemic admission standards were not especially burdensome.

  Discussion:

  Vice Chair Haltinner argued that enrollment is up, as reported by the Provost earlier, in part because we have lowered those standards. She shared some new information from Dean Kahler: In fall 2023, we admitted about 9,500 students, or 81% of the applicants. Under the pre-Covid criteria, we would have admitted 5,600 students, which is 48% of the total number of applicants. Thus, one must consider other aspects as well, such as lost faculty lines or jobs. It's important to consider the impact of this decision on the size of the student body and its possible implications. David Paul disagrees. By pre-Covid standards, students with GPA of 3.0 and higher were directly admitted, and those with GPA between 2.6 and 2.99 could still get in with a composite SAT score of 740. From 2023 UI data, 96% of the submitted SAT scores were 800 or above. Dean Kahler joined the conversation and confirmed the conclusions of his analysis. He looked at the 11,762 applicants for fall 2023 and tried to forecast how many of those students wouldn't have test scores, and how many would not be admissible using the pre-Covid criteria. He found a significant reduction in the number of students that would be directly admissible to the university.

  The discussion moved to the ISAT as one of the standardized tests that we may accept or require for admissions. UCC felt they could not incorporate the ISAT in their recommendation due to lack of data. A senator pointed to ISAT data from 2019, the results of which seem less

biased regarding race, gender and socioeconomic status. David Paul reiterated that retention and success are not predicted by the ISAT.

Provost Lawrence noted that reverting to pre-Covid standards would put UI in a very different situation with respect to state-wide direct admissions – students could be admitted to 8 or 7 of the 8 schools. We would be out of line with BSU. Our mission as a land grant institution is access, teaching the people in the state, not being an elite institution. At the same time, we want to admit students who we are reasonably confident have a high probability of being successful. But we cannot forget that there is a core to our mission. Access versus limiting for success are conflicting points. There was some additional discussion on the importance of identifying the best balance between facilitating access and admitting students who are ready for college.

Provost Lawrence commented on the admissions criteria issue being complicated by a generational issue, impacting children who were not yet in high school during the pandemic. Furthermore, pre-Covid criteria are lower because they allow automatic admission down to a GPA of 2.2 with a certain test score, which is a lower standard than automatic admission with a 2.6, as we do now. Below that threshold, they can be admitted and receive extra support through the VGP. Thus, the real difference is that pre-Covid criteria require test scores. The current emergency criteria do not require test scores but set a higher bar on the minimum GPA. The Provost suggested talking about "different" rather than "higher" or "lower."

Before closing the discussion, Chair Gauthier had one final remark. He was intrigued by some conversations at the State Board about being able to predict where students will require additional help based on the ISAT store. Chair Gauthier thanked everyone for the productive discussion.

- SUCCESS Update – Erin Chapman, School of Family and Consumer Science, Dan Eveleth, Department of Business, Attach. #2.
  Dan briefly reviewed the history of SUCCESS. It started with a call from the President for a working group to come up with initiatives that would have the potential impact of increasing six-year graduation rate from the current one to the average for R1 universities, which is 77%. Based upon an initial round of input from the U of I community, the SUCCESS Team identified three types of initiatives that have been successful at other universities and that build upon our existing strengths: 1) Expand and enhance common experiences; 2) Increased use of evidence-based teaching practices; 3) Provide earlier applied learning opportunities. (Read more at **https://www.uidaho.edu/provost/academic-initiatives/student-success-initiative**.)
  At this point in the process, the team is looking for two basic types of information. First: If there was an initiative on, for example, early applied learning opportunities, what form would that take in your unit? Perhaps there are things you're already doing that you would like to expand, or your unit is talking about some new ideas. What are those ideas? What form would they take in your unit? What kind of support would you need to either expand existing initiatives in your unit or develop new ideas? We welcome your feedback. There is a link to a survey in your binder where you could comment on any or all of the three types of initiatives.
  Link to Stage 2 Feedback Survey:
  https://forms.office.com/pages/responsepage.aspx?id=Y2u8fpJXGUqyCwS4JgSIU5scQ5_mUx5Er b1revX2YQpUOUFMRThOVEFaM1RUMFlUREFVTVlWSkdaQS4u&origin=lprLink
  Link to tomorrow's campus-wide meeting: https://uidaho.zoom.us/j/84282522599?from=addon
  <u>Discussion:</u>

A senator asked whether making a first-year experience part of the Gen Ed curriculum was ever considered. Dan replied that they did talk about it. They also discussed the idea of a first-year experience being something that all students would go through rather than a more local one. They settled on the idea of supporting and nurturing the amazing local efforts already going on, so that people could customize them to fit their unique needs.

- Phi Kappa Phi President Search – Dean Panttaja, Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives. Nationally the Chapter was instituted in 1960 as an interdisciplinary honors society. They have over 4 million dollars a year and give out fellowships. We have had 6 students over the last 4 years earn some of those fellowships to go on to our graduate school or other graduate schools. We are requesting senators to get the word out there. We're also looking for people who are willing to serve and run the Chapter, and we will pay for their membership every year that they work as officers. There should be a president, a vice president, and a secretary, but we've managed to just work with the president for the last 15 years. We have till January to get new officers up to speed. It's quite simple, and it's nice to meet these very talented students and share a little time with them and help them apply for these fellowships.
  Nomination Form can be found at https://forms.office.com/r/j3BzgtDD0u?origin=lprLink

- MyUI – Teresa Amos, Director, IT Planning and Initiatives, Office of Information Technology. At OIT, they have been working through some issues with the user experience and logins. Specifically, based on certain browsers, people were being logged out and ended up in a loop. So, we have opted to delay replacing Vandal Web until these problems can be addressed. No new actions have been put in place yet, although there is a variety of new cards that are showing up in MyUI. I would invite everybody to take the opportunity to have a look and play around. Feel free to send us your feedback.
  Discussion:
  Chair Gauthier mentioned a long list of questions he prepared based on people's concerns. Some of those issues have been out for some time, such as how faculty can be involved in technological choices through some form of shared governance on issues that impact their research and teaching, or AI concerns. Should we reschedule another time after Teresa has prepared to address those questions? Teresa agreed to this course of action.
  Discussion:
  Chair Gauthier mentioned aspects on the user testing side that need improvement. In his opinion, video tutorials are not helpful.
  A senator brought up former questions about new requirements of ticket approval for purchasing common software like Slack and Dropbox and having to get OIT approval before one can get reimbursed for that software through Chrome River. Teresa mentioned some miscommunication problems they are having with Accounts Payable. They are getting those worked out. As for Dropbox or other similar storage mechanisms or locations, there is a concern from a security perspective, because we would be in a situation where we don't know where the university's data is. This could impact our eligibility for Federal grants. But all that information is being put into the broader response to the questions Teresa and Dan received over the weekend from Chair Gauthier. The senator looks forward to a broader discussion.
  Provost Lawrence pointed out that we do have an Information Technology committee that's meant to have this type of discussion. I suggest we use these committees. That's why we have them.

Chair Gauthier emphasized the importance of working together and thanked everybody for these important discussions.

New Business:
None.

Adjournment:
The agenda being completed, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:46pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

From: Gauthier, Jean-Marc (gauthier@uidaho.edu)
Sent: Sunday, March 17, 2024 12:21 PM
To: Amos, Teresa (tamos@uidaho.edu) <tamos@uidaho.edu>
Cc: Lawrence, Torrey (tlawrence@uidaho.edu) <tlawrence@uidaho.edu>; Ewart, Dan (dewart@uidaho.edu) <dewart@uidaho.edu>; Haltinner, Kristin (khaltinner@uidaho.edu) <khaltinner@uidaho.edu>; Sammarruca, Francesca (fsammarr@uidaho.edu) <fsammarr@uidaho.edu>
Subject: FSM #25 / questions to OIT

FYI to Darryl Woolley

Hello Teresa,
Thank you for making time to come speak at FSM. I would like to share the list of questions that you requested about OIT and use of technology. I hope this is helpful for the presentation at FSM on 03/19.

MyUI
What is the best way to access MyUI for employees from the UoI website?
Is there a direct link on search engines?
How much of the MyUI project is completed?
What is the schedule to shift from Vandal Web to MyUI?
From the OIT website, "Navigation in VandalWeb will be turned off during the Spring Semester, 2024", is mid-semester the best time to make a critical change?
What is the cost involved with shifting to MyUI?
How many people worked on this project?
How many people will maintain MyUI?
Are faculty and students involved with maintenance, revisions and testing revisions of MyUI?
How many people used the MyUI video tutorials?

AI
What is OIT's technology assessment of AI in 2023-24?
What are OIT's recommendations about the use of AI software?
Do you expect an impact on OIT positions in the next two years?
What do you think about AI's level of acceptance in many fields of activity?
How does it influence OIT's choices of equipment or recommendations?
Do you think that AI has or will have an impact on teaching, learning and research?
What is the point of view of OIT on shared AI governance with faculty, teachers and researchers?

Hardware and software
What are the restrictions on

- buying software and hardware for research and/or using grant money?
- buying software and hardware for teaching and/or using departmental budget?
- using small devices such as a Raspberry Pi or Arduino?
- buying hardware and/or equipment from certain companies?

Personal phones
What is the responsibility of a UoI employee using a personal phone loaded with UoI required apps: for example, Teams, Duo?
What is the difference between an UoI employee using his or her personal phone or using a UoI desktop, or using a UoI laptop?
Does OIT collect, receive or use data from UoI employee personal phones? For example, geo-location data.
How does OIT manage the joint use of UoI apps and other apps on personal phones?

Please let me know if you have any questions or feedback.
Thank you again for your time.

Kind regards,

Jean-Marc Gauthier
Associate Professor & Program Director
innovation, storytelling & visualization

University of Idaho
Virtual Technology
and Design Program

VTD on the web Follow VTD on Vimeo
Follow Jean-Marc's projects on Vimeo

POLICY COVER SHEET

**For instructions on policy creation and change, please see
https://sitecore.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)
☐ Addition ☐ Revision * ☐ Deletion* ☐ Emergency ☐ Minor Amendment
Policy Number & Title:

Administrative Procedures Manual (APM)
☐ Addition ☒ Revision* ☐ Deletion* ☐ Emergency ☐ Minor Amendment
Policy Number & Title: **APM 45.35 – University of Idaho Unmanned Aircraft Systems ("UAS")**

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

Originator: Kay Dee Holmes, Assistant Director for Research Integrity, UAS Coordinator

Policy Sponsor, if different from Originator: Arch Harner, Office of Research Assurances Director

Reviewed by General Counsel__xx_Yes ___No   Name & Date: Manisha Wilson 2/29/2024

1.   **Policy/Procedure Statement:** Briefly explain the reason for the proposed addition, revision, and/or deletion.
                 - Standardized and updated formatting.
                 - Clarification on existing requirements.
                 - Address policy gaps & remove unnecessary language.

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

3.   **Related Policies/Procedures:** Describe other UI policies or procedures related or similar to this proposed change, or that will be impacted by it.   None.

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

APM 45.35-- University of Idaho Unmanned Aircraft Systems ("UAS")

Updated: February 1, 2017

Preamble: This policy, and the related policies and procedures described herein, is intended to ensure that the University operates any unmanned aircraft system in the furtherance of its educational, research, and service missions, as well as in compliance with applicable federal and state laws. This policy shall be effective immediately.

Contents:

A.   Definitions. Purpose. This policy ensures that the use of any unmanned aircraft system for uUniversity business complies with federal, state, and local rules and regulations.

B.   Scope.

B-1. Applicable. This policy applies to uUniversity employees, third parties, visitors, and students operating UAS on behalf of the university.

B-2. Not Applicable. This policy does not apply to personal use of UAS by University employees, students, or third parties on University property, including but not limited to recreational or hobby flight of model aircraft. See APM 95.35 and 35.35 for information on personal use of UAS on University property.

C.   Definitions.

C-1. Certification of Waiver; Certificate of Authorization ("COA") means a Federal Aviation Administration grant of approval for a specific unmanned aircraft flight operation. Standard use of a UAS under 14 CFR Part 107 does not require a COA.

C-2. Civil Operation means any UAS operation falling outside the scope of a public aircraft operation, such as an operation involving a commercial purpose or an operation involving research or other institutional activity outside the definition of governmental function. *[rev. 2-17]*

C-3. Commercial Purpose means the transportation of persons or property or other use of UAS for compensation or hire.

C-4. **Governmental Function** means an activity undertaken by a government, such as national defense, intelligence missions, firefighting, search and rescue, law enforcement (including transport of prisoners, detainees, and illegal aliens), aeronautical research, biological or geological resource management.

C-5. Public Operation COA means a COA granted by the FAA for a public aircraft operation. Public aircraft operations are those conducted by a public agency, like the University, in furtherance of a governmental function.

A-1. ~~**Aircraft** means any contrivance invented, used, intended to be used, or designed to navigate, or fly, in the air.~~

~~A-2~~**C-6. Responsible Party** ~~**(or Parties)**~~ means a university employee, third party, visitor, or student operating UAS on behalf of the University.

C-7. **Unmanned Aircraft System** ("UAS") means an aircraft that is operated without the possibility of direct human intervention from within or on the aircraft and associated elements (including communication links and the components that control the unmanned aircraft) that are required for the pilot in command to operate safely and efficiently in the navigable airspace of the United States under the regulatory authority of the Federal Aviation Administration ("FAA").

A-3. ~~**Certification of Waiver; Certificate of Authorization** ("COA") means a Federal Aviation Administration grant of approval for a specific unmanned aircraft flight operation. Standard use of a UAS under the Section 107 does not require a COA. *[rev. 2-17]*~~

A-4. ~~**Navigable Airspace** means the airspace of the United States above the minimum altitudes of flight prescribed by the regulations of the FAA, including airspace needed to ensure safety in the takeoff and landing of aircraft.~~

A-5. ~~**Public Operation COA** means a COA grant by the FAA for a public aircraft operation. Public aircraft operations are those conducted by a public agency, like the University, in furtherance of a governmental function.~~

A-6. ~~**Governmental Function** means an activity undertaken by a government, such as national defense, intelligence missions, firefighting, search and rescue, law enforcement (including transport of prisoners, detainees, and illegal aliens), aeronautical research, biological or geological resource management.~~

A-7. ~~**Civil Operation** means any UAS operation falling outside the scope of a public aircraft operation, such as an operation involving a commercial purpose or an operation involving research or other institutional activity outside the definition of governmental function. *[rev. 2-17]*~~

A~~C~~-8. ~~Commercial Purpose~~ ~~means the transportation of persons or property~~ ~~or other use of UAS for compensation or hire.~~

B. **VPRED** means the university's ~~**Policy.**~~

~~**B-1. Introduction.**~~ ~~The University, in carrying out its educational, research,~~ ~~and service missions, may make use of Unmanned Aircraft Systems ("UAS"),~~ ~~more commonly known as "drones," in Navigable Airspace when granted~~ ~~authorization to do so by the FAA. As a "governmental instrumentality for the~~ ~~dissemination of knowledge and learning," the University of Idaho is eligible for~~ ~~Public Operation certificates of waiver or authorization ("COAs") from the FAA~~ ~~that permit the University to fly UASs in the furtherance of a Governmental~~ ~~Function and where use of UAS would otherwise be prohibited under current~~ ~~law. The University has committed to the FAA that it will not use any UAS for~~ ~~purposes that are not Governmental Functions, including but not limited to~~ ~~Commercial Purposes, or for purposes otherwise authorized by the FAA,~~ ~~including but not limited to authorization through a Special Airworthiness~~ ~~Certificate, Experimental Category, or through exceptions that may be granted~~ ~~under Section 333 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 ("Section~~ ~~333") or through 14 C.F.R. §§107.1 *et seq.* ("Part 107"). This policy is~~ ~~intended to ensure University compliance with federal and state laws regarding~~ ~~UAS. [rev. 2-17]~~

~~**B-2. Policy.**~~ ~~No use of UAS may be undertaken by University faculty, staff,~~ ~~and students, or by third parties (including, but not limited to, consultants or~~ ~~contractors) acting on behalf of the University, without: 1) prior review by the~~ ~~UAS Committee; 2) approval by the~~ Vice President for Research and Economic Development or designee.

D. Policy. ("

> **D-1.** No indoor or outdoor use of a UAS may be undertaken by a Responsible Party without:
> **a.** Prior review by the UAS Committee;
> **b.** Prior approval by the VPRED~~"),~~ and, if necessary, ~~3) approval~~
> **c.** ~~Approval~~ by the FAA of a COA ~~and/~~or any other authorizations or exemptions applicable to the University use. ~~[rev. 2-17]~~ as required by FAA regulations.

~~Personal~~ **D-2. Compliance with FAA ~~R~~regulations, ~~L~~laws, and ~~p~~Policies.** The Responsible Party is personally responsible for complying with FAA regulations, state and federal laws, and ~~u~~University policies with respect to the use of UAS. Any waivers required from the FAA to conduct UAS flights must be obtained by the Responsible Party before flights occur.

D-3. Drones weighing more~~Larger~~ than 55 ~~LBS~~lbs. Use of a drone ~~larger~~weighing more than 55 lbs at take-off ~~on behalf of the University~~ ~~faculty, staff, students,~~is not permitted unless the Responsible Party first obtains an

exception or ~~third parties on~~ authorization from the FAA and receives approval as stated in D-1.

E. Insurance~~.~~

E-1. Liability insurance required. UAS liability insurance is required before any UAS activity by a Responsible Party may be carried out.

E-2. ~~University~~ property, including but not limited to recreational or hobby flight of model aircraft, is governed by APM 95.35, Personal Use of Unmanned Aircraft Systems on Campus, which prohibits such use on **~~Owned UAS~~UAS owned by University~~'s~~.** A UAS~~'s~~ owned by the university must be added to the University's insurance coverage via the Risk Management website before any flights are conducted.

E-3. UAS~~'s~~ not o~~O~~wned by University~~Third Parties~~. A Responsible Party using a UAS not owned by the University ~~property. *See also* APM 35.35, Public Use and Liabilities~~must provide proof of insurance coverage that lists the University as a covered party and provides coverage that meets the requirements set by the state of Idaho.

~~C. Scope of~~**F.** **UAS Committee** ~~a:~~ **A**uthority and ~~Responsibility for Review, Approval, and Monitoring of University Use of UAS~~r**R**esponsibilities~~.~~

~~C~~

F-1. ~~UAS Committee.~~UAS Committee

    a. The UAS Committee is an ad-hoc committee established by the President ~~, pursuant to FSH 1620B-3,~~ to advise the VPRED, who acts on behalf of the President in matters related to the use of UAS. The Committee ~~will be~~is appointed by and ~~report~~reports to the VPRED. The UAS Committee is the principal mechanism by which the University ensures that it is meeting its obligations under federal and state law applicable to UAS use and under any COA approved by the FAA and that ethical issues related to UAS use ~~is~~are given due consideration ~~prior to~~before use.

    b. The UAS Committee may, with the assistance of ORA and subject to approval by the VPRED, develop and implement:
        1. ~~C~~ S~~s~~tandard operating procedures for use and operation of UAS;
        2. Procedures for expedited approval of UAS use;
        ~~1.~~ P procedures for submission of a proposal to the UAS Committee;
        3.
        ~~2.~~ P procedures for appeal to the VPRED of any denial of a proposed UAS use by the UAS Committee; and
        4.

5. I⎯internal rules and procedures for the operation and administration of the UAS Committee, as may be consistent with this policy.

F-2. UAS pProposed uUse rReviews.

a. Procedures. The UAS Committee will review and make a formal recommendation to the VPRED~~, or his or her designee,~~ regarding any proposed use of UAS ~~in Navigable Airspace by any members of the University of Idaho community, including faculty, staff, students, or by third parties acting on behalf of the University~~by a Responsible Party. The UAS Committee will consider the legal and ethical issues related to the UAS use and apply relevant law, guidance from federal agencies, etc., in determining whether a proposed use should be recommended to the VPRED for approval. The Committee's review may:

1. ⎯~~The UAS Committee will determine whether a~~Recommend the proposed use ~~can be recommended~~ for approval by the VPR as described~~, needs~~ in the application;
2. Require modification to ~~be recommended~~ the application/proposed use before recommending it for approval~~, or~~ by the VPR;
3. Recommend that the proposed use should be denied.~~⎯~~; or
4. Deny the proposed use. ⎯(See sub~~jection~~ section c. below.)~~.~~

b. Approvals. The UAS Committee shall only recommend for approval those uses that it reasonably believes:
1. T~~t~~o be a Governmental Function and therefore eligible for a Public Operations COA;
2. T~~t~~o be within those areas of activity covered by other authorizations or exemptions that may be granted by the FAA to the University for Civil Operations, including Part 107;
3. T~~t~~o be within the Model Aircraft Rule for educational use; or
4. T~~t~~o be covered by an authorization by the FAA for Civil Operations held by a third party, subject to an agreement between the University and third party with respect to such services. ~~[rev. 2-17]~~

c. ⎯**Denied uUse by the UAS Committee.** The UAS Committee may deny a proposed UAS use on the basis of factors including, but not limited to:
1. T~~t~~he proposed use raises risk or ethical issues;
2. T~~t~~he proposed use constitutes a Commercial Purpose;
3. T~~t~~he proposed use is not a Governmental Function eligible for coverage by a Public Operations COA;
4. T~~t~~he proposed use is not covered by other forms of authorization by the FAA for Civil Operation of UAS; or
5. T~~t~~he proposed use is prohibited by law without written consent of the individual or the owner of a farm, dairy, or

other agricultural industry, and such consent has not ~~and/~~or cannot be obtained.

d. ~~Appeal of UAS Committee ~~d~~Denied ~~u~~Use.~~ If the UAS Committee denies a proposed use, the denial may be appealed, in writing, to the VPRED. Any proposed use which the UAS Committee determines needs modification may be recommended for approval, following completion of any required modifications.

e. ~~Ongoing ~~r~~Review.~~ The UAS Committee, with the assistance of the Office of Research Assurances ~~("ORA"),~~, shall provide ongoing review of any use approved by the VPRED and covered by a COA ~~issued~~ or other forms of authorization provided by the FAA. ~~The UAS Committee may, with the assistance of ORA and subject to approval by the VPRED, develop and implement:~~ ~~standard operating procedures for use and operation of UAS; procedures for submission of a proposal to the UAS Committee; procedures for appeal to the VPRED of any denial of a proposed UAS use by the UAS Committee; and internal rules and procedures for the operation and administration of the UAS Committee, as may be consistent with this policy.~~

~~F-3.~~ ~~Termination or Suspension~~**Suspension or termination of approvals.** The Committee may recommend suspension or termination of any use it deems inconsistent with the use approved by the VPRED ~~and/~~or the requirements of the applicable COA or other authorization granted by the FAA. Authority to suspend or terminate any previously approved use rests solely with the VPRED~~, or designee~~.

~~C-3.~~**G. Vice President of Research ~~a~~Authority ~~and~~& ~~r~~Responsibilities~~.~~**

G-1. In general. The VPRED is the ~~empowered~~ individual at the University empowered to approve proposed UAS use by Responsible Parties. The UAS Committee is appointed by and reports to the VPRED.

G-2. UAS ~~u~~Use ~~a~~Approval ~~by VPRED~~. Any proposed use of UAS recommended for approval by the UAS Committee shall be reviewed by the VPRED~~, or designee,~~ and approved or denied. Only ~~those operations~~UAS use approved by the VPRED may be ~~covered by an application to the FAA, as necessary, and/or~~ undertaken by ~~University personnel, students engaged in coursework, or third parties operating on behalf~~a Responsible Party. Denials of ~~the University. Only the VPRED, or designee, may submit an application for a Public Operations COA or similar applications to the FAA, after consultation with the Office of General Counsel. [rev. 2-17]~~use by the VPR are final and cannot be appealed.

G-3. COA, ~~w~~Waivers or ~~s~~Similar ~~a~~Applications to the FAA. Only the VPRED may apply for a Public Operations COA or similar application after consultation with the Office of General Counsel. In some cases, the Responsible Party may apply for a Public Operations COA or similar application, but only with written approval and authorization from the VPRED.

G-4. Suspension~~d~~ or ~~t~~Termination of~~e a~~Approvals. The VPRED may, at ~~his or her~~their sole discretion, suspend or terminate any previous approval of UAS under this policy on the basis that actual use is inconsistent with the previous grant of approval by the VPRED ~~and/~~or the requirements of an applicable COA.

~~D~~G-5. Signature authority. Only the VPRED is authorized to sign permits or agreements authorizing UAS usage on university or non-university property. See FSH 3170, B-9.

H. **Contact Information.** For further information regarding implementation of this policy~~, you may~~ contact the Office of Research Assurances, the UAS Committee, or visit the University UAS website.

~~Regulations authorizing section 336 has expired, the rules governing this are now section 349 (Exception for limited recreational operations of UAS, aka hobby flights) 14CFR Part 107, with these special exceptions. Now must take training, but no specifics on this, and no test at the end.~~

~~https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2019/05/17/2019-10169/exception-for-limited-recreational-operations-of-unmanned-aircraft~~

~~https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CFR-2020-title14-vol2/xml/CFR-2020-title14-vol2-part107.xml~~

~~107 allows our employees to fly in class g airspace~~

~~349 allows students to fly in class g airspace – personal pleasure (not this APM) for educational purposes they would be this APM~~

![University of Idaho logo]

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)
☐ Addition ☐ Revision* ☐ Deletion* ☐ Interim ☐ Minor Amendment
Policy Number & Title:

Administrative Procedures Manual (APM)
☐ Addition X Revision* ☐ Deletion* ☐ Interim ☐ Minor Amendment
Policy Number & Title: **APM 20.60 UNRELATED BUSINESS INCOME TAX**

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

Policy originator: Amanda Bauer, Controller

Policy sponsor, if different from originator: Brian Foisy, VPFA

Reviewed by General Counsel: __Yes __No   Name & Date:

Comprehensive review? __X Yes __No Patrick Grace, 2/21/24

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

   Comprehensive review; addition of purpose and scope sections.

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.

   Immediate

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.

20.60 - Unrelated Business Income Tax (~~Tax~~UBIT)

~~Owner:~~

- ~~**Email:** controller@uidaho.edu~~

Last reviewed/updated: ~~March 31, 2015~~~~February 14, 2024~~ March 5, 2024

~~**Preamble:** Some university revenue producing activities may result in unrelated business income as defined by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). Generally this will involve funds derived from a university business activity that is not substantially related to the university's exempt purposes of instruction, research and extension.~~

A. Purpose.~~:~~ This policy addresses the requirement for the University of Idaho to report and manage unrelated business income as defined by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), ensuring compliance with tax regulations and accurate reporting of revenue generated from activities not substantially related to the University's exempt purposes.

B. Scope.~~:~~ This policy applies to all University ~~u~~Units engaged in revenue-producing activities that may result in unrelated business income, as well as personnel responsible for financial management and reporting within those ~~u~~Units.

~~**C. Definitions:** None required.~~

B~~D~~C. Policy.~~:~~ The University is required to file an annual tax return to the IRS and the State of Idaho reporting all unrelated business income, and thus an annual review of all revenue generated by University ~~u~~Units must be done in order to ensure accurate reporting. To the extent an activity results in tax to the University, the ~~u~~Units generating taxable revenue are responsible for the payment of any tax due.

C~~D~~E. ~~Process/~~Procedure.~~:~~ ~~General Accounting has a questionnaire that is used to make a determination as to the status of income derived from each activity.~~ Prior to engaging in any new income producing activity, ~~u~~Units are required to complete ~~a~~the questionnaire provided by General Accounting ~~has a questionnaire that is used~~ to make a determin~~ation as to~~ the status of income derived from each activity. ~~~~General Accounting may also require ~~u~~Units to update the questionnaire information for existing activities. The questionnaire is ~~provided by~~available at General Accounting.

A spreadsheet will be sent out annually to all ~~u~~Units requiring them to review all revenue to determine if it is related or not to the exempt purpose of the university. The spreadsheet is to be filled out by department personnel and returned to G~~g~~eneral A~~a~~ccounting by the stated deadline.

D~~F~~E. Contact i~~I~~nformation.~~:~~ Questions regarding unrelated business income should be directed to General Accounting at gnrlacctg@uidaho.edu.

~~**G. Forms:** None required.~~

~~**H. Related Policies:** N/A~~

University of Idaho

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)
☐ Addition ☐ Revision* ☐ Deletion* ☐ Interim ☐ Minor Amendment
Policy Number & Title:

Administrative Procedures Manual (APM)
X Addition ☐ Revision* ☐ Deletion* ☐ Interim ☐ Minor Amendment
Policy Number & Title: **APM 35.66 LABORATORY DECOMMISSIONING**

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

Policy originator: Samir Shahat, Executive Director, Environmental Health and Safety

Policy sponsor, if different from originator: Brian Foisy, VPFA

Reviewed by General Counsel: __X Yes __No   Name & Date: Manisha Wilson, 3/22/24

Comprehensive review? _x_Yes __No

1. **Policy/Procedure Statement:** Briefly explain the reason for the proposed change.
   This policy was developed in collaboration with the Office of Research Assurances. It provides requirements for the removal of hazardous materials and equipment from laboratory spaces when the Principal Investigator (PI) or laboratory supervisor is leaving the University of Idaho, moving to another campus building, relocating to another laboratory within the same building, or disposing of or transferring laboratory equipment that is no longer needed. This policy also applies to the removal of all hazardous materials and equipment from laboratory spaces prior to a renovation.

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.

   Immediate.

APM 35.66
Laboratory Decommissioning

A. Purpose. This policy provides requirements for the removal of hazardous materials and equipment from laboratory spaces when the Principal Investigator (PI) or laboratory supervisor is leaving the University of Idaho, moving to another campus building, relocating to another laboratory within the same building, or disposing of or transferring laboratory equipment that is no longer needed. This policy also applies to the removal of all hazardous materials and equipment from laboratory spaces prior to a renovation.

B. Scope. This policy applies to all laboratories and laboratory equipment that are part of the University of Idaho, including all teaching laboratories, research laboratories, and auxiliary spaces serving as laboratories. Management of laboratory hazardous waste and biohazards is within the scope of APM sections 35.01, 35.11, 35.40, and 45.20.

C. Policy

> **C-1. Disposition of materials and sharps.** All chemicals, radioactive, and biological materials must be disposed of or their ownership transferred; hazardous wastes, sharps, and other wastes must be submitted to EHS for disposal in an appropriate manner before a laboratory is vacated.

> **C-2. Surfaces and storage locations.** Laboratory work surfaces and storage locations for all hazardous materials must be thoroughly cleaned and decontaminated before a laboratory is vacated.

> **C-3. Laboratory equipment.** All laboratory equipment must be thoroughly cleaned and decontaminated before removal from service, placing back into service, transporting to another location, storing in another location, or disposing of in a proper manner.

D. Procedure

> **D-1. Department chair.** The department chair must notify Environmental Health and Safety when a PI plans to vacate a laboratory, ensure PIs are aware of and follow procedures defined in this policy, and pay for all costs associated with the proper disposal or decontamination of hazardous materials or equipment remaining in the laboratory after the PI leaves the university (hazardous waste, unknowns, expired chemicals, equipment, etc.).

> **D-2. Principal Investigator.** The PI is responsible for the following:

>> **a.** Notify EHS of the plan to vacate the laboratory at least four weeks in advance and begin review of applicable items from the Laboratory Decommissioning Procedure and Checklist or the Laboratory Equipment Decontamination Form.

b. Arrange for the transfer or disposal of all chemicals, radioactive materials, and biological materials prior to leaving the University of Idaho.

c. Ensure all hazardous waste has been submitted for pickup and removed by EHS before leaving the University of Idaho.

d. Ensure all laboratory rooms, storage areas, equipment, and work surfaces are thoroughly cleaned and decontaminated before vacating the assigned lab space.

e. Ensure all laboratory equipment slated for removal has been decontaminated and has a completed and signed Laboratory Equipment Decontamination Form.

f. Correct any nonconformance after an EHS decommissioning inspection.

D-3. Environmental Health and Safety. EHS is responsible for the following:

a. Provide guidance to lab personnel on how to perform activities listed on the Laboratory Decommissioning Procedure and Checklist.

b. Provide guidance on proper methods or procedures for decontamination of lab equipment listed on the Laboratory Equipment Decontamination Form.

c. Collect all submitted hazardous chemical waste.

d. Perform a laboratory decommissioning inspection when applicable activities described in the Laboratory Decommissioning Procedure Checklist have been completed by the PI, notify the PI and department chair of any findings, and identify any potential nonstandard costs for review and determination by Vice President of Research, Vice President of Finance and Office of Research Assurances.

E. Nonstandard cost recovery

E-1. Department responsibility. The responsibilities and procedures mandated above should be managed within normal office operations and existing budgets because the PI is familiar with the area or materials and can thus partner with EHS for timely and cost-effective assistance. Current procedures on how to identify, manage and request disposal of hazardous wastes prior to decommissioning can be found at the Environmental Health and Safety website. Should decommissioning result in nonstandard costs, the department is solely responsible for the cost of remediation. Nonstandard costs are those that arise due to the specific nature of the waste or failure of the PI or laboratory supervisor to correctly and timely identify, manage, and request disposal of hazardous wastes prior to decommissioning. Whether an identified cost is nonstandard will be jointly determined by the Vice President of Research and Vice President of Finance in consultation with Environmental Health and Safety and the Office of Research Assurances.

E-2. Funding source identification. EHS will provide an estimate of nonstandard costs to the department. Within 10 business days, the department must identify to EHS a funding source. EHS will then engage the appropriate services.

E-3. Discretionary loan. The department's parent college may petition the Vice President of Research to grant a loan from the Office of Research to the department for all or some of the costs. If granted, the Office of Research will withhold all F&A recovery from the college until the loan is repaid from withheld F&A recovery. Additional loan terms may be negotiated between the college and the VPR. These terms may include, but are not limited to, suspension of proposal submissions by the involved college, loan interest, etc.

University *of* **Idaho**
Faculty Senate

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Jean-Marc Gauthier, Chair
              Kristin Haltinner, Vice Chair
              Francesca Sammarruca, Faculty Secretary
              Torrey Lawrence, Provost & Exec. Vice President
              Dean Kahler, Vice Provost for Strategic Enrollment Management

DATE: March 25, 2024

SUBJECT: Admissions Criteria for Summer 2025 and Beyond

The university's admissions criteria have been operating on emergency actions that began during the Covid-19 pandemic. This was a result of standardized test scores not being available and changes to high school grading during the pandemic.

On the surface, admissions criteria may appear to be a simple topic, but it is very complex. This is a critical decision that has great impact on student achievement (including retention, graduation, student debt, etc.) as well as the university's enrollment.

We have three possible paths to consider:
1. Take no action – the emergency action will expire, and we will revert to the 2019-2020 criteria contained in the catalog.
2. Approve new criteria – these criteria would replace the 2019-2020 criteria and go into effect as a permanent change.
3. Continue another one-year emergency action and delay a more permanent decision until the 2024-25 academic year.

Context and Assumptions
- Criteria should reflect our mission as a public, land-grant university which includes educating the working classes to receive a liberal (i.e., broad), practical education. This is a mission of access as we serve the State of Idaho and students from other locations.
- All criteria have limitations so there is no simple or obvious solution. Significant research in recent years about the "best predictor" for student success centers on GPA as the strongest overall criteria indicating a longer trajectory of student activity, effort, and achievement (e.g., Sawyer 2013); however, GPA is not standardized. Standardized tests provide a comparable assessment of aptitude but there is broad concern for bias (e.g., Carnevale et al 2019).
- We should consider all the possible impacts from criteria, including:
  - Student success: Are we admitting students who are not reasonably likely to succeed? Are we rejecting students who are reasonably likely to succeed?
  - GPA: What did we learn during the last three years of admitting students with 2.60+ which was different than the pre-2020 criteria?
  - What did we learn during the last three years of admitting students with no standardized test score?
  - What does the data show about pre-2020 admissions vs. admissions under the emergency criteria?

- We need to avoid any "try it for a year" approaches. It takes years for HS counselors to understand changes to admissions criteria. Any "trial year" has implications for longer than one year – it will impact university enrollment for 4+ years as the cohort class progresses through its degree.

Authority

Faculty

According to *FSH 1520 Constitution of the University Faculty* the admission criteria are established by the university faculty:

ARTICLE IV--RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY…
Section 1. Standards for Admission. The university faculty establishes minimum standards for admission to the university. Supplementary standards for admission to individual colleges or other units of the university that are recommended by the appropriate constituent faculties are subject to approval by the university faculty.

See also *FSH 4120 E-3* **Other catalog changes**. *Noncurricular catalog changes may be submitted directly to the most relevant standing committee of the university faculty and require approval by Faculty Senate and the university faculty before being forwarded to the provost for approval.*

University Curriculum Committee (UCC) (FSH 1640.91)

A. FUNCTION
A-1. To act on catalog changes involving the curriculum, including changes in the general requirements and academic procedures, and to coordinate curricular matters among UI's major academic divisions.
A-2. To recommend policies and procedures concerning the matriculation, advising, and registration of students.

University Admissions Committee (FSH 1640.08)

A. FUNCTION. To act on applications for admission to UI in the cases of undergraduate applicants who do not meet minimum requirements for admission but who request a review. The Admissions Committee also evaluates and acts on applications of undergraduate students to special UI programs requiring minimum qualifications lower than those for regular admission to the University of Idaho. The Admissions Committee also hears appeals from disenrollment when that disenrollment is the result of the presentation of incomplete or false information on initial application as an undergraduate at UI. Decisions of this committee may be appealed as stated in 2500. (Similar applications for admission to the College of Graduate Studies are acted on by the Graduate Council, and its decisions may be appealed as stated in 2500; those for admission to the College of Law are acted on by that college's Committee on Admissions, and its decisions may be appealed, in order, to the full faculty of the college and, when they consent to hear the appeal, to the president of the university and the regents.)

Process
Once a decision is made about which way to proceed, any required changes to the Catalog will be drafted and presented to Faculty Senate. Note: admissions criteria are part of the University Catalog. Catalog changes follow FSH 4120 which is different from changes to FSH itself.

History
There have been significant changes in our criteria in recent years due to the pandemic, test score availability, high school grading changes as a result of the pandemic. In addition, there is significant public debate about the value of certain tools to predict college success, especially standardized test scores (e.g. GPA, SAT, ACT, etc.).

July 2016 to Fall 2020 Admission Requirements

For many years prior, the university admitted students based on a sliding scale relating two required elements – GPA and test score (SAT or ACT). The criteria details are listed below in UCC's proposal.

June 2020

The Covid-19 pandemic significantly impacted high school grades from Spring 2020 semester as well as standardized test availability. Faculty Senate Leadership supports the following proposal that adjusts admissions policies <u>for the Fall 2021 admission cycle only</u>. Admissions requirements will revert to previous policy for the Fall 2022 admission cycle. To accommodate the irregularities in spring 2020 high school grading practices and changes to the College Board's standardized testing schedule, we propose the following for the Apply Idaho program for the Fall 2021 class only:

- The U of I will allow the use of 5th semester high school grades instead of 6th semester in the admission consideration (assuming the 5th semester GPA is cumulative), and
- The U of I make an admission decision based upon GPA only where a test score is not available (be "test optional"), and
- Establish a minimum high school GPA of 2.60 for admission.
- Under this accommodation, the U of I would not require a standardized test for admission but would require a placement test score prior to registration for the fall 2021 semester.
- Students whose GPA is below 2.6 will apply through the appeals process administered by the Admissions Committee.

April 2021

Faculty Senate requests the President to implement emergency policy again for Fall 2022 (Barb Kirchmeier, senate chair).

October 2021

UCC examined standardized test requirement for admissions. Jim Connors recommended a senate committee be created to examine the policy.

April 2022

Faculty Senate requests the President to implement emergency policy again for Fall 2023, Spring and Summer 2024 (Russ Meeuf, senate chair)

March 2023

Faculty Senate requests the President to implement emergency policy again for Fall 2024, Spring and Summer 2025. (Kelly Quinnett, senate chair)

<u>**Complicating Factors**</u>
SBOE Direct Admission process
Under the Apply Idaho - Next Steps initiative the Idaho State Board of Education screens Idaho high school seniors and shares that contact information with two-year and four-year colleges in the early fall of their senior year. The students are informed they are admissible to the two-year or four-year schools and that they can expect to hear from the colleges. The contact information of those students who meet established benchmarks to be admitted to a four-year college are provided to the U of I. We then communicate with student to share they are admissible to the university. They are invited to complete the application process to the U of I.

ISAT Test
This is a standardized test required of all Idaho high school students. It was recently moved from the 10th to 11th grade. We believe use of the ISAT should be considered in future years after data is available to compare multiple years of 11th grade tests against college success metrics.

Transfer Student Admissions
Criteria for transfer students have not changed and all proposals assume continuation.

Vandal Gateway Program (VGP)
VGP is currently in its second year of a three-year pilot. Evaluation of the program will be done after data of third year data is available (fall 2024 or early spring 2025). Admissions criteria for Summer 2025 and beyond are needed now so the program does not automatically cease prior to consideration of the pilot's results.

Proposals

#1 Recommendation from University Curriculum Committee

UCC recommends reverting to previous admission criteria. This criteria was used from July 2016 to Fall 2020. It is a sliding scale relating two required elements – GPA and test score (SAT or ACT).

High School Cumulative GPA (Unweighted)	*ACT Composite	*SAT Critical Reading + Math (SAT Taken Prior to March 2016)	*SAT Evidence Based Reading & Writing + Math (SAT Taken March 2016 and After)
3.00-4.00	Any Test Score	Any Test Score [required]	Any Test Score [required]
2.60-2.99	15 - 36	740 - 1600	830 - 1600
2.50-2.59	17 - 36	830 - 1600	910 - 1600
2.40-2.49	19 - 36	910 - 1600	990 - 1600
2.30-2.39	21 - 36	990 - 1600	1070 -1600
2.20-2.29	23 - 36	1070 -1600	1140 -1600

Notes:
- Either the SAT or ACT are required for all students. During the previous period, the SAT was required for all high school students in Idaho so it was not a barrier for admission. This is no longer true so keeping this criteria may decrease future enrollment. Our Fall 2023 entering class included **720 students** without a SAT/ACT score.
- Writing/Essay component is not required for admission
- The third column "SAT Taken Prior to March 2016" is rarely used and is outdated.
- Students may be automatically admitted down to a 2.20 GPA if their test scores are high enough.
- It does not account for admission to the Vandal Gateway Program currently serving students in the 2.30-2.59 GPA range. Students who do not meet these criteria would need to appeal via the UAC appeal process.
- Reverting to the above criteria would have decreased the number of admitted students from 9,579 to 5,650 (decrease of 3,929 admits) from 11,762 applicants in Fall 2023. (Again, this is not a perfect comparison given the number of students who didn't submit test scores.)

#2 Recommendation of Faculty Senate Leadership, Provost, and Vice Provost for SEM
We recommend new criteria that has a higher GPA range than UCC's recommendation and incorporates the test optional component for people with a GPA over 2.8.

- Criteria
  - GPA 2.80-4.00: Automatic admission without any test score
  - GPA 2.60-2.79: Automatic admission with SAT 830+/ACT 15+
  - GPA 2.30-2.59: Automatic admission to VGP (current criteria)
  - GPA 0.00-2.29: Admission via UAC appeal process

- Notes
    - This proposal allows us to use the same admission criteria for students across all states (i.e., not ISAT dependent)
    - The SAT and ACT requirements for GPA 2.60-2.79 are the same as the pre-2020 criteria for 2.60-2.99.
    - We do not have robust data for Idaho's new ISAT exam. We may consider this as a suitable alternative for SAT/ACT requirements in future years.
    - We believe this criteria may align with admission criteria of Boise State University which allows OSBE to manage direct admissions for Idaho students to both universities in the same manner.
    - When we apply this criterion to the Fall 2023 applicant pool we would admit 9,310 of the 11,762 applicants compared to the 9,579 actually admitted (269 fewer admits).
    - The UAC process continues as it does today.

#3 Alternate Recommendation of Faculty Senate Leadership, Provost, and Vice Provost for SEM

If a permanent solution is not found in the near future, we recommend that Senate asks President Green to continue the current emergency action criteria.

- Criteria
    - GPA 2.60-4.00: Automatic admission without any test score
    - GPA 2.30-2.59: Automatic admission to VGP without any test score
    - GPA 0.00-2.29: Admission via UAC appeal process to VGP
- Notes
    - The data shown to senate previously show no significant drop in student success with the use of these metrics.

Other Information

Reverting to pre-Covid admissions requirements would result in a significant loss in admittance and enrollment. A decrease of this magnitude could have significant negative implications for the university. (Again, this is not a perfect comparison. Test scores were optional and therefore some additional students may have been admitted if they had taken and submitted test scores. It is the best information we have.)

Admittance Rates

- This Fall 2023 we admitted 9579 students or 81% of the 11,762 that applied.

- If we reverted to the pre-Covid criteria and applied that to the Fall 2023 applicants, we would have admitted 5650 students or 48% of the 11,762. We would have admitted 3,929 less students than we did this year.

- If we apply the recommendation by FSL and the Provost's Office (above) to the Fall 2023 applicant pool, we would have admitted 9310 students or 79% of the applicants. We would have admitted 269 less applicants than we did this year.

Enrollment Rates

- In Fall 2023 we enrolled 1837 students

- If we reverted to the pre-Covid criteria and applied that to the Fall 2023 applicants, we would have enrolled 779 fewer students.

- If we apply the recommendation by FSL and the Provost's Office (above) to the Fall 2023 applicant pool, we would have enrolled 115 fewer students.

<u>Conclusion</u>
We believe recommendation #2 strikes the proper balance of access and reliability for student success allowing UI to fulfill its mission as a public, land-grant institution and recommend faculty senate vote to implement it for the 2024-25 academic year.