INFORMATION ITEM

SUBJECT
COMMITTEE MINUTES

BOARD ACTION
No action required.

Approved Minutes

Council on Academic Affairs and Programs

February 26, 2002 • 9:30 am – 12:30 pm
Conference Room 302 • Boise, Idaho

Present: Jerry Beck, CSI; Daryl Jones, BSU; Jonathan Lawson, ISU; Jerry Gee, NIC; Brian Pitcher, UI; Rita Rice Morris, LCSC; Mary Ann Carlson, EITC; Dan Petersen, SDPTE; Mike Falconer, SDPTE; Gary Stivers, OSBE; Patty Sanchez, OSBE

Absent: Bob West, SDOE

Guests: Lynn Humphrey, OSBE; Gary Lauer, SPTE; DeVere Burton, Dean, CSI; Pam Holloway, HSHS Dept, CSI; Jim Palmer, HSHS Dept, CSI; Joel Rodgers, Minidoka Hospital; Jerry Hart, Adm MVRMC; Susan Morris, Ancillary Services, MVRMC; Jake Rice, Director Diagnostic/Imaging; Darlene Travis, Program Director, Radiologic Sciences, BSU

1. Minutes of December 13, 2001 CAAP Meeting

It was agreed by consensus to approve the minutes of the December 13, 2001 meeting

2. Notices of Intent:

a. Concurrent Degree-JD and Master of Accountancy--**UI**
b. Bachelor of Science, Materials Science and Engineering--**UI**
c. New Center for Forest Nursery and Seedling Research--**UI**
d. Bachelor's (B.S. & B.A.) in Computer Science--**LCSC**
e. Associate of Science, Radiographic Science**--LCSC**
f. Program Change--Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT)--**ISU**
g. New emphasis area in Subsurface Science, adding to existing interdisciplinary Ph.D. in Engineering and Applied Science--**ISU**
h. Diagnostic Imaging/Radiograph, Health Professions -- **CSI**

DeVere Burton introduced the discussion regarding the CSI proposal for a Diagnostic Imaging/Radiograph program. In response to concerns and comments given by ISU and BSU, an amended curriculum was provided for CAAP's review. He noted that an accrediting body has granted approval of this curriculum. He briefly outlined additional comments to their response to CAAP. He noted that CSI has met with BSU regarding this proposal and would plan to meet with ISU in future.

The guests in attendance supporting the CSI Diagnostic Imaging/Radiograph program provided the following testimony:

Joel Rodgers, Minidoka Hospital
Mr. Rodgers expressed the hospital's support for the program and felt that the education process is working well for their needs and would hire a student with an Associate of Applied Science, Associate of Science, or a Bachelor of Science degree in the field of radiography. He noted that both BSU and ISU were approached but was not acknowledged with concerns of meeting the need for radiologists. He felt that the CSI proposed program would be adequate.

Jerry Hart, Chief Director, MVRMC
Mr. Hart expressed concern with the demographics in producing opportunities for health care workers in the Magic Valley. CSI is in a position to address the problem and offer the training and the hospital is willing to provide the setting for that to happen. He fully supports the approval of the program.

Susan Morris, Admin. Director, Ancillary Services, MVRMC
Ms. Morris expressed sincere support for the CSI program. She added that from the many needs being addressed nationally, radiologists are vastly becoming a priority. They currently have 5 vacancies and no applicants. If there is a way to look locally and attract applicants/students it would be to their benefit. She added that the program is very well structured to meet their needs and asks that CAAP recommend approval. Medical directors and equipment are lined up for the program needs.

Jake Rice, Director of Dept. of Diagnostic/Imaging
Mr. Rice commented that there is room for a 2 and 4 -year degree in the industry for students. They too currently have 5 full-time positions open and a Weber State student would be hired soon. He added that two radiologists are willing to support the program with their services. He also noted that since the CSI proposed program went public, they have received 100 inquiries about the diagnostic program and when it would be in place.

Jerry Beck summarized and concluded the discussion by stating that he hoped everyone's concerns with clinical sites, accreditation, and the curriculum of the CSI proposed Diagnostic/Imaging program were addressed and that CSI would receive the recommendation of CAAP so that the program may begin Fall 2002.

Jim Palmer, Health Sciences and Human Services, CSI
Mr. Palmer noted that he would certainly put forth a collaborative effort from the Health Sciences and Human Services Department and fully supports the program.

Daryl Jones and Jonathan Lawson both responded that they are sensitive to the need and the shortage in the radiography field and noted that the same can be said about engineering and teacher professions. The institutions are very aware of the needs. In fact, the health profession deans have been tracking the shortages so that this can be addressed--radiology and nursing being top priorities.

A brief discussion ensued regarding certification, accreditation, and employment credentials and it was noted that the State of Idaho currently does not have state

licensure requirements for practitioners of medical imaging and radiation therapy.

Darlene Travis, Program Director of BSU's Radiologic Sciences program expressed concern regarding the curriculum in that its content is very marginal. DeVere Burton encouraged CAAP to review the curriculum once again with the revisions. He has reservations about adding more credits to the curriculum for a student to reach in a 2-year program with the clinical experience being critical as well.

A brief discussion ensued regarding articulation. Darlene Travis stated that BSU does not automatically transfer credits from other programs but looks at the course content to see if a student would need to take other classes/courses to meet the requirements of the program. Gary Lauer noted that articulation is in place with ISU and BSU.

It was agreed by consensus to recommend to the Board approval of the CSI Diagnostic/Imaging Radiograph program. This notice of intent will be considered at the Board's March 7-8, 2002 meeting.

Jonathan Lawson noted that industry appears to want programs that articulate/coincide with a B.S. degree and that CAAP should look at that more closely. He also shared his concern with the lack of communication with the CSI proposal and encouraged that future communication occur before a proposal is proposed. Although the issues for this CSI proposal have been addressed, more discussions need to occur. DeVere Burton offered to get in touch with ISU for a future meeting. It was also requested that a copy of the full curriculum of the CSI Diagnostic/Imaging Radiography program be shared with CAAP members. In terms of credentialing, it was recommended that CAAP be aware of House Bill 1011, a federal credentialing bill in the radiography field, and track its progress in Congress.

Other Notices of Intent:

Brian Pitcher briefly discussed the University of Idaho's intent to offer a concurrent degree in JD and a Master of Accountancy, which would enable students to earn both degrees in less time than it would take to earn the degrees separately. Brian also discussed UI's intent to establish a Center for Forest Nursery and Seedling Research. According to Board policy for program approval, the Executive Director may approve the establishment of a Center. Patty Sanchez explained that it was added to the agenda due to the fiscal impact in the budget. Brian also shared UI's intent to establish a Bachelor of Science degree in Materials Science and Engineering. The degree program will parallel and complement the current B.S. degree in metallurgical engineering by offering courses in material systems.

Daryl Jones observed that in the NOI UI's future plans are to expand the program to their branch campuses and to other markets worldwide via Engineering Outreach. He noted that BSU is moving in the same direction and asked whether UI would be extending this to Boise. Brian stated that UI is not planning to offer/expand this program to Boise or Idaho Falls.

It was agreed by consensus to recommend to the Board approval of the UI's concurrent JD and Master of Accountancy degree program and Bachelor of Science in Materials Science and Engineering. These Notices of Intent will be considered at the Board's March 7-8, 2002 meeting.

It was agreed by consensus to recommend to the Board's Executive Director approval of the University of Idaho's request to establish a Center for Forest Nursery and Seedling Research.

Rita Morris shared with CAAP Lewis-Clark State College's intent to offer a 4-year academic Bachelor of Science/Bachelor of Arts in Computer Science with a particular emphasis on information systems and a solid foundation in mathematics. She noted that this comes as part of the Governor's incentive funds.

Rita also discussed Lewis-Clark State College's intent to establish an Associate of Science in Radiographic Science. This program will include study and practice in clinical application of radiographic procedures for the purposes of imaging all parts of the human body for medical diagnosis. Due to the concerns with the CSI radiography curriculum, it was requested that LCSC provide a copy of the curriculum for this program to CAAP members.

It was agreed by consensus to recommend to the Board approval of the LCSC Bachelor of Science/Bachelor of Arts in Computer Science and Associate of Science in Radiographic Science program without the development of full proposals. These Notices of Intent will be considered at the Board's March 7-8, 2002 meeting.

Jonathan Lawson discussed with CAAP Idaho State University's intent to add a new emphasis in Subsurface Science to the existing interdisciplinary Ph.D. in Engineering and Applied Science. According to Board policy for program approval, the Executive Director may approve a new emphasis. Patty Sanchez explained that it was added to the agenda due to the fiscal impact in the budget.

It was agreed by consensus to recommend to the Board's Executive Director approval of Idaho State University's intent to add a new emphasis in Subsurface Science to the existing interdisciplinary Ph.D. in Engineering and Applied Science.

Jonathan also shared with CAAP ISU's intent to create a Doctorate of Physical Therapy (DPT) as a three-year, post baccalaureate entry to profession degree, which is essentially a change in degree level from its current Masters entry-level degree to a doctorate. In accordance with Board policy and program review guidelines, all doctoral programs require, as part of the Full Proposal, a report with recommendations from an external peer-review panel of at least two. The on-site visit occurred December 17-18, 2001 with reviewers Carl DeRosa, PT, Ph.D. of Northern Arizona University, and Ann Williams, PT, Ph.D. of the University of Montana. This

report has been shared with CAAP and will be shared with the Board at its March 2002 meeting.

It was agreed by consensus to recommend to the Board approval of ISU's Doctorate of Physical Therapy (DPT) program. This Full Proposal will be considered at the Board's March 7-8, 2002 meeting.

3. CAAP Program Guidelines Draft

Patty Sanchez explained that Jane Hochberg, OSBE's Deputy Attorney General, and the University Counsel have reviewed CAAP guidelines and made comments and suggestions that are incorporated in the document. She added that there were certain issues highlighted in red for CAAP's specific discussion.

CAAP reviewed and discussed these guidelines and made some changes in the language for clarity. A majority of the discussion was centered on the newly added *Section E. Program Discontinuance Criteria and Procedures*. CAAP felt the section on *Criteria* needed more clarification and information on the discontinuance portion and the due process for "letting go" tenure faculty. Brian Pitcher distributed an additional draft of Section E from the UI counsel and outlined some additional potential changes.

Due to time constraints, it was suggested that CAAP hold a conference call with Jane Hochberg and the University Counsel this week to discuss further the program closure and discontinuance and tenure faculty/ Faculty-Staff Notice sections.

4. Grow Your Own Update--Lynn Humphrey

Lynn Humphrey reported that the Joint Finance and Appropriations Committee voted to fund the Grow Your Own program for the next fiscal year but with a 10% reduction in the base budget. The appropriation is expected to be $405,000.

Lynn directed CAAP to the budget sheet, which summarized the allocations to each of the participating institutions including the number and amount of scholarships awarded to date. All of the institutions indicated verbally that they planned to provide scholarships to students attending the summer session. Lynn noted that any unspent funds at the end of the fiscal year would revert to the General Fund as no carryover authority was granted of FY02 funds. She also expressed concern over the significant amount of unspent funds and noted that the Board office will likely have to consider reallocation of the scholarship funds. Lynn also mentioned that she has not heard from the University of Idaho regarding their recruiting activities/initiatives for the GYO program. Brian Pitcher offered to check on the status and provide an update to Lynn.

A standard amount for part-time scholarships was never formally established. Lynn thought with several of the GYO students attending classes part-time and taking anywhere from 3 to 15 credits that it would be important to establish a standard part-

time scholarship rate perhaps based on the institutions' part-time fees. There was a suggestion that a part-time rate be no more than 130 or 140% of the part time fees. CAAP asked Lynn to draft a proposal for the part-time scholarship amount for CAAP's consideration.

4. Other

Jonathan Lawson asked that the following be considered for discussion at a subsequent CAAP meeting: Institutions bearing administrative charge for those programs exceeding 8 credits, which make students full-time; bundling of fees; and revisiting list of high demand programs.

Approved Minutes

Conference Call

Council on Academic Affairs and Programs Committee and University Counsel

February 28, 2002
10am -12pm
LBJ Building/Boise, ID

Present:

Jerry Beck, CSI	Brian Pitcher, UI	Mike Falconer, SDPTE
Daryl Jones, BSU	Georgia Yuan, UI	Jane Hochberg, OSBE
Amanda Horton, BSU	Randy Gellar, UI	Patty Sanchez, OSBE
Kevin Satterlee, BSU	Rita Rice Morris, LCSC	
Jonathan Lawson, ISU	Mary Ann Carlson, EITC	
Brad Hall, ISU	Dan Petersen, SDPTE	

1. CAAP Program Guidelines

Similar concerns shared at CAAP's meeting on Tuesday, February 26, 2002, regarding the language in the proposed text on *Faculty-Staff Notice* was shared with the Counsel. CAAP essentially felt that the section on *Criteria* needed more clarification and information on the discontinuance portion and on the due process for "letting go" tenure faculty. Institutional counsel and CAAP members proceeded to discuss potential changes for these sections of the draft guidelines. Dan Petersen suggested that CAAP and the Counsel refer to the language in the Division of Professional-Technical Education IDAPA rules when revising this *Criteria* draft section as it may provide some insight and language that could be incorporated into that section.

Jane Hochberg will look at the *Criteria* portion as well as the language on tenured faculty (Section E.2.b.3) and provide CAAP with another draft for discussion. She noted, however, that a draft would not be ready until after the legislative session is over.

Conference call adjourned at 11am.

Approved Minutes

Council on Academic Affairs and Programs

April 25, 2002 • 9:30am – 12:30pm
Conference Room 302 • Boise, Idaho

Present:	Jerry Beck, CSI	Brian Pitcher, UI	Mike Falconer, SDPTE
	Daryl Jones, BSU	Rita Rice Morris, LCSC	Gary Stivers, OSBE
	Alan Eggers, ISU	Mary Ann Carlson, EITC	Patty Sanchez, OSBE
	Jerry Gee, NIC	Dan Petersen, SDPTE	

Guests: Lynn Humphrey, OSBE

1. Minutes of February 26, 2002 CAAP meeting

It was agreed by consensus to approve the minutes of February 26, 2002 CAAP meeting.

2. Minutes of February 28, 2002 CAAP and University Counsel Conference Call

It was agreed by consensus to approve the minutes of February 28, 2002 conference call.

3. Notices of Intent:

a. Master of Nursing, Professional Fee—ISU

Alan Eggers briefly discussed ISU's request to add a professional fee of $500 per semester to their Master of Nursing program, which is a new expense from the existing fee. With fees already going up, there were concerns with the justification of instructional costs. CAAP felt that if ISU pursues this request that they should strengthen justification of instructional costs. It was also suggested that ISU research other funding avenues.

Alan Eggers offered to forward concerns to Jonathan Lawson and provide additional information/clarification for CAAP.

b. Bachelor of Science in Health Science—ISU

Alan Eggers discussed ISU's intent to create a Bachelor of Science in Health Sciences. This degree program would provide an opportunity for A.A.S. students to train in a para-professional health occupation. Students graduating with this B.S. degree would be able to obtain employment within the health care field of their choice.

It was agreed by consensus to forward a recommendation to approve this program to the Board at their June 27-28, 2002 meeting.

c. Associate of Applied Science in Pre-Professional Nursing—ISU

Alan Eggers briefly discussed ISU's intent to create an A.A.S. in Pre-Professional Nursing. This proposal would give Practical Nursing students an option of continuing academic classes after the completion of the 15-month Practical Nursing certificate. He mentioned that there are no additional resources needed for this program.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the need for this program as ISU currently has a Bachelor of Science in Nursing. CAAP wondered how this program articulates and does it make sense to have it.

Alan Eggers offered to forward these concerns to Jonathan Lawson and provide additional information/clarification for CAAP.

4. CAAP Guidelines and Forms--Draft

Patty Sanchez informed CAAP that Jane Hochberg has revised the *Criteria* portion of the draft guidelines on Program Discontinuance as discussed at CAAP's February conference call with the University Counsel. She added that some of the language in the Division of Professional-Technical Education's IDAPA rules was incorporated to that *Criteria* section as recommended for CAAP's review. There was a general concern that the language used was too specific and the group did not feel too comfortable with it as stated. Gary asked Jane and Lynn Humphrey to rework the language on the draft.

Brian Pitcher began the discussion by briefly outlining some suggested changes to the guidelines. It was suggested to strike out "administrative units, components, research, and public service" from page one, paragraph four and simplify the language and/or define those more clearly and on subsequent pages. It was also suggested to rework the language on page eight under number four, "Off-campus Program/Distance Learning Delivery/Residence Centers." Rita Morris suggested that the "Guidelines for Evaluation of Electronically Offered Degree and Certificate Programs," adopted by the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges, be referenced when reworking the language to this item.

A brief discussion ensued regarding out-of-state institution offerings and the possible duplication of efforts. Some members asked how the out-of-state institution's courses/programs are approved. Lynn Humphrey explained that per Board policy, the institutions are to register with the Board office if they plan to conduct business in Idaho. Some CAAP members felt that it would be helpful to be kept informed on a regular basis of out-of-state institutions who have requested and received approval for offering programs/courses in Idaho. Lynn Humphrey informed CAAP that this

information is tracked by the Board office and that a list could readily be compiled and distributed to CAAP with updates provided as needed.

Notice of Intent and Full Proposal Forms

Patty Sanchez briefly outlined the changes made to the Notice of Intent and Full Proposal forms and added that she used the last drafts that CAAP reviewed and of those suggested changes from the Division of Professional-Technical Education and incorporated them into one form. Mike Falconer added that SPTE would like to add an additional statement to Notice of Intent form, page 2, number 4, to read that the scope and sequence for professional-technical education programs will be required. CAAP once again inquired what was meant by "Administrative/Research Unit" and thought it should be defined more clearly on the form and on the program guidelines.

Patty Sanchez offered to make the revisions and noted that once a final version has been completed of these forms, that they would be forwarded to CAAP and would also be available on the Board's website.

6. Oversight Councils for Regional Collaborative Programs Proposal

Brian Pitcher noted that the President's Council discussed at a previous meeting the need to establish an oversight committee to coordinate regional collaborative program efforts. There are concerns with Magic Valley and Treasure Valley and their oversight management on common program/facilities. It was suggested that Provosts and Presidents coordinate program planning and work on issues collaboratively perhaps by having a yearly meeting to discuss coordination of courses so that the two institutions are not duplicating efforts.

It was suggested that four separate/unique coordinating council meetings occur a day before a Board meeting. It was also suggested that someone track down the document the President's Council was looking at and use it as a starting point for this proposal.

7. Ad Hoc Health Professions Workforce Group

Gary Stivers informed CAAP that the Board has discussed restarting the Health Professions Workforce group. He added that Karen McGee has expressed interest in wanting to remain on the committee as chair. Some CAAP members felt that someone in the private sector should chair the committee. Gary also shared with CAAP that he has been receiving calls from individuals expressing interest in serving on the committee such as nurses who have not only expressed interest in the committee but in forming another group to tackle primarily nursing issues. CAAP felt it would be more worthwhile to have just one group to address and identify health profession issues. Gary noted that the Board is moving in a different direction with the committee to perhaps include adding more hospital administration to the membership. Gary distributed a membership list of the current committee members and asked CAAP to look at the list and indicate which of the members' continued participation would be recommended.

A brief discussion ensued on the role and specific charge of the health professions group and whether CAAP would want to be a part of the discussions. It was essentially agreed that any recommendation that comes through the health professions group would come through CAAP before going to the Board. It was also suggested that community college representation be identified to represent issues. CAAP offered to provide additional names to the committee once a more defined role and charge of the health professions workforce group is identified.

8. Chief Academic Officer Position

Gary Stivers briefly updated CAAP on the status of the recruitment for the vacant Chief Academic Officer position. He informed CAAP that due to budget issues, he has not been successful in filling this position. He presented CAAP with the concept of hiring someone at a mid-level to handle academic processing issues and give CAAP more of the decision-making authority. CAAP members expressed concern with this concept and felt the position needed someone at a higher level with strong leadership skills to address Idaho's academic issues. CAAP continued to discuss other possibilities such as hiring someone on a temporary appointment from an institution. Gary stated that he expected the tenure issue to be a barrier to that possibility but would keep this in mind as he continues to recruit for the position. He also asked that the institution's forward names to him of potential candidates.

9. WICHE AP Grant—K-12 and Higher Education Collaboration—Lynn Humphrey

Due to time constraints, Lynn Humphrey stated that she would send the CAAP members an email message regarding this issue.

10. Governing Policies and Procedures: Policies Regarding Faculty, Section II.G-- Discussion of Concerns and Issues—Daryl Jones

Daryl Jones briefly discussed with CAAP the policy changes that had occurred with Board policy *Section II.G. Policies Regarding Faculty* in July 2001. He noted that the policy draft changes, before they were approved, were routed from the institutions to the human resource departments and were never brought before CAAP. Daryl informed CAAP that some of the changes that were made are now problematic and conflict with policies at BSU and perhaps some of the other institutions and he urged that the policy be reviewed once again. He suggested that CAAP spend some time over the summer to re-examine and work on the policy and bring forward to the Board another draft for their review and approval.

11. Nancy Szofran—update

Nancy Szofran briefly informed CAAP that the Evaluation Committee for the Idaho Technology Incentive Grant Program discussed potential changes to the Request for Proposals (RFP) for next year to include program goals such as collaboration with public schools (K-12) and perhaps also collaboration with other institutions. Nancy noted that the committee suggested CAAP discuss this topic at subsequent meeting. Due to time constraints, this topic could not be discussed at length.

Nancy Szofran informed CAAP that there was monies left from this and previous years' budget that will not be allowed for carryover. She proposed using the monies to cover the airfare costs of the faculty attending the "Pacesetters Symposium," which is being held on May 22, 2002. CAAP did not have any concerns with this suggestion.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30pm.

APPROVED MINUTES

HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH COUNCIL MEETING

December 4, 2001
LBJ Building, Boise, ID - Room 324 / 8:30 am – 9:25 am

Present:

Darrell Manning, Chair	Richard Bowen	Dene Thomas	Chuck Ruch
Ron Bitner	Brian Pitcher for Bob Hoover	Dennis Stevens	Lynn Humphrey

Absent: Bill Shipp John Huffman **Guest:** Gary Stivers

I. Minutes of September 11, 2001

MSC (Pitcher/Bowen): To approve the minutes of September 11, 2001.

II. Reappointments to HERC

General Manning announced that the State Board of Education reappointed Dr. Dennis Stevens and Mr. John Huffman to HERC for three-year terms, November 2001 – November 2004.

III. FY01 Science and Technology Expenditure

Information provided by Mr. Gary Mahn, Department of Commerce, in response to Dr. Stevens' request for an accounting of the $50,000 HERC expenditure for the S & T Advisory Council was included in the agenda information. Committee members noted from the Idaho S & T Strategy, 2001 Accomplishments, that the Advisory Council will likely have positive benefits in the K-12 and higher education areas.

IV. Idaho EPSCoR Review Preliminary Report

The Committee reviewed the interim report prepared Dr. Marianne Clarke. She indicated that she still has several interviews to conduct so the report is very preliminary and no conclusions should be drawn from it at this point. In response to Dr. Clarke's request for feedback, HERC asked her to consider the following:

1. Explore HERC's relationship to EPSCoR. EPSCoR appointments are reviewed by HERC, which makes a recommendation to the Board of Education, who has final approval. HERC President (and current Board member) prefers that all research issues go to the Board through only one committee – HERC. Do EPSCoR members feel that it is it a barrier or problem?
2. Do other EPSCoR states have paid Directors? Perhaps a full-time paid position to focus exclusively on pursuing research opportunities (funding sources); and coordinating that information to the other research universities.
3. Should there be a separate committee for NIH-EPSCoR, or other EPSCoR programs? Does the current committee structure adequately address NIH's expectations for oversight of its program?

4. HERC would like recommendations with the report.

V. FY02 HERC Budget

A. Reallocation

Lynn Humphrey presented two options for the HERC to consider when allocating roughly $31,000 from its FY02 budget that had not previously been earmarked for HERC programs. One option was to distribute the unallocated funds on the same formula that the Infrastructure funds are distributed. The other option was to allocate the funds based on the total percentages of all other FY02 HERC program allocations.

It was agreed by consensus to allocate the funds based on the formula used to distribute Infrastructure funds (40%, 25%, 25%, 10%).

B. Specific Research Grant Program

There was a general discussion of the possibility of the legislature restoring the $600,000 for Specific Research Grant Programs back into HERC's budget. HERC was very supportive of the program, particularly because it provides seed grant to develop preliminary research that can be used later to leverage EPSCoR or other non-state sources of research funding. Dr. Stevens pointed out that despite HERC's efforts to re-write the entire HERC policy and guidelines for the SRGP, the funding still not had not been restored. General Manning also mentioned that the institutions did receive approximately $2.0 million dollars for two new programs that allowed the institutions to use the money for targeted needs.

Dr. Brian Pitcher observed that the political reality is that the $600,000 has not been restored in HERC's budget despite their efforts and perhaps that suggests that there needs to be a broader constituency supporting the request.

(MSC: Ruch/Bitner): That HERC make a presentation to the Science and Technology Advisory Council to talk about HERC programs and how they contribute to the Research & Development and economic climates in the state.

In addition, it was agreed that it would be valuable to have the HERC chair serve on the Governor's Science and Technology Advisory Council. Lynn Humphrey agreed to follow-up on that request.

VI. Other – (Department of Agriculture; Intellectual Property Policy)

A. Dr. Ron Bitner mentioned that the USDA has recently awarded the Idaho Department of Agriculture $4.2 million through the Specialty Crops Assistance Program. Dr. Bitner had spoken with a staff member of the Agriculture Department about HERC's process for awarding grant funding, which he thought could be used as a model for the Dept. of Ag to award the funds to local

commodities groups. He also planned to meet with Mr. Pat Takasugi, the Director of the Dept. of Agriculture.

Lynn Humphrey will draft a letter under General Manning's signature to Mr. Takasugi offering HERC's technical assistance and requesting the opportunity to discuss any potential overlap with the Department of Agriculture and HERC's programs.

B. A copy of the draft benchmarking report on intellectual properties prepared by Mr. David Hochman was distributed to HERC for their review. HERC members were invited to submit any comments on the draft report to the Board staff.

ACTION ITEM

SUBJECT

FIRST READING
GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
III.G. Program Approval and Discontinuance
III.H. Program Review —First Reading

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

The Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP), the University Counsel, and the Board office has been addressing the need for clear Board guidelines on program reduction and discontinuation.

Currently, the Board Policy Section III.G., Program Approval and Discontinuance, refers to IRSA/CAAP Guidelines for Program Review and Approval for guidance and procedures. CAAP had been working on finalizing changes to these Guidelines to correspond with current Board Policy. These guidelines are currently in draft form. The University Counsel and CAAP have been working on draft versions of the guidelines to present to the Board for approval.

The University Counsel recently presented to CAAP at its May meeting, a draft version of the Board Policy Section III.G., which incorporates the CAAP/IRSA guidelines with current policy text. The changes made provide a clear definition of program discontinuance and its procedures.

The language in Board Policy Section III.H., Program Review, has been changed in order to be consistent with the proposed language in Board Policy Section III.G.

RECOMMENDATION

The CAAP and the Board office recommend approval of the first reading of the Board's Policy Section III.G., Program Approval and Discontinuance.

MOTION

A motion to approve the first reading of the Board's Policy Section III.G., Program Approval and Discontinuance.

A motion to approve the first reading of the Board's Policy Section III.H., Program Review.

Moved by_____ Seconded by_____ Carried Yes_____ No_____

ATTACHMENTS

Board Policy Section III.G. Program Approval and Discontinuance
Board Policy Section III.H. Program Review

Idaho State Board of Education
GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS
G. Program Approval and Discontinuance **April 2002**

G. Instructional Program Approval and Discontinuance

1. Policy Intent

a. The Board affirms that a major percentage of academic and professional~~applied~~ - technical program planning, assessment, and review rests with the institutions, both in theory and in practice. However, the Board has final authority and responsibility for how a program and the curriculum relate to other institutions, the system as a whole, and the needs of the consumers. The Board also anticipates that all postsecondary program approvals will include identifiable learning outcomes and competence measurements for graduates of their programs.

b. The Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (CAAP) is authorized to make recommendations on a wide variety of academic and ~~applied~~ professional-technical program issues. The CAAP serves as the working unit of the Instruction, Research and Student Affairs (IRSA) committee at their direction and pleasure. Changes, duties, and responsibilities are at the discretion of IRSA and the Board.

c. This policy does not apply to ~~academic~~ instructional programs that are discontinued as a result of financial exigency as defined and discussed in Section II.N. of these policies.

d. Academic programs ~~and administrative units~~ at the University of Idaho, Idaho State University, Boise State University, and Lewis-Clark State College are included in this subsection. Professional-technical education programs ~~and administrative units~~ at Idaho State University, Boise State University, Lewis-Clark State College, Eastern Idaho Technical College, North Idaho College, and the College of Southern Idaho also are included. To the extent rules of the State Division of Professional-Technical Education apply, including but not limited to program discontinuance rules, those rules shall pre-empt this section. Furthermore, to the extent the rules or policies of the Boards of Trustees of North Idaho College and the College of Southern Idaho apply, those rules or policies shall pre-empt this section.

2. Board Expectations

a. The Board affirms that program instructional approval ~~review~~ is a collaborative process, which includes the Board, its staff, the institutions, external advisory groups, accreditation bodies, and other interested parties. Consistent with the Board's philosophy of institutional autonomy in matters of internal management, each institution assumes primary responsibility for the review of programs whether they are existing or new. However, the Board does have the following specific expectations from the institutions concerning academic and ~~applied~~ professional-technical planning and program review in general:

(1) With respect to academic programs, strategic planning is taking place, which permits the institutions to focus upon strengths distinctive from other institutions, and in accordance with its approved mission statement. The result is an opportunity for access to a broad spectrum of high quality programs.

(2) For ~~applied~~professional-technical programs, strategic planning permits each institution to fulfill its role in serving the needs of its assigned service region. Input from local business and industry is expected.

(3) All existing ~~academic~~ instructional programs are reviewed systematically by the institution. The findings from these reviews permit the institutions to build program quality, respond to the needs of their constituents, and deliver cost effective and performance based programs to the citizens of Idaho.

(4) The standards for the program approval process are rigorously applied according to the Board's priorities for quality, unnecessary duplication, centrality to institutional role and mission, demand, and resource sharing.

(5) Institutional efforts are directed toward meeting those needs that are a high priority to the state.

(6) Expansion or reduction of programs and services is implemented consistent with institutional program priorities and statewide needs.

(7) Input from consumers, appropriate agencies and professional boards, (e.g., dentistry, medicine, nursing, pharmacy, etc.), and the Professional Standards Commission is expected when developing or modifying new programs.

3. Statewide and Institutional ~~Review~~ Approval Objectives

a. Program ~~review~~ approval will take into consideration statewide and institutional objectives. Such ~~reviews~~ approval will apply to the following categories of ~~academic~~ instructional programs:

(1) New or existing academic/~~applied~~ professional-technical/contract programs or research units;

(2) Additions, expansions, discontinuances, and consolidations of existing programs;

(3) New or changes in majors, minors, options, or emphases;

(4) Changes in research units;

(5) New or modified programs or program components, both in-state and out-of-state that are located outside of the service area defined by the institution's Board-approved role and mission statement.

b. Statewide Program ~~Review~~ approval objectives assist the Board in:

(1) meeting its goals and responsibilities for management of the system of postsecondary education by ensuring effective and efficient use of state resources;

(2) ensuring that the system of postsecondary education is meeting the needs of consumers;

(3) increasing the Board's knowledge and understanding of the instructional programs at its institutions; and

(4) developing incentives for change according to the needs identified through the planning and approval ~~review~~ process.

c. Institutional Program ~~Review~~ approval objectives assist the institutions in:

(1) meeting its goals as described in their Board approved role and mission statements;

(2) creating solid foundations for academic and ~~applied~~ professional-technical planning, assessment, and budgeting that permits the institution to respond to the needs of its consumers;

(3) ensuring the effective and efficient use of state resources for access to quality instructional programs and for learning and performance outcomes;

(4) broadening the institution's knowledge base for the purpose of establishing instructional program effectiveness, priorities, strategies, budgets for future program development, and accreditation reviews; and

(5) assisting the institution in the reallocation process.

Idaho State Board of Education
GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS
G. Program Approval and Discontinuance **April 2002**

~~2~~4. Classification and Definition of Programs

a. ~~Academic~~ Instructional Program

An ~~academic~~ instructional program is a systematic, usually sequential, grouping of courses (i.e., curricula) that provides the student with the knowledge and competencies required for a degree or certificate (See definition on Section III E-1). There are several distinct degrees and certificates depending upon time and orientation of the curriculum. As a consequence, programs may include certificates (technical certificates, advanced technical certificates) and degrees (i.e., associate, bachelor, master, and doctorate). A certificate of completion (e.g., Teacher Technology Certification, Geotechnology Certification, Structural Engineering Certification, Secure and Dependable Computer Systems Certification, etc.) is not defined as a program.

b. Academic Program Components

(1) Major

A principle field of academic specialization that usually accounts for 25 to 50 percent of the total degree requirements; the concentration of coursework in a subject-matter major serves to distinguish one program from others leading to the same or a similar degree.

(2) Minor

A body of coursework that pertains to a secondary area of academic or specialization. The coursework usually amounts to between 15 to 25 percent of the total degree requirements.

(3) Emphasis

One of two or more alternatives within the same major but usually affecting only 20 to 40 percent of the requirements in the major.

(4) Option

One of two or more alternatives within the same major; the differences between the options usually amount to 50 percent or more of the requirements in the major.

(5) Academic Certificate of Completion

A credential awarded for the completion of a course of study, or series of courses of study, representing a coherent body of knowledge, that does not lead to a degree (i.e., bachelors, masters, doctoral) or a program component (i.e., major, minor, emphasis, or option).

c. Professional-Technical Certificates

Professional-Technical Certification and degrees are designed to prepare individuals with skills and training requirements for employment in a specific trade, occupation, or profession.

(1) Technical Certificate of Completion - Certificate of Completion - a credential awarded by the institution for a professional-technical program that does not meet the criteria for other professional-technical certificates and consists of seven (7) semester credits or less.

(2) Postsecondary Technical Certificate - a credential awarded for completion of requirements in an approved vocational program of instructions of at least eight (8) semester credit hours and mastery of specific competencies drawn from requirements of business/industry.

(3) Technical Certificate - a credential awarded for the completion of requirements entailing ~~between 27 and 29~~ at least 27 semester credit hours and less than two years of full-time work and includes mastery of specific competencies drawn from requirements of business/industry.

(4) Advanced Technical Certificate - a credential awarded for completion of technical and technical support requirements entailing more than one (1) academic year, a minimum of 52 semester credit hours and mastery of specific competencies drawn from requirements of business/industry.

d. Professional-Technical Degrees

(1) Associate of Applied Science Degree (A.A.S) - a credential awarded for completion of requirements entailing at least two but less than four years of full-time professional-technical effort with a minimum of 60 semester credits (includes a minimum of 16 general education credits) and includes mastery of specific competencies drawn from requirements of business/industry. The A.A.S. degree has specific requirements in the individual technical fields (e.g., drafting, electronics, civil engineering technology, business occupations, information technology, etc.)

(2) Advanced Option - a credential awarded to additional credits of at least 15 credit hours that are beyond the A.A.S. degree ~~totaling at least 75 credits.~~.

e. Professional-Technical Program Components

(1) Option - options of a program provide alternative instructional paths to fields of specialized employment, consist of more than one specialized course, and may have a separate advisory committee. Justification is based on availability of employment requiring the optional specialized training.

~~3~~5~~6~~. Approval~~/Overview~~ for all ~~Academic~~ Instructional Programs, Units, and Titles

a. Executive Director Approval

Executive Director approval is required thirty (30) days prior to the implementation, discontinuance, expansion or change in title in any of the ~~academic~~ instructional programs and units identified ~~in 3a – b~~ below including ~~off-campus~~ programming delivered at sites outside of the service area described in the institution's role and mission in cooperation with another institution, business, agency or industry. The executive director may refer any of the above requests to the Board or its designated Committees for review and action. Those program, component, unit and title changes approved by the Executive Director shall be reported quarterly by the Executive Director to the Board.

~~An institution may appeal the decision of the Executive Director. That appeal procedure is a component of the Guidelines for Program Review and Approval.~~

b. ~~Financial Impact~~ Board Approval

The creation of any new credit bearing instructional program outlined in ~~3.c~~ 5e, and any other request in ~~3~~5~~a~~c or ~~3~~5~~b~~d having a financial impact of $150,000 or more per year ~~will~~ requires Board approval prior to implementation. "Financial impact" as used in the policy means the total new financial resources needed to support salaries of additional faculty~~,~~ and staff~~, or facilities costs~~ operating expenditures, capital outlay, physical facilities, and indirect costs (such as overhead) that are newly generated as a direct result of the new instructional program.

~~Those program, component, unit and title changes approved by the Executive Director shall be reported quarterly to the Board.~~

Idaho State Board of Education
GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS
G. Program Approval and Discontinuance **April 2002**

~~a~~c. Academic or Professional-Technical Units

Academic or Professional-Technical Units include: Departments, Institutes, Offices, Centers, Divisions, Schools, Colleges, Campuses, Branch Campuses, ~~Administrative units of r~~ or Research Units~~or public service~~.

~~b~~d. Credit Bearing Instructional Programs~~s~~ Components

Academic majors, minors, emphases, options, do not require Board approval unless the ~~fiscal~~ financial impact is greater than $150,000 per year.

(1) Professional-Technical Program components, except tech-prep articulations, do not require Board approval unless the ~~fiscal~~ financial impact is greater than $150,000 per year.

(2) Certificates of Completion are not defined as programs per se and hence do not require Board approval.

~~c.~~e. New Program Requests

All credit bearing certificates (excluding Certificate of Completion) and degrees require full ~~b~~Board approval.

(1) Professional-Technical Certificates (as defined in Section III.G.4.c., 1-4)

(2) Degrees (Associates of Applied Sciences, Associate of Arts, Associate of Science, Baccalaureate, Masters, Doctorate)

~~47~~6. Approval Procedures

~~General guidelines for review and approval of programs and program components will be set forth in an IRSA policy/procedures manual.~~

a. ~~New Programs State Board of Education~~ Board Approval Process

(1) Subsequent to institutional review and consistent with institutional policies, requests for the addition of any new academic or professional-technical certificate, degree, or request with a ~~fiscal~~ financial impact greater than $150,000 per year will be submitted by the institution as a notice of intent to the Chief Academic Officer of the Board.

(2) A notice of intent may be forwarded to the Board office at any time~~. If new funds are required, the last date for IRSA consideration is the April Board meeting and these requests must be considered no later than the March CAAP meeting.~~

(3) The Chief Academic Officer shall forward the request to the ~~Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (~~CAAP~~)~~ for its review and recommendation. Professional-technical requests will be forwarded to the State Division of Professional-Technical Education ("SDPTE") for review and recommendation prior to CAAP review and action.

(4) If the CAAP recommends approval, a "full proposal" may be requested and must be distributed in the required time prior to review by both CAAP and ~~the Instruction, Research and Student Affairs Committee (~~ the IRSA committee~~)~~. The IRSA committee will forward its recommendation to the full Board during committee reports. Those new academic/professional-technical certificates, degrees, or other requests that require new state appropriations will be included in the annual budget request of the institution and the ~~State~~ Board ~~of Education~~.

(5) ~~The only request(s) that require a full proposal are graduate degrees.~~ A request for a Graduate degree requires a full proposal. CAAP may, at its discretion, request a full proposal for any request requiring a notice of intent. Full proposals should be forwarded to CAAP members at least two (2) weeks prior to the CAAP meeting. ~~If new funds are to be requested, the last date for IRSA consideration is the April Board meeting.~~

(6) As a part of the full proposal process, a~~A~~ll doctoral program request(s) ~~as a part of the full proposal process,~~ will require an external peer review. The external peer-review panel will consist of at least two (2) members and will be selected by the Board's Chief Academic Officer and the requesting institution's Chief Academic Officer. The review will consist of a paper and on-site review followed by the issuance of a report and recommendations by the peer-review panel. Considerable weight on the approval process will be placed upon the peer reviewer's report and recommendations.

b. ~~Existing Programs~~ Office of the State Board of Education Approval Process

Idaho State Board of Education
GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS
G. Program Approval and Discontinuance **April 2002**

(1) Requests concerning existing academic units and/or credit bearing instructional components will be submitted by the institution as a notice of intent to the Chief Academic Officer of the Board. The Chief Academic Officer shall forward when appropriate the request to ~~the Council on Academic Affairs and Programs (~~CAAP~~)~~ for review and recommendation. Professional-technical requests (i.e., units and/or credit bearing instructional program components) will be forwarded to the Division of Professional-Technical Education for review and recommendation prior to CAAP review and action.

(2) If the CAAP recommends approval of the request(s), the notice of intent will be submitted to the ~~State Board of Education's~~ Executive Director for consideration and action. The Executive Director shall act on any request within thirty (30) days of receipt of the CAAP recommendation. If the Executive Director denies the request he or she shall provide specific reasons in writing. The institution has thirty (30) days in which to address the issue(s) for denial of the request. The Executive Director has ten (10) working days after the receipt of the institution's response to re-consider the denial. If the Executive Director decides to deny the request after re-consideration, the institution may send its request and the documents related to the denial to the president of the Board for final reconsideration. ~~The institutions may appeal the Executive Director program request decision(s). The appeal procedures are available in the Guidelines for Program Review and Approval.~~

c. Routine Changes

Routine changes may be forwarded annually to the State Board of Education's office for retroactive approval. These include:

(1) ~~The~~ changes of major or minor requirements in academic programs;

(2) changes in individual courses that will be reflected in course catalogs such as~~,~~ ~~or the~~ addition, discontinuance, expansion, change in title, semester in which ~~offering~~offered, credit changes, prerequisites, or descriptions ~~of individual courses for routine catalog changes may be forwarded annually to the State Board of Education's office for retroactive approval~~.

d. Distance Learning Delivery and Residence Centers

Idaho State Board of Education
GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS
G. Program Approval and Discontinuance **April 2002**

All ~~academic~~ instructional programs offered or delivered to sites outside of the service area defined by the institution's role and mission statement shall be submitted to the Executive Director using a n~~N~~otice of i~~I~~ntent. The notice must be received at least one hundred and twenty (120) days prior to the date of first delivery of the program. It is the Board's desire that those institutions under their governance will use the "Guidelines for the Evaluation of Electronically Offered Degree and Certificate Programs" adopted by the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges when using electronically offered degree and certificate programs. ~~The Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges has adopted these "Guidelines".~~ The Executive Director, or his/her designee, will notify the institution in writing of approval or disapproval. If the Executive Director denies the request he or she shall provide specific reasons in writing. The institution has thirty (30) days in which to address the issue(s) for denial of the request. The Executive Director has ten (10) working days after the receipt of the institution's response to re-consider the denial. If the Executive Director decides to deny the request after re-consideration, the institution may send its request and the documents related to the denial to the president of the Board for final reconsideration.

~~5~~7~~8~~. Official Program Listing

The Office of the State Board of Education ("OSBE") will maintain the Official Program and Degree Listing of Board-approved academic and professional-technical programs offered at the public institutions. Changes or modifications to the Official Program and Degree Listing require prior OSBE approval. The official program and degree listing will use the U.S. Department of Education's most current classification of instruction program (cip) codes as a tracking and approval mechanism.

8~~9~~. Criteria for Review of New Instructional Programs

The following criteria are used for the statewide review of requests for new academic and ~~applied~~ professional-technical programs. The CAAP is responsible for maintaining the criteria to reflect the current priorities of the IRSA committee and the Board~~'s current priorities~~ for instructional program quality, unnecessary duplication, centrality to role and mission, and resource sharing as a method for improving quality, access, cost efficiency, and outcome measures.

(1) Quality -- the full proposal must include documentation that the new instructional program will be of high quality. To ensure quality programs, the institution should address the following: curriculum, faculty, students, infrastructure support, funding resources, outcome and performance measures, business and industry support and partnerships, State Licensing Board acknowledgment and other agency support where appropriate. Accreditation reviews, self-study reports, external peer-review evaluations, etc. are encouraged as part of the documentation of quality.

(2) Duplication -- the institution submitting the full proposal must document that the new instructional program avoids duplicating an existing program or presents evidence that duplication is ~~necessary~~ warranted.

(3) Centrality -- the institution must clearly document and ensure that the new instructional program is consistent with the Board's approved role and mission.

(4) Demand -- the institution seeking a new instructional program will address student, regional, and statewide needs. In addition to access and demand, (i.e., the anticipated number of students seeking admission to the proposed program), it is important to recognize the needs of other consumers such as business, industry, and governmental agencies. Further, communication and cooperation with the appropriate standard of practice agency (e.g., licensing board), as it relates to student graduate placements and needs of the respective professions, is expected.

(5) Resources -- documentation concerning cost efficiency of the new instructional program is also required before the Board can take action on the full proposal. The institution/SDPTE must assure the Board of effective use of resources in promoting the new program. In addition, the impact that the new program will have on existing programs at the institution, faculty, facilities, library, etc. must be addressed. The budget for the proposed program clearly tracks the source and amount of funds (e.g., new funds, reallocation, resource sharing with business, industry, other institutions, contract agencies, federal government, etc.).

9~~10~~. Instructional Program Discontinuance Criteria and Procedures

~~In determining whether to discontinue a program, the following criteria and procedures will apply:~~

a. Criteria

The primary consideration in instructional program discontinuance will be whether the instructional program is an effective use of the institution's resources, and specific criteria supporting instructional program discontinuance will include, but will not be limited to:

(1) Quality -- the institutions should address the following: curriculum, faculty, students, infrastructure, support, funding resources, outcome/performance measures, business industry support/partnerships, State Licensing Board acknowledgement, and other agency support where appropriate. Accreditation reviews, self-study reports, external peer review evaluations, etc. should also be considered when determining quality.

(2) Duplication -- the institution should consider whether the program duplicates an existing program or whether there is evidence that duplication is unwarranted.

(3) Centrality -- the institution should consider whether the program is inconsistent with the Board's approved institutional/professional-technical role and mission.

(4) Demand -- the institution should consider whether the program addresses student, regional, and statewide needs. In making this consideration, the institution should look at access to the program, the needs of other consumers such as business, industry, and governmental agencies, communication and cooperation with the appropriate standard of practice agency (e.g. licensing board).

(5) Resources -- the institution should consider whether the program is cost efficient and whether the program is an effective use of resources. In making this determination, the institution should consider the impact of the program on other programs, faculty, facilities, library, etc.

~~6. Faculty/Staff/Student Rights~~
b.~~11.~~Instructional Program Discontinuance Procedures -- Students and Employees

(1)~~a.~~ Students

Idaho State Board of Education
GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS
G. Program Approval and Discontinuance **April 2002**

A student enrolled in a program scheduled for discontinuance under Section III.G. does not have the right to complete the program. When there is a similar program within the state, an affected student will be provided with information on transferring to that program, although admission to any such program is contingent upon the availability of a position and the student's meeting any applicable admission requirements. If there is no similar program available within the state or the student is not able to gain admission to a similar program, the institution will make reasonable efforts to place the student in a related or comparable program within the institution. If none is available, the institution will make reasonable efforts to assist the student in locating to another program at the institution or elsewhere for which he or she is qualified.

(2)~~b.~~ Employees

~~Any f~~Faculty or staff members whose employment the institution seeks to terminate~~ed~~ due to the discontinuance of a program ~~as a result of a program discontinuance~~ based upon Section III.G. shall be entitled to the following procedures: ~~al rights outlined Board policy or rules.~~

~~If there has been a Board declaration of financial exigency, the employee shall be entitled to the procedures outlined in Board Policy Section II.N.~~

~~Otherwise, the following procedures shall apply:~~

(a~~1~~) Non-classified contract employees, including non-tenured faculty, may ~~be dismissed~~ have their contracts terminated or non-renewed in accordance with Board and institutional policies. ~~and the employee's contract of employment, if any. In the event the program discontinuance does not, in the institution's sole discretion, reasonably permit the institution to provide such notice, the institution shall provide the employee such notice in writing at least thirty (30) days prior to the effect date of termination.~~

(b~~2~~) State of Idaho classified employees shall be subject to layoff as provided in the rules of the Division of Human Resources. Classified employees of the University of Idaho shall be subject to layoff as provided in the policies of the University of Idaho.

(c~~3~~) Tenured faculty will be notified in writing that the institution intends to dismiss them as a result of program discontinuance. This notice shall be given at least twelve (12) months ~~one (1) semester~~ prior to the effective date of termination.

(d4) An employee ~~tenured faculty member~~ who receives a notice of termination as a result of program discontinuance is entitled to use the internal grievance procedures of the institution. The sole basis to contest a dismissal ~~of tenured faculty members~~ following a program closure is compliance with these policies~~ and Board-approved guidelines for academic program review, approval and discontinuance~~.

~~Reinstatement Rights.~~

~~Nonclassifided employees, nontenured faculty and tenured faculty are entitled to the same reinstatement rights as set forth in Board Policy Section II.N.~~

~~A Sstudents enrolled in a program scheduled for discontinuance under Section III.G. does not have the right to complete the program. shall, wWhen there is a similar program within the state, an affected student will be provided with information on transferring to that program, although admission to any such program is contingent upon the availability of a position and the student's meeting any applicable admission requirements. If there is no similar program available within the state or the student is not able to gain admission to a similar program, the institution will make reasonable efforts to place the student in a related or comparable program within the institution. If none is available, the institution will make reasonable efforts to assist the student in locating another program at the institution or elsewhere for which he or she is qualified. currently enrolled students shall be permitted to complete the program in accordance with existing graduation requirements.~~

Idaho State Board of Education
GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS
H. Program Review **April 2002**

H. Program Review

1. Coverage

   Academic and ~~applied~~ professional-technical programs, administrative units, research centers/institutes, and public service components at Boise State University, College of Southern Idaho, Eastern Idaho Technical College, Idaho State University, Lewis-Clark State College, North Idaho College, and University of Idaho are included in this subsection.

2. Program Review.

   Program review is the method by which the Board and the institutions evaluate proposed and existing postsecondary programs. The goals of program review are: (a) maintenance and enhancement of the quality of instruction, research, and public service efforts, (b) assurance of the postsecondary education system's responsiveness to changing societal and state needs, (c) promotion of effective and efficient management of the state's resources, and (d) assist the institutions in defining how effective their programs are.

   In the context of program review for and by the Board, a program is a curriculum or course of study in a discipline specialty that leads to a certificate or degree. It is often but not always the same as a "major." Administrative units of research and public service are those that are: (a) essential to student training, (b) an integral part of an academic/~~applied~~ professional-technical program, (c) related to institutional role and mission, or (d) serve the consumer/state interests.

3. Purposes.

   Categories of academic and ~~applied~~ professional-technical programs reviewed at the institutional and state levels as directed by the Board include:

   a. State-Level Review

      (1) New, expanded, and cooperative programs. (*See also* "Instructional Program Approval," Section III, Subsection G.)

      (2) Programs proposed for consolidation, relocation, or discontinuance.

      (3) Administrative units of research and public service.

(4) Existing programs by audit procedures and special topics reviews.

(5) Distance learning/technology program delivery.

The Board will establish procedures and criteria for each audit and special topics review, which are germane to each audit and special topics review.

b. Institutional Review.

The institutional reviews include all categories identified above for state-level review with the exception that the review of existing programs and administrative units of research and public service is carried out as part of the systematic evaluation of all programs within a period of time established by the Board.

4. Institutional Policies and Procedures.

Each institution will establish and maintain policies and procedures, following the guidelines of the Board and subject to Board approval, for evaluating existing programs and new program proposals, as well as programs proposed for (a) expansion, (b) delivery at an off-campus site by various distance learning methods or in cooperation with another institution, a business, or an industry; (c) consolidation, (d) relocation, or (e) discontinuance. The evaluation process should be an integral component of the institution's academic and vocational education planning and budgeting processes.

5. Statewide Policies and Procedures.

~~The Instruction, Research and Student Affairs Committee will establish and maintain guidelines which are consistent with Board policy for the review of new and existing programs as well as those programs scheduled for expansion; delivery at an off-campus site in-and-out-of-state, or in cooperation with another institution, a business, or an industry; consolidation; relocation; or discontinuance.~~ State-level review of new and existing programs will be integrated with the state-level academic and ~~applied~~ professional-technical planning and budgetary processes and where possible in concert with accreditation self-study and on site review by the accrediting body.

6. Official Vehicle for the Approval of Teacher Education Programs

The official vehicle for the approval of teacher education programs will be the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) approved Idaho

Standards for the Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel. The Teacher Certification Office will provide each institution with any revisions to the Idaho Standards for the Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel. Teacher education programs must ensure their pre-service teachers meet the components (knowledge, disposition, and performance) of the Core Teacher Education Standards and the standards of the level and/or content area(s) in which they plan to be endorsed. *(Effective Sept. 1, 2001)*

ACTION ITEM

SUBJECT

NEW PROGRAM PROPOSALS: NOTICES OF INTENT

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

In accordance with Board policy Section III.G.4., all new academic and professional-technical programs must have full Board approval prior to implementation or inclusion in the Board's fiscal year budget request. The CAAP committee, in using its guidelines on program review (i.e., quality centrality to role and mission, duplication, demand/need, and resources) has acted on the IRSA charge to evaluate new program requests. The program reviews have been completed and are now being forwarded to the Board for their approval.

IMPACT

If Board approved, the institutions requesting these new programs will implement these programs and will be subject to future monitoring for program compliance.

FISCAL IMPACT

See Attached

RECOMMENDATION

Both CAAP and Board staff recommend approval of these Notices of Intent as presented.

MOTION

A motion to approve Idaho State University's Bachelor of Science, Health Science program.

A motion to approve Idaho State University's request to charge a $500 per semester fee to the Master of Nursing program beginning fall semester 2002.

A motion to approve Idaho State University's Master of Science in Dental Hygiene program.

Moved by_____ Seconded by_____ Carried Yes_____ No_____

ATTACHMENTS

New Postsecondary Notices of Intent - Summaries

New Postsecondary Notices of Intent - Summaries

Idaho State University has submitted Notices of Intent in the medical sciences for approval. The CAAP and Board staff has reviewed these NOIs and recommend approval.

a. Bachelor of Science, Health Science –Idaho State University

Idaho State University proposes to create a Bachelor of Science in Health Science, which would provide an opportunity for Associate of Applied Science students to train in a para-professional health occupation to pursue higher levels of education in Health Sciences. This proposed B.S. degree would allow a student to transfer up to 50 Applied Science credits with a requirement of a total of 128 credits and would require 36 upper division credits and also require the same general education requirements as all other B.S. degrees at ISU. Students graduating with this B.S. degree would be able to gain employment within the health care field of their choice and assist in alleviating the shortage facing the state and nation. Currently, Boise State University has a Bachelor of Science in Health Science; however, the purpose of the proposed degree in Health Science is altogether different than that of BSU. The purpose of ISU's B.S. in Health Science is to provide a bridge between A.A.S. degrees and opportunities for the students to move into higher levels of education in Health Sciences. The B.S. degree is formatted to use the current faculty and program space currently existing. No additional monies are being requested.

b. Master of Nursing Program Professional Fee—Idaho State University

Idaho State University proposes to add a $500/semester program fee to the Master of Nursing program, beginning fall semester 2002. Historically, ISU moved vigorously to provide additional access to graduate nursing education statewide. That move was supported by federal grant dollars. ISU expanded both the number of seats available and locations from which they were delivering graduate nursing.

To again provide additional access, the nursing program moved from a cohort basis to annual admissions. While that provides additional opportunities for participants to join the program, it also increases significantly the cost of instruction as the curriculum is no longer delivered to a single group taking a single set of courses. ISU also began weekend and evening programming as part of the effort to expand access.

All of this doubled the required travel budget for the nursing faculty who feel that despite the use of distance learning technology, contact with students face to face was extraordinarily important as a quality control measure. It is also something supported strongly by the students. Additional expense now becomes visible as three new distance-learning classrooms will be required in serving Coeur d'Alene, Idaho Falls, and Boise.

The expense of all the above is computed to be some where between $204-$468 per student per course as these expenses are amortized over five years. Boise line

charges, for example, will be tailing down – the disappearing- of the grant money which supported ISU's initial outreach.

c. Master of Science in Dental Hygiene—Idaho State University

Idaho State University proposes to create a Master of Science in Dental Hygiene. The proposed program will be a statewide, academic-based graduate curriculum located in Boise, centered in Boise and Pocatello, and offered in part via ISU's statewide distance learning network.

Graduate level dental hygiene leading to a master's degree provides advanced education to further develop the scientific basis for dental hygiene practice; to prepare professional dental hygienists for leadership roles in academics, industry, and community health settings; and to promote acquisition of advanced skills in research, planning, evaluation, and oral and written communication. Presently, only eight (8) Master of Science degree programs are offered in dental hygiene. No MSDH program exists in the western United States. Thus, the master's degree is accepted as a terminal degree in the field.

Needs and Fiscal Impact:

Since no appropriated funds can be reallocated to support this program, especially in light of the recent budget cuts, the clinical equipment and resources, teaching materials, and research facilities used by the existing program would be used to support the graduate program. In the future, grant funds to support student and faculty research would be anticipated. Revenues would be generated by a $3,000 per year program fee charged to each student enrolled as well as patient fees from the summer clinical course. The total amount of new appropriated funds requested is $169,660 for FY03, $333,700 for FY04, and $303,700 for FY05.

- A full-time graduate program director will be needed to plan and implement the program.
- A second faculty member will be needed to teach graduate courses and supervise student research projects, along with program director. Both of these faculty members are expected to apply for Graduate Faculty status.
- A full-time classified clerical staff position is needed in Boise to support the program. In addition, four (4) existing dental hygiene faculty members will contribute 10-20% of their time to teaching graduate students and supervising research projects, etc., pending appointment to the Graduate Faculty.
- A half-time faculty position in Pocatello will be needed to provide these individuals with release time from undergraduate teaching assignments.
- Because the on-campus clinical facility operates only 10 months out of the year, it's not staffed during the summer months when the advanced clinical course would be offered for graduate students. One month's salary is requested for a clinical receptionist who would coordinate patient scheduling and appointments,

dental records, asepsis and sterilization, fee collection, and related responsibilities.

- Because the course is an advanced clinical course, an initial capital outlay expenditure is needed to purchase advanced clinical equipment needed for training and research, which also includes office furniture and equipment needed for the faculty and staff offices and graduate student study carrels.
- Space has been requested in Idaho Place, the new Boise building being designed by Idaho State University and the University of Idaho. Classrooms and conference rooms to be shared by all academic programs located in Idaho Place can be used in Boise, as well as all of those in the on-campus dental hygiene facilities in Pocatello. The Idaho Dental Residency Program also has agreed to share its clinical facilities in Boise as needed.

ACTION ITEM

SUBJECT

HERC RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Appointments

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

On May 6 2002, the Idaho EPSCoR Committee forwarded their nominations of six individuals to be re-appointed to the committee. The HERC took those nominations under consideration at their June 4, 2002 meeting and recommended to the Board approval of the nominations as listed below.

- Major General Darrell V Manning, Boise
- Dr. Carole McWilliam, Pocatello
- Senator Laird Noh, Kimberly
- Mr. Leo Ray, Buhl
- Dr. Frederick Templeton, Boise
- Dr. Parker G. Woodall, Coeur d'Alene

The Idaho EPSCoR Committee also forwarded the nomination of Mr. John Glerum, Coordinator, Governor's Science and Technology Advisory Council to HERC for their consideration. HERC recommends to the Board approval of Mr. Glerum's this appointment to the Committee. A brief biographical sketch follows:

Mr. John Glerum (M.B.A. and B.S., Finance), Director of the Technology and Entrepreneurial Center at Boise State University and the Coordinator for the Governor's Science and Technology Advisory Council in the Idaho Department of Commerce. Mr. Glerum is a knowledgeable business executive with progressive experience with various sized companies and has extensive hands-on and consulting experience with business start-ups, planning, development, cost improvement, quality management, and acquisitions activities.

FISCAL IMPACT

None at this time.

RECOMMENDATION

The HERC recommends to the Board approval of the nominations to the Idaho EPSCoR Committee as listed above.

MOTION

A motion to approve the nominations to the Idaho EPSCoR Committee.

Moved by_____ Seconded by_____ Carried Yes_____ No_____

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

ACTION ITEM

SUBJECT

HERC RECOMMENDATIONS

B. Budget

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

The Higher Education Research Council was allocated $1440,000 for FY03 through the colleges and universities appropriation. At their June 4, 2002 meeting, HERC voted to recommend the FY2003 allocation be disbursed as follows:

Allocation of HERC Funds FY2003

FY03 Allocation	Amount Allocated
$1,440,000	
Infrastructure Funds	
BSU	$ 125,000
ISU	$ 125,000
UI	$ 200,000
LCSC	$ 50,000
Total Infrastructure	**$ 500,000**
Specific Research Grant Program	
BSU	
ISU	
UI	
LCSC	
Total SRGP Grants	**$ -**
Matching Award Grants	
NSF - EPSCoR (UI)	$ 600,000
Total Matching Grants	**$ 600,000**
Research Centers	
ISU Accelerator Center	$ 338,902
Total Research Center	**$ 338,902**
Administrative Costs	
FY03 Administrative Costs	$ 1,098
Total Administrative Costs	$ 1,098
Total Budget / Allocation	**$ 1,440,000**
Under / (Over) Budget	**$ 0**

Notes and Options

FY03 base reduction taken from infrastructure category at established percentages (25, 25, 40, 10) and fully funded EPSCoR and Research Center at historical and requested level of funding.

RECOMMENDATION

The Board office forwards their recommendation to the Board to approve the budget allocations as recommended by HERC.

MOTION

A motion to approve the FY2003 Budget Allocations as outlined in the table above.

Moved by_____ Seconded by_____ Carried Yes_____ No_____

INFORMATION ITEM

SUBJECT

HERC RECOMMENDATIONS
C. EPSCoR COMMITTEE BATTELLE REPORT

BACKGROUND

On July 26, 2000, HERC contracted with Battelle Institute to review the Idaho Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) program. That review was to be an extension of the scope of work with the Governor's Statewide Science and Technology Advisory Council's strategic plan. Although the strategic plan was completed, the EPSCoR review was post-poned due to a lack of sufficient funds in the HERC FY01 budget. The review was conducted in the 2002 fiscal year November 2001 through January 2002.

The Battelle consultant, Dr. Marianne Clarke, delivered her report to the Board at its March 7, 2002 meeting. The Board referred the report to HERC for its review and recommendation. The EPSCoR committee representatives presented its response to HERC at its June 4, 2002 meeting. The HERC then accepted the response and recommends to the Board approval of the EPSCoR committees' responses and recommendations as exhibited on pages 45-49.

DISCUSSION

The Board of Education engaged Battelle's Technology Partnership Practice to survey existing EPSCoR Advisory Committee members to solicit their views on the appropriate role and responsibilities of the committee and to assess how well they feel the committee is functioning. In addition, Battelle was asked to benchmark Idaho's EPSCoR processes against those of three other states to identify options that Idaho could consider to improve the operation of the committee and to encourage greater collaboration of the state's higher education institutions and linkage to state technology development policy. This report describes the structure and operations of EPSCoR committees in various states and compares them to the Idaho EPSCoR committee.

The report is complete and has been distributed to the Board for their review.

FISCAL IMPACT

The final cost of Battelle report is $13,990 and will be paid from HERC's FY2002 budget.

ATTACHMENTS

A Response to Battelle Report from EPSCoR Chair (pages 45-49)
A Review of the Idaho EPSCoR Committee—Battelle Report (50-68)

STATE OF IDAHO EPSCoR COMMITTEE RESPONSE

To the Review of the Idaho EPSCoR Committee Prepared by the
Battelle Technology Partnership Practice, Dated March 2002

- *All EPSCoR Announcements Posted* on the Idaho EPSCoR website on a timely basis.

  This can and is being done.

- *Idaho Should Consider Lodging Responsibility for Identifying Research Opportunities, Disseminating Information, Organizing Research Teams and Providing Technical Assistance on Developing Research Proposals with an Organization that is Independent of the State's Universities.*

  EPSCoR research opportunity announcements in the format of Request for Proposals (RFPs) or Request for Applications (RFAs) and technical requirements are currently disseminated by the seven federal agencies through the Idaho State EPSCoR office by e-mail and in the future will also be distributed via the EPSCoR website. These agency opportunities are also disseminated via the Commerce Business Daily, in print and by e-mail, to which each university has access. Technical assistance individually available to each university on developing proposals will continue using external reviewers, e.g., the AAAS as sometimes arranged by the Idaho EPSCoR office and by individual universities. Important here are individual contacts by research faculty both with federal funding agencies and with potential private sector partners. Additionally, EPSCoR will work closely with the S&T Council in helping to match academic research with the needs of Idaho's industries.

  Except for the EPSCoR research opportunities, the Committee believes that the Governor's Science and Technology Council is the most logical entity to identify the current research and technical capabilities, assess the strength of these capabilities and forecast areas offering research opportunities as well as technical assistance available within the state for future development and expansion. The Science and Technology Council should routinely disseminate the information throughout the state. Neither HERC nor the State Board of Education is equipped or prepared to perform this function.

- *A Clear Process Should Be Developed for Soliciting Ideas for EPSCoR Projects.*

  The Committee recognizes the importance of having a stronger sense of participation, cooperation and understanding amongst research faculty members from Idaho's three universities in order to facilitate greater interaction and idea development within and between the faculties. To accomplish this the Committee will consider:
  - Hosting symposia for university research faculties in an effort to encourage the exchange of ideas and development of collaborative efforts prior to ever receiving RFP's or RFAs.
  - Encourage the use of website links of research faculties for better idea communication and interaction as well as cooperative possibilities.
  - Reinforce within research faculties the realization that they are in fact one of the best contacts and conduits with the business/industry communities to bring forth ideas and needs from the private sector, which may in turn be of great importance for inclusion in future EPSCoR proposals.
  - The current process used by Idaho EPSCoR to identify research focus areas first and then ask team leaders to prepare concept papers in response to RFP's and

RFAs has been successful as evidenced by the $117 million research dollars brought to Idaho in twelve short years from federal and private sources. Because NSF continues to view the Idaho EPSCoR Program as a model for other EPSCoR states and because the Clarke-suggested "open" process using letters of intent choose EPSCoR research topics has twice failed to win NSF funding for Idaho, the current proven and successful process should continue to be followed in response to future RFP's and RFAs.

- *While the Composition and Structure of the EPSCoR Committee is Representative of the State's Research and Industrial Community, Several Changes in the Board Could be Considered*:
    - The EPSCoR Committee has recommended to the State Board of Education that Mr. John Glerum, currently the Coordinator for the Governor's Science and Technology Advisory Council, be approved as a member of the Idaho State EPSCoR Committee.
    - The Committee believes strongly that we have one of the most diverse and strongest EPSCoR Committees in the national EPSCoR Program. The Idaho Committee consists of 18 members, including eleven representatives from the private sector, two legislators, three research officers, and two academic researchers. The Committee also believes that the availability of educated, competent and well-trained individuals throughout the state of Idaho is at a level at least equal to the "benchmark states of Alaska, Montana and Maine" and, as such, we have a broader population base from which to choose for future committee membership. Many of the Committee members have previous experiences outside the State of Idaho, already adding this out-of-state perspective to EPSCoR in Idaho. To add a Committee member or two from California or Washington would prove not only costly in terms of travel, but the educational process to keep outside representatives up to date as to Idaho's strategic direction in science and technology as well as research opportunities would provide very little benefit to the Idaho EPSCoR committee or the state program.

- *The Higher Education Research Council (HERC) should play a greater role in providing strategic direction for Idaho's EPSCoR Program.*

    As previously indicated, the Governor's Science and Technology Council is the most logical entity to help identify the current research and technical capabilities, assess the strength of these capabilities and forecast areas offering research opportunities as well technical assistance available within the state for future development expansion. The Science and Technology Council should routinely disseminate the information throughout the state. Neither HERC nor the state board of education is equipped or prepared to perform this function. The Committee does recommend that one or two additional active, practicing researchers be added to the Governor's Science and Technology Council.

- *The statewide EPSCoR should continue to serve as the oversight committee for all of Idaho's EPSCoR Programs.*

    The Idaho EPSCoR Committee does and will continue to serve as the oversight committee for all EPSCoR Programs, including both the NSF and the NIH programs, which are strong, grant benefactors to the state of Idaho. It should be noted that the NIH

IDeA Program does require the establishment of an IDeA Coordinating Committee and NIH states this can in fact be done by the same state EPSCoR Committee with the addition of bio-medical research expertise. This is the predominant model of all EPSCoR states. Idaho EPSCoR has added the required bio-medical research expertise to its committee through the participation of Dr. Dennis Stevens, MD, Ph.D., and is currently seeking a second qualified bio-medical expert with the help of Dr. Stevens.

In conclusion, The Idaho EPSCoR committee acknowledges the report's concluding remarks stating that Idaho's committee "is very similar to the committees of other EPSCoR states" and that "Idaho's existing processes have resulted in the submission of numerous successful projects." Indeed, under the committee's guidance, Idaho has benefited in winning more than $68 million in agency EPSCoR awards plus nearly $48 million in awards won by EPSCoR-targeted investigators. With that nearly $117 million in statewide research funding since 1989, 364 research faculty have been impacted and 846 undergraduate and graduate students have received research training (see attached data).

The Idaho EPSCoR committee acknowledges the goal of the NSF to increase the "R&D competitiveness of an eligible state through the development and utilization of the science and technology (S&T) resources residing in its major research universities, those institutions granting significant numbers of the state's Ph.D. degrees in science and engineering disciplines [i.e., University of Idaho]", while simultaneously improving and strengthening the participation of Idaho State University and Boise State University within the EPSCoR Programs. ISU's participation in NSF-Idaho EPSCoR has increased from $71,000 in 1989 to nearly $1.8 million budgeted in the project that began on February 1, 2002. BSU's budgeted funding has increased from $44,000 in 1989 to $1.7 million. Each university has also experienced a concomitant sharp rise in faculty and student participants. The committee will continue to work to strengthen this cooperation and participation amongst our universities.

The Idaho EPSCoR committee helped catalyze the appointment of the Governor's Science and Technology advisor and helped to develop the state's S&T strategy. Currently, three EPSCoR committee members and two past members serve on the Idaho Science and Technology Council. That link could be strengthened by appointment of the Idaho EPSCoR Project Director and the EPSCoR committee chair (currently serving) to that Council.

It is very important for the Governor's Science and Technology Council to work with the Idaho EPSCoR programs in identifying areas of possible commercialization resulting from ongoing research programs and help determine the best methods for implementing that research for the benefit of the state's economy.

Doyle W. Jacklin
Chair, State of Idaho EPSCoR Committee

EPSCoR in Idaho

Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research

112 Morrill Hall, University of Idaho, Moscow ID 83844-3018
Tel: 208-885-5742 Fax: 208-885-6198 epscor@uidaho.edu and http://www.uro.uidaho.edu/epscor/

The National Science Foundation provides the following EPSCoR program information in the EPSCoR program solicitation available on the foundation's web site at www.nsf.gov/pubs.

> *The National Science Foundation (NSF) provides awards for research in the sciences, mathematics and engineering. NSF EPSCoR awards increase the R&D competitiveness of an eligible state through the development and utilization of the science and technology (S&T) resources residing in major research universities.*

Idaho EPSCoR is led by a state committee composed of 18 members with diverse professional backgrounds from both the public and private sectors and from all regions of the state. The state committee reports to the State Board of Education via the Higher Education Research Council (HERC). The Idaho EPSCoR office and the State of Idaho EPSCoR Project Director are located at the University of Idaho. Idaho's EPSCoR partners are the University of Idaho, as lead institution and fiscal agent, and Boise State University and Idaho State University.

Idaho became an NSF EPSCOR state in 1985 and has won $27.4 million in competitive NSF research infrastructure strengthening awards since then. In 1991-92 the U.S. congress mandated that other federal agencies supporting academic research would form an EPSCoR program similar to that of NSF. Idaho has mostly been successful in competing for these other agency awards. EPSCoR awards to Idaho from all agencies total over $68 million.

Included in the research infrastructure strengthening accomplished by all federal agency EPSCoR awards is the strengthening of Idaho's human resources in science, engineering and technology among university faculty and students and selected high school students and their teachers.

Summary of Returns To Idaho from All Agency EPSCoR Programs

FEDERAL AGENCIES	EPSCoR AWARDS	HERC MATCH	RESEARCH TRAINING (including all projects and outreach)			
			FACULTY	GRADUATE STUDENTS	U/GRADUATE STUDENTS	HIGH SCHOOL
NSF	27,417,974	6,911,900	183	254	350	92 STUDENTS 31 TEACHERS
NIH	25,921,483	525,300	68	18	40	
DOE	1,339,188	20,000	3	21	2	
NASA	1,781,252		9	2	13	
DOD	7,858,570		40	67	17	
EPA	943,991		13	11	3	
USDA	3,259,924		47	47		
TOTALS	$68,522,382	$7,457,200	364	421	425	123

- Additional competitive funding won by NSF EPSCoR investigators 1989-2001: $47,918,445
- $15.57 in research dollars returned to Idaho for each HERC dollar invested in NSF EPSCoR.
- 364 faculty and 846 university students mentored and trained.
- 31 high school teachers and 92 high school students engaged in special science/engineering training.

NSF EPSCoR has also funded special infrastructure awards of special benefit to citizens across the state:

- The UI SBIR enhancement program to assist Idaho's small businesses and entrepreneurs.
- The BSU electronics laboratory to help explore technology opportunities of benefit to Idaho's industry.
- The UI fish research laboratory at Hagerman assisting Idaho's fish farming industry.
- The UI bioinformatics center to support biological research at UI, BSU, ISU, and the private sector.
- The UI-Native American outreach education program for high school students and teachers.
- The UI Science Educator in Residence providing special science education opportunities in elementary schools.

A Review of the Idaho EPSCoR Committee

PREPARED FOR:

IDAHO BOARD OF EDUCATION

Draft

PREPARED BY:

BATTELLE TECHNOLOGY PARTNERSHIP PRACTICE

JANUARY 2002

Introduction

Congress created the National Science Foundation (NSF) Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) in 1978 to "strengthen research and education in the sciences and engineering, including independent research by individuals, throughout the United States, and to avoid undue concentration of such research and education."1 The EPSCoR program was created to address concerns that federal R&D dollars were heavily concentrated in a small number of states. The program seeks to improve the research capacity in underrepresented states so that they can become more competitive while at the same time continuing to award research funding based on merit and technical excellence.

Mission of EPSCoR

"EPSCoR acts on the premise that universities and their science and engineering faculty and students are valuable resources that can potentially influence a state's development in the twenty-first century much the same way that agricultural, industrial, and natural resources did in the twentieth century
EPSCoR's goal, therefore, is to identify, develop, and utilize a state's academic science and technology resources in a way that will support wealth creation and a more productive and fulfilling way of life for its citizens.
To achieve this goal the NSF actively cooperates with state leaders in government, higher education, and business to establish productive long-term partnerships capable of effecting lasting improvements to the state's academic research infrastructure and increased national R&D competitiveness."

Source: EPSCoR Program Solicitation, NSF

Participation in EPSCoR is limited to those states that have historically received a small percentage of federal R&D funding. Twenty-one states and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico are currently eligible to receive EPSCoR funding. Idaho has participated in the NSF EPSCoR program since 1989. In FY 1991, Congress created EPSCoR type programs in seven other federal agencies: US Department of Agriculture (USDA), Department of Commerce (DoC), Department of Defense, (DoD), Department of Energy (DOE), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), National Institutes of Health (NIH) and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). Idaho received more than $601,000 in NIH Institutional Development Awards (IDeAs), NIH's program designed to broaden geographic distribution of NIH funding for health research, between FY 1993 and FY 1999. In FY 2000, the University of Idaho was awarded $9.2 million by NIH to establish a Center for Biomedical Research Excellence and in FY 2001 Idaho EPSCoR was awarded a $5.9 million Biomedical Research Infrastructure Network grant to help strengthen the research infrastructure at Idaho's three universities. Idaho has also participated in the DoD, DOE, EPA and USDA EPSCoR programs. .

The NSF EPSCoR program is structured as a partnership between individual states and NSF. NSF requires that a statewide EPSCoR committee comprised of leading scientists,

1 Section 3(2) of the National Science Foundation (NSF) Act of 1950, as amended.

university administrators, political leaders, and representatives of the private sector be appointed to oversee the program. The statewide committee is expected to:

- Identify policies and initiatives that will benefit the overall research infrastructure of the state;
- Ensure that proposals undergo a rigorous merit review process;
- Identify proposals for submission;
- Encourage and facilitate high levels of collaboration among the state's research institutions;
- Ensure that EPSCoR is responsive to state and regional needs; and
- Cultivate broad-based support for science and technology.

NIH's IDeA program requires that a statewide coordinating committee be established representing all eligible state institutions of higher education. The IDeA Coordinating Committee (ICC) is responsible for determining priorities for state proposal submissions as well as providing advice relating to the planning and preparation of proposals. States with NSF EPSCoR committees may choose to use them as the ICC provided that the committee includes representation from the biomedical community. Many states use their existing statewide EPSCoR committees to provide policy guidance and oversight for the EPSCoR programs of the other federal agencies.

In 2000, Idaho's Governor appointed a Governor's Council on Science and Technology and charged them with developing a strategy to grow Idaho's technology base and economy. The Council developed the following vision for Idaho:

> ***Idaho will have, and be recognized as having, a vibrant technology-based economy that provides employment opportunities and high wage jobs for Idaho citizens. Increased emphasis on the application and use of science and technology in Idaho will continue to spawn new companies and industries, while contributing to the global competitiveness of its traditional industry.***

The Council realized that this vision would not be achieved unless Idaho invests in creating research and development excellence. Idaho's research universities have a small, although rapidly growing, research base. In FY 2000, the University of Idaho received approximately $61 million in R&D funding2, Boise State University received about $3.5 million and Idaho State University received approximately $9 million for a total of $73.5 million.3 To put this in perspective, the University of Utah and Utah State University received approximately $300 million in R&D funding in FY 2000. However, between FY91 and FY98, R&D funding at Idaho's three universities increased by a healthy 57 percent.4

2 The University of Idaho reports that FY 2001 R&D awards totaling $86.4 million; FY 2001 data are not yet available from the National Science Foundation.
3 National Science Foundation, Total R&D Expenditures at Universities and Colleges, FY 2000.
4 National Science Foundation. *Survey of Research and Development Expenditures at Universities and Colleges, FY 1998.*

The EPSCoR program has played an important role in building Idaho's research base and offers a continuing opportunity to strengthen the state's research infrastructure. Between FY 89 and FY 2001, Idaho received more than $49 million in EPSCoR funding and the Idaho EPSCoR office has been informed that the state will receive an additional $9 million from the NSF EPSCoR program for the 2002 – 2005 time period.

While investments in the state's university R&D capacity is critical, it is also important that these investments be targeted strategically. The EPSCoR program offers the opportunity to develop research capacity in areas that support the state's existing industrial base and emerging technology areas, while at the same time responding to the mission and requirements of the federal agencies. Recognizing this, the Board of Education decided that this is an appropriate time to review the structure and operation of Idaho's statewide EPSCoR Advisory Committee and to consider options for making the most effective use possible of Idaho's EPSCoR program.

The Board of Education engaged Battelle's Technology Partnership Practice to survey existing EPSCoR Advisory Committee members to solicit their views on the appropriate role and responsibilities of the committee and to assess how well they feel the committee is functioning. In addition, Battelle was asked to benchmark Idaho's EPSCoR processes against those of three other states to identify options that Idaho could consider to improve the operation of the committee and to encourage greater collaboration of the state's research institutions and linkage to state technology development policy.

This draft report describes the structure and operations of EPSCoR committees in the states of Alaska, Maine, and Montana and compares them to the Idaho EPSCoR Committee. Next, it presents the results of a phone survey of Idaho's EPSCoR Committee members. Third, it presents options for changes in Idaho's EPSCoR program for the consideration of the Idaho Board of Education.

Review of Benchmark States' Programs

Three states, Alaska, Maine and Montana, were selected for examination. These states were chosen because federal program managers and others familiar with the EPSCoR program, as having highly effective statewide committees and processes, view each. In addition, each has some unique approaches that may be of interest to Idaho. The following section describes the composition of each state's EPSCoR committee, the role the committee plays in developing and selecting EPSCoR projects, and the relationship of the EPSCoR program to overall state technology policy and programs.

ALASKA

Alaska's EPSCoR program is in a very early stage. Alaska received its first NSF EPSCoR funding in FY 2000. The EPSCoR committee that was assembled to pursue participation in EPSCoR played an instrumental role in the state being successful in receiving an EPSCoR award. In September 2001, NIH awarded $6 million to the University of Alaska to build Alaska's capacity in biomedical research through the Biomedical Research Infrastructure Network (BRIN), a component of NIH's IDeA program.

Composition and Structure of EPSCoR Committee

The EPSCoR committee is composed of members appointed by the President of the University of Alaska system and must include:

- Representatives of the four-year colleges and graduate universities with experience in the University's research role and mission;
- A representative of the Governor's office;
- One or more members of the Alaska Legislature;
- Representatives of the private sector with experience in innovation and entrepreneurial activities, applied research and development, management and finance, or community economic development; and
- The EPSCoR project director serves as an ex officio member.

The current EPSCoR committee includes 16 members and is chaired by the Chief of Staff to the President of the University of Alaska system. Other members include two state legislators, the Chair of the Senate Finance Committee and the House Whip, a Republican and a Democrat, and the Governor's Deputy Chief of Staff. The state EPSCoR project director indicated that these political leaders "helped tremendously" in building initial state support for and interest in the program." The committee also includes two business members and a foundation official who represents Native American interests. On the academic side, the committee includes the Director of Artic

Research, an Associate Professor of Marine Science, and the Director of the Institute of Artic Biology, all at the University of Alaska-Fairbanks; the Director of Biomedical Programs, University of Alaska-Anchorage; and the Vice-Chancellor, University of Alaska -Southeast.

The Executive Director of the Alaska Science and Technology Foundation (ASTF) is a member of the committee. ASTF is a state agency created in 1988 that invests funds to improve Alaska's economy and to increase the state's science and engineering capabilities.

A somewhat unique aspect of Alaska's committee is that the committee membership includes two individuals from outside the state. The Vice-President of Research at the University of Oklahoma and a retired Vice President of Research from the University of Montana are members of the Alaska EPSCoR committee. These out-of-state members bring with them expertise and an objectivity that may be more difficult for people involved with individual Alaska research institutions to achieve. The project director indicated that the input from these outside experts has been very valuable.

Function of the EPSCoR Committee

The purpose of the Alaska EPSCoR committee as stated in the Committee's by-laws are to: 1) assist Alaska in focusing and enhancing its capacity for research and development through a partnership of Alaska's colleges and universities, industry, and state government, and 2) to promote research in the universities and economic development of the state of Alaska. To accomplish this, the committee is charged with

- Developing a state strategic plan for advancing scientific and engineering research and training at the colleges and universities, determining research priorities for emphasis, and implementing strategies for investment of resources to enhance research capacity;
- Cooperating with various state agencies in promoting research and development;
- Promoting private sector involvement in university research and expediting technology transfer; and
- Coordinating applications for EPSCoR program funding from federal agencies.5

The Alaska EPSCoR committee created a number of subcommittees. These include a Research Subcommittee that approves proposed research topics, an Outreach Subcommittee that is seeking to address K-12 education issues, a Technology Transfer Subcommittee and a Policy and Administration Subcommittee, which serves as a type of Executive Committee.

While the initial focus of Alaska's EPSCoR committee was on planning for and securing EPSCoR funding, the focus is now shifting to look at future development and maintenance of the effort. It is likely that some changes in membership will be made as a result.

5 Draft Bylaws for Alaska EPSCoR, http://www.alaska.edu/epscor/bylaws.html.

Proposal Development and Review Processes

This is the process that was used to develop Alaska's NSF EPSCoR proposal. As a first step, the EPSCoR program office solicited research topic nominations and concept papers from faculty at all of the state's research institutions. The concept papers submitted were evaluated by the EPSCoR Grants subcommittee, which is comprised of the EPSCoR vice Chair and four university representatives. The Grants subcommittee reviews and ranks the concept papers and identifies 4 – 8 as potential research focus areas. Proposers are then asked to prepare proposals for the selected research areas. Each proposal is then sent out for an external peer review. Any proposal that is judged to be congruent with the priorities of ASTF is also sent to the Foundation for review. The Grants subcommittee examines the proposals and reviews and selects 3 – 4 to recommend to the full committee for submission.

A similar process is followed to develop proposals to be submitted to other federal agencies. Generally all faculty are invited to submit proposals. If the number submitted exceeds the maximum allowed per state, the EPSCoR committee chooses the proposals to submit.

Relationship of EPSCoR Committee to Overall State S&T Policy

The Alaska EPSCoR program has only been operating for a year and a half so it is probably too soon to determine what role EPSCoR will play in supporting the development and implementation of state science and technology policies and programs. The inclusion of the Director of ASTF on the EPSCoR committee is one mechanism being used to encourage coordination of the state's activities aimed at supporting the growth of technology-based companies with EPSCoR's efforts to build the state's R&D capacity. Clearly the by-laws of the committee call for EPSCoR to cooperate with various state agencies and to promote economic development of the state of Alaska.

MAINE

Maine, one of five original states, has participated in EPSCoR since 1980. The Maine EPSCoR program is housed in the Maine Science and Technology Foundation (MSTF). MSTF is a state-chartered non-profit organization that stimulates economic growth in Maine through the application of science and technology in education, research, and business. In 2001, the State of Maine created the position of State EPSCoR Director. Funding for this position, which is housed in MSTF, is shared on a 50:50 basis between MSTF and the University of Maine System. The State EPSCoR Director reports to the Chair of the Research Capacity Committee (RCC), which is Maine's Statewide EPSCoR Advisory Committee. This position is separate from the state's NSF EPSCoR program director who is located at the University of Maine.

Composition and Structure of EPSCoR Committee

The RCC is responsible for overseeing all of Maine's EPSCoR programs. The committee currently has 18 members representing academia, not-for-profit research institutions (of

which Maine has quite a few), industry, and government. The government representatives include a senator and representative from the legislature and the President of MSTF. The committee includes five private sector representatives, one of whom serves as the chair. The committee seeks to have fairly even representation from the academic, not-for-profit and industrial communities. Although the members represent the various elements of Maine's R&D enterprise, they are asked to serve on the committee with a view beyond their own institutional biases.

The existing committee membership can propose new members, who must be selected by the RCC Executive Committee, which includes the University of Maine System, the MSTF, and the chair of the RCC.

Function of the EPSCoR Committee

The RCC seeks to provide a mechanism for coordination across the State's research institutions and a forum to discuss state priorities and needs. In addition to serving as the statewide committee for EPSCoR and IDeA, RCC oversees the approval and allocation of state matching funds for federal programs and recommends awards under specific state programs as needed. The RCC also serves as an advocate for R&D in the state.

RCC's Charter identifies the following RCC responsibilities:

- Providing oversight to the EPSCoR/IDeA programs in the context of the shared vision of the University of Maine System, the Maine Science and Technology Foundation and the Chair of RCC;
- Conducting the preselection process in federal research competitions, where each participating state is limited in the number of proposals that may be submitted;
- Ensuring that the institutional proposals submitted for EPSCoR and IDeA are consistent with the state's overall S&T plan, other state policy documents, and meet the requirements of the federal funding agencies;
- Distributing EPSCoR/IDeA information across the state; and
- Participating in EPSCoR IDeA activities as necessary; e.g. coordinating the state's participation in federal agency events.

In addition, the RCC is responsible for reviewing and recommending proposals for state matching funds. Because the RCC has this responsibility, the committee monitors the use of matching funds on an ongoing basis. The RCC requires organizations that receive state funds to submit an Annual Report. The committee is currently preparing guidelines for how matching funds should be awarded.

Proposal Development and Review Processes

One role of the State EPSCoR Director is to make Maine's research institutions aware of federal R&D grant opportunities. In those cases where the state can submit only one or a limited number of applications for an EPSCoR type program, the State EPSCoR Director is responsible for holding an in-state competition to select the proposal(s) to submit. Proposals are solicited from Maine researchers. These proposals are then subject to an

initial technical review by outside peer reviewers. A panel, composed of AAAS members, is assembled to review the best technical proposals. The review panel and the RCC meet to discuss the proposals. The RCC's primary role is to represent the needs and interests of the state. The RCC then selects the proposals to submit.

Relationship of EPSCoR Committee to Overall State S&T Policy

MSTF is the state agency charged with developing and overseeing Maine's science and technology policies and programs. MSTF is responsible for developing a Maine Science and Technology Action Plan. The state's first 5-year plan was prepared in 1992 followed by a second in 1997. A third state S&T action plan was released in 2001. It recommends actions designed to "create the conditions in which vibrant research and technology sectors will generate economic opportunity for the citizens of Maine."6

One of the goals of the Maine 2001 Action Plan is to create a robust R&D enterprise. The plan specifically calls for creating a Maine EPSCoR Program to provide matching funds for high quality EPSCoR proposals. The placement of Maine's EPSCoR program at MSTF and the creation of the position of Statewide EPSCoR Director, are aimed at ensuring that Maine's EPSCoR program is an integral component of the state's overall S&T strategy.

MONTANA

Montana, like Maine, is also one of the five original EPSCoR states that joined the program in 1980. In addition to NSF EPSCoR, Montana participates in the EPSCoR programs of USDA, DoD, EPA, NASA, and NIH. Project Directors for agency programs report to the State EPSCoR Committee.

Composition and Structure of EPSCoR Committee

The Montana EPSCoR Committee, like those in Alaska and Maine, include a mixture of academic, government and industry representatives. The Committee includes two state government officials, one from the Department of Commerce and one from the Board of Regents. The Vice-Presidents of Research from Montana State University and the University of Montana both sit on the Committee. Montana's program is focused in three research areas and the committee includes prominent researchers with experience in each of the focus areas. The Committee, like Alaska's, includes two individuals from outside the state.

Function of the EPSCoR Committee

The committee has two primary roles. The first is a monitoring role. The committee is responsible for making sure that the EPSCoR program directors are implementing the grant in good faith. Second, the committee plays an important role in helping to consider new IDeAs and areas of emphasis for the EPSCoR program. The EPSCoR project

6 *Maine Science and Technology Action Plan 2001: Positioning Maine for the New Economy*, MSTF.

directors often develop new IDeAs, which they bring to the committee to see whether the committee thinks they should be pursued.

The full committee meets once or twice a year; the Executive Committee, which includes the Vice-Presidents of Research for the University of Montana and Montana State University and the EPSCoR project directors, meets monthly.

Proposal Development and Review Processes

While the committee reviews EPSCoR proposals before their submission, responsibility for generating the proposal resides primarily with the Director and Co-director of the EPSCoR program. Montana places great emphasis on generating IDeAs for EPSCoR projects. Proposals developed are submitted to outside reviewers.

Relationship of EPSCoR Committee to Overall State S&T Policy

Montana's EPSCoR program is closely tied to the state's Research and Technology Commercialization Fund, which is the primary state S&T initiative. Through this fund, the state invests in projects expected to lead to marketable products or processes. The Fund provides matching funds for Montana's EPSCoR projects.

The Montana Board of Research and Commercialization oversees the Research and Technology Commercialization Fund. While the Fund is not reserved for EPSCoR projects, preference is given to projects in which at least 25 percent of total project costs come from non-state funds. The Board was authorized to provide $4.85 million in grants or loans in FY 2000.

The EPSCoR Committee and the Board of Research and Commercialization do not have overlapping membership but the two groups have a strong working relationship.

Review of Idaho's EPSCoR Program

As would be expected there are many similarities between Idaho and the benchmark states in terms of the structure and operation of their respective statewide EPSCoR committees. But there are also some differences that may suggest options for improving the operation of Idaho's EPSCoR committee and better integrating it into the state's overall science and technology activities. Table 1 compares Idaho's EPSCoR program to those of Alaska, Maine and Montana on selected variables.

COMPOSITION AND STRUCTURE OF EPSCOR COMMITTEE

Idaho's EPSCoR committee includes 18 members from diverse areas of the state. The committee includes 11 private sector business representatives, the research officers from Boise State University and Idaho State University, two state legislators, two academic researchers, one of whom is from the University of Idaho and serves as the EPSCoR Project Director, and a former administrator in Idaho's K-12 system.

Idaho's committee has relatively more industry representation than the committees of the benchmark states. This may reflect the fact that Idaho's technology economy is better developed than that of the benchmark states. Each of the committees includes legislative and state government representation, as does Idaho's committee. Idaho does not include any members from out of state, as is the case in Alaska and Montana.

One difference in Idaho's committee composition as compared to the benchmark states is that in Maine and Montana the EPSCoR project director is not a member of the EPSCoR committee. In Alaska, the director serves as an ex-officio member of the EPSCoR

Members of the Idaho EPSCoR Committee

- Doyle Jacklin, Chair, Managing Partner Riverbend Commerce Park, Post Falls
- Senator Laird Noh, Vice-Chair
- Representative Maxine Bell
- R. James Coleman, President, J-U-B Engineers, Coeur d'Alene
- Blake Grant, Principal, Grant and Associates (bioconsulting firm), Hagerman
- Edwin House, Chief Research Officer, Idaho State University
- Jim Kempton, Delegate to Northwest Power Planning Council
- Major General (Ret.) Darrell Manning, Member, State Board of Education
- Carole Baldwin McWilliam, Retired Director of Secondary Education for Pocatello School District Number 25
- John Owens, Vice President, Boise State University
- Leo Ray, President, Fish Breeders of Idaho, Inc.
- Debonny Shoaf, Manager of Research Initiatives, INEEL
- Jean'ne Shreeve, State of Idaho EPSCoR Project Director
- Ray Smelek, President and CEO, Extended Systems, Inc.
- Dennis Stevens, Chief of Infectious Disease Unit, VA Hospital
- Jon Stoner, VP of Standard Products, AMI Semiconductors
- Frederick Templeton, President Insightek of Pocatello
- Parker Woodall. Educator and Businessman from Coeur d'Alene.

committee. In this case, however, the benchmark states may differ from the norm as the national NSF EPSCoR Office Director reports that in nearly all of the states, the EPSCoR project director is a member of the Statewide Advisory Committee.

Idaho's EPSCoR Committee has an Executive Committee that is comprised of the Chair, Vice-Chair, the research officers from BSU and ISU, and the EPSCoR project director. Most committees have an Executive Committee that usually includes representatives of the higher education institutions and the committee chair.

Both Idaho and each of the benchmark states have a single committee that oversees participation in all federal EPSCoR type programs. Having individuals responsible for individual federal agencies that report to the EPSCoR Director and Committee appears to be a common approach.

Table 1: Comparison of Idaho EPSCoR Program Practices with EPSCoR Programs in Alaska, Maine, and Montana

	Alaska	Idaho	Maine	Montana
Entity responsible for making appointments to the EPSCoR Committee	President, University of Alaska	Idaho State Board of Education via the Higher Education Research Council (HERC)	Executive Committee that includes representatives of University of Maine and MSTF and the Committee Chair,	
Committee membership includes: • Staff from the state ED or S&T agency • Out of state members	 Yes Yes	 No No	 Yes No	 Yes Yes
Responsible for EPSCoR program management	University of Alaska - Fairbanks	University of Idaho	Maine Science and Technology Foundation (MSTF)	Montana State University
Single committee oversees all federal EPSCoR programs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Entity responsible for overseeing use of state matching funds	EPSCoR committee	HERC and Board of Education	Research Capacity Committee7	Board of Research and Commercialization

7 This committee is Maine's statewide EPSCoR committee.

FUNCTIONS OF THE EPSCOR COMMITTEE

Idaho's EPSCoR committee is responsible for "developing policies, criteria and procedures necessary to ensure that Idaho meets project goals and objectives."8 The long-term goals of the committee are to make Idaho competitive in obtaining federal R&D funding. The primary role of Idaho's EPSCoR committee and those of the benchmark states is to provide research opportunities for the state's universities, and to make sure that the highest quality proposals are submitted for funding.

Idaho EPSCoR committee members indicated that the committee members seek to bring awareness of what is going on in the larger research community to the process and work to facilitate partnerships between and among Idaho's research institutions. Committee members also play a role in reviewing project opportunities and helping to solidify ideas.

The committee in Idaho and in each of the benchmark states primary role is to develop and implement the highest quality research program possible and to work towards developing a strong and vibrant research infrastructure. In addition, the EPSCoR committees play a role in developing and supporting state science and technology policies and serving as an advocate for state support for research and development. Members of Idaho's committee actively advocate for support of research and development in Idaho and four members of the EPSCoR Committee, including the chair, plus one past member, also serve on the Governor's Science and Technology Council, which is responsible for developing and implementing science and technology programs in Idaho.

PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW PROCESSES

A great deal of similarity was noted in the process used to develop and evaluate proposals for submission to the EPSCoR program. The three benchmark states each use outside evaluators and the EPSCoR committee in the review process. One way in which the processes appear to differ, however, is in how open the process is in terms of identifying initial research focus areas. In both Alaska and Maine, a solicitation is widely disseminated requesting IDeAs for projects. Faculty and researchers are encouraged to submit initial concept papers. In the case of Montana and Idaho, the research institutions and the EPSCoR project directors guide the identification of potential research areas.

The following process was used to develop Idaho's most recent, and successful, NSF EPSCoR proposal. The first step involved a meeting of EPSCoR committee representatives from BSU, ISU, and UI. Key principal investigators were also invited to attend this meeting. This ad hoc committee focused on NSF priority areas which include: nanostructures, information technology, biodiversity, and workforce for the 21st Century. A scientist or engineer was identified to develop a concept paper proposing a research focus area for Idaho within each of these major areas. These initial concept papers were presented to the EPSCoR committee.

8 Excerpted from recent Idaho NSF EPSCOR proposal.

Once the committee agreed that these topics should be pursued, team leaders were selected for each topic. Each team included representatives of Idaho's three universities. A researcher from UI led a team that focused on nanophotonics, a researcher from BSU focused on IT, specifically the area of mixed signal electronics (although this team subsequently withdrew from the proposal), and a UI researcher led the biodiversity team that focused on the interface of bacteria and subsurface materials. Another team focused on novel ideas in workforce development.

The teams prepared 5 page concept papers, which were sent out for external review. They were also reviewed by NSF program directors and by staff in the NSF Director's office. Based on the input received from the reviewers, the concepts were refined and the team leaders prepared concept proposals that defined essential goals and tasks to be undertaken. These proposals were then sent out for another round of external reviews.

Next the proposal was sent to the EPSCoR committee members for review. In some cases, the members saw copies of the external reviews but not in all cases. A meeting of the Committee was held by conference call and each member had the opportunity to comment on the proposal. The proposal was modified and approved by the committee and submitted to NSF.

RELATIONSHIP OF EPSCOR COMMITTEE TO OVERALL STATE S&T POLICY

Among the benchmark states, Maine views the EPSCoR program and the EPSCoR committee as an integral part of the state's science and technology policy infrastructure. Indeed the placement of the EPSCoR program in the MSTF and the creation of the position of Statewide EPSCoR Director demonstrate that Maine sees the EPSCoR program as a key part of the state's efforts to build it science and technology base.

The State of Idaho began implementing a science and technology strategic plan within the last year. The strategy proposes that the State undertake a research excellence initiative that would provide funding for faculty recruitment and infrastructure to develop research excellence in areas identified as key to Idaho's future economic growth. The Governor's S&T Advisory Council proposed that an Idaho Science and Technology Corporation be established and given responsibility for working with Idaho's universities, INEEL, and the technology business community to identify the technology areas to be targeted under this initiative.

If this new organization is created, it will be essential to integrate and coordinate the activities of this entity, or any existing organization designated to implement the science and technology strategy, with the EPSCoR program and committee. Efforts to encourage such coordination and implementation have already begun as four members of the EPSCoR Advisory Committee also serve on the Governor's Science and Technology Advisory Council.

PERSPECTIVES OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Battelle conducted short telephone interviews with 16 of the 18 members of the EPSCoR Statewide Committee. The committee members were asked a number of open-ended questions regarding their participation on the committee and their views regarding how well the committee is fulfilling its function. An attempt has been made to indicate the number of committee members that raised a particular issue or expressed a particular viewpoint. Please note, however, that every member was not specifically questioned about each issue and in some cases, newer members indicated that they did not have sufficient experience with the committee to express an opinion. The purpose of the survey was to identify issues of concern to any of the committee members and to solicit input on actions that could be taken to further strengthen the committee and Idaho's EPSCoR program. Appendix A contains a copy of the interview guide that was used. The following section summarizes the findings from the interviews.

The committee members view the primary roles of the committee to be 1) to improve the quality of research in Idaho; 2) to provide research opportunities for Idaho's universities; and 3) to review and approve proposals. Additional roles for the committee include: making sure funds are adequately distributed and bringing a statewide perspective to the proposal selection process. Four members indicated that they thought the role of the committee was somewhat unclear. One member suggested that a charter or by-laws be developed that would explicitly state the role and responsibilities of the committee.

By and large, the committee members feel that the EPSCoR Committee is effectively fulfilling its role of ensuring that Idaho submits the most qualified proposals for funding. Nine committee members indicated that they are afforded sufficient opportunity for input and that they are confident that Idaho is submitting proposals with the greatest chance of being funded. Four committee members indicated that the time to review proposals was limited and that meetings were sometimes held on short notice making it difficult for some members to participate.

The use of outside peer reviewers is seen as an essential and effective element of Idaho's program. The committee members indicated that the evaluations prepared by outside peer reviewers are critical because they ensure that experts in the appropriate technical areas review the proposals and they provide an objective means of comparing and selecting proposals among competing institutions.

The committee members also generally agreed that more needs to be done to facilitate collaboration among Idaho's universities and to bolster the research capabilities of ISU and BSU. Eleven committee members acknowledged that UI has played a dominant role in the EPSCoR program both in terms of project design and implementation. Six committee members indicated that this is a result of UI's stronger research base and believe that the highest quality proposals have been chosen. Four members, however, indicated that UI has exercised significant control over the selection of research focus areas and the proposal development process, which has benefited UI at the expense of ISU and BSU. These members suggested that the proposal process be opened up to the widest number of researchers and faculty and that mechanisms be put in place to provide

all of the universities with early notification of research opportunities. There was consensus among all the members, however, that increasing the competitiveness of ISU and BSU should be an important goal of the program.

The committee members indicated that the committee has not been greatly involved in providing input on research focus areas and generally providing strategic direction for Idaho's EPSCoR effort. Five committee members suggested that the committee should be more involved in an ongoing basis in the identification of research focus areas for the EPSCoR program. These members feel that Idaho is lacking an overall strategic framework that would identify research areas targeted for development in Idaho and what role each of Idaho's research institutions can play in developing capabilities to support these areas.

The composition of the committee is viewed as balanced both regionally and in terms of areas of expertise. In particular, the presence of private sector representatives is viewed as an asset as these members bring knowledge of what is occurring in the larger research community and are not tied to any single institution of higher education. One committee member suggested that the committee might wish to add another individual or two with expertise in the biomedical field since the committee has responsibility for developing proposals for NIH's IDeA program.

In summary, while the majority of the committee members feel that the committee is functioning well, they also felt that the committee could do more, particularly in terms of facilitating collaboration between UI, ISU and BSU and by providing input on the overall strategic framework for the program. The following section suggests changes that could be made in the operation and structure of the committee to accomplish this.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Whether accurate or not, there is a perception among a number of committee members that the EPSCoR program is dominated by UI and that ISU and BSU are given limited opportunities to participate. ***To address this issue, processes must be put in place to ensure that all three universities are made aware of research opportunities and given the opportunity to suggest areas of focus and develop teams to prepare concepts for the consideration of the committee***. It is proposed that:

- ***All EPSCoR announcements and solicitations be posted*** on the Idaho EPSCoR website on a timely basis. (See http://alepscor.ua.edu/funding.html for an example.)
- ***Idaho should consider lodging responsibility for identifying research opportunities, disseminating information on them, organizing research teams and providing technical assistance on developing research proposals with a person or organization that is independent of the state's universities***. This is the approach that the State of Maine has taken in creating the position of Statewide EPSCoR Director, which is separate from the NSF EPSCoR Project Director. It should be noted, however, that Maine's effort is in an early stage so it is too soon to determine its effectiveness. The most appropriate place to lodge

this responsibility might be in the Idaho Science and Technology Corporation that was proposed by the Governor's Council on Science and Technology, assuming that this entity is established. There are four five states in which responsibility for EPSCoR is lodged with an entity other than a university, including Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, and Maine.

Until the new organization is established, it may be desirable to assign this function to staff of the State Board of Education.

A clear process should be developed for soliciting ideas for EPSCoR projects. Given concerns raised about the process used in developing Idaho's recent NSF proposal, the Board should direct the EPSCoR office to develop written procedures describing the process that will be used to develop future proposals. The process should be developed by a subcommittee of the Advisory Committee that would include, at a minimum, representatives of Idaho's' three universities. The following approach should be considered:

- ***When an opportunity arises, the EPSCoR office would issue a call for letters of intent.*** All researchers and faculty at Idaho's universities would be encouraged to form research teams and submit ideas for proposals. A subcommittee of the EPSCoR committee that would include at a minimum the representatives of the three universities would review the letters of intent. The subcommittee would review and rank the concept proposals and select those that have promise and address the state's priority research areas. (See recommendation below). The proposers would then be asked to develop proposals that would be sent out for external peer review.

  This process would differ from the way that Idaho's recent NSF EPSCoR project was developed in that in that case research focus areas were identified first and team leaders were asked to prepare concept papers. Under the proposed process, the research topics would be chosen based upon the response to the call for letters of intent. It should be noted that the proposed approach was employed in the development of earlier EPSCoR proposals in Idaho that were not successful in obtaining NSF funding. However, this approach is used successfully in other states. The identification of statewide technology focus areas, discussed below, and the dedication of staff resources to facilitate the development of teams as described above should improve the quality of the letters of intent. This process could also be used in cases in which the number of proposals that can be submitted are limited by the funding organization.

While the composition and structure of the EPSCoR committee is representative of the state's research and industrial community, several changes in the Board could be considered:

- One or two out-of-state members could be added to provide objectivity and to bring additional expertise and experience to the Committee;
- Once the Idaho Science and Technology Corporation is created, the Director should be appointed to the EPSCoR committee.

The Higher Education Research Council should play a greater role in providing strategic direction for Idaho's EPSCoR program. The primary role of the EPSCoR Committee, as perceived by the majority of the committee members is to review EPSCoR proposals and ensure that those of the highest quality are submitted for funding. This is an entirely appropriate role for the committee and one that it is required to fulfill.

The committee members acknowledge that the committee has not played a role in identifying state priorities or setting a strategic direction for Idaho's overall efforts to strengthen the state's research capabilities. Nor do the committee members feel that enough has been done to facilitate partnerships between and among the states' higher education institutions.

The strategy developed by the Governor's Science and Technology Council called for the establishment of a research excellence initiative that would be designed to help Idaho's universities develop research excellence in areas identified as key to Idaho's future economic growth. The strategy suggested that the proposed Idaho Science and Technology Corporation be given responsibility for working with Idaho's universities, INEEL, and the technology business community to identify the technology areas to be targeted under this initiative. It was proposed that Idaho conduct an analysis of the state's technology core competencies and identify technology focus areas that would build on the state's existing and emerging technology clusters. Potential focus areas identified by the Council included agricultural biotechnology, environmental sciences, computer programming and software development, and microelectronics.

Given that the Idaho Science and Technology Corporation has not been established, it may be appropriate for the Higher Education Research Council (HERC) to analyze Idaho's technology core competencies and identify key strategic areas in which Idaho wants to develop research excellence. HERC is well positioned to serve this role given that its membership includes the Governor's Science and Technology Advisor and the President's of Idaho's four-year colleges and universities, as well as private sector representatives. The development of such a statewide strategic framework would provide guidance to the EPSCoR committee by identifying research focus areas that could be pursued cooperatively by partnerships of Idaho's universities.

The Statewide EPSCoR Committee should continue to serve as the oversight committee for all of Idaho's EPSCoR programs. As discussed above**,** seven federal agencies now operate EPSCoR type programs in addition to the National Science Foundation, the largest of which, NIH's IDeA program, requires the establishment of an IDeA Coordinating Committee, which NIH stipulates may be the sate EPSCoR committee and which is the predominant governance model among the EPSCoR states. Presently, Idaho's Statewide EPSCoR Committee also serves to coordinate Idaho's participation in the EPSCoR programs of the other federal agencies. This is the approach taken by Alaska, Maine, and Montana and appears to be the preferred route for a majority of the participating EPSCoR states. All of the EPSCoR committee members interviewed felt comfortable in reviewing EPSCoR proposals for various federal agencies. The committee members feel that the use of outside peer reviewers is sufficient to ensure that people with particular areas of expertise review proposals. If additional participation of

people with backgrounds in specific areas such as biomedical research is desired, this could be accomplished by creating subcommittees within the full EPSCoR committee.

CONCLUSION

Idaho's Statewide EPSCoR Committee is very similar to the committees of other EPSCoR states in terms of structure and operation. Idaho's existing processes have resulted in the submission of successful projects. The committee members agree, however, that greater participation of and partnership with all three of Idaho's universities is desirable.

A challenge for Idaho, and for all the EPSCoR states is to fund research excellence while at the same time trying to improve research capabilities of all the state's research institutions and developing research strengths that tie to and support the state's economic base. The above recommendations suggest actions that the State Board of Education could take that might help to address this issue.