University of Idaho
2010-2011
FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #15

3:30 p.m.
Tuesday, February 1, 2011
BRINK HALL FACULTY LOUNGE

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2010-11 Faculty Senate Meeting #14, January 25, 2011

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.
   • Emergency Prevention and Response Training (Pitman/Spink)
   • 2011-12 Sabbaticals

VI. Committee Reports.
   UCC
   • FS-11-020: (UCC-11-11) Education: Professional Practices, Doctor of Education Degree (Gregson/Mantle-Bromley)

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Dan Eveleth, Chair 2010-2011, Faculty Senate

Attachments:
Minutes of Meeting #14
Sabbatical 2011-12
FS-11-020
Present: Baillargeon, Christiansen for Baker (w/o vote), Bathurst, Budwig (Boise), Duvall (Coeur d’Alene), Eveleth, Halloran, Hasko, Hill (w/o vote), Hopper, Hoversten, Krug (for Horn, w/o vote), Huber, A. Marshall, J. Marshall, Mosman, Padgham-Albrecht, Riesenberg, Stark, Strawn. Absent: Barlow, Dakins, Edwards, Fairley, Horn, Joyce, Limbaugh. Visitors/Guests: 1

A quorum being present, the Chair opened the meeting at 3:39 p.m.

Minutes: It was moved to accept the minutes of meeting #13 (J. Marshall/ Padgham-Albrecht)

Chair’s Report: The Chair noted that the Committee on Committees had reported a late surge in the number of volunteers for committee service. There were now 94 nominees, of whom 32 have not previously volunteered for committee service, suggesting that there was increased, and very welcome interest from young faculty.

Last week, faculty leadership had met with the Executive Director of Budget and Planning, Keith Ickes for a discussion about a proposed restructure of the University Budget and Finance Committee (UBFC). There had been a productive discussion and the ideas generated from the meeting have been passed on to the Committee on Committees for their review and recommendations. The committee would review the UBFC structure and function and forward their recommendation for Senate consideration.

A question had come forward from faculty about the ability to obtain institutional data on the numbers of students registered in courses. Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, Archie George was the source for this information and faculty are encouraged to connect with Dr. George to obtain such data and statistics.

Provost’s Report: Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Jeanne Christiansen noted that Provost Baker was in Boise to give testimony to the legislature this week. Student retention was an important issue that the Vice Provost’s office was working on. The third annual SOAR program had just been completed assisting students on academic probation. An ad hoc retention work-group had been formed and faculty who are interested are encouraged to join the group. A focus is on the sophomore experience; enhancing the student experience, and considering the enriching elements presented to sophomores including internships and study abroad. The group was also studying improved administrative processes to support faculty and staff in enhancing student retention, among other items.

Nominations for institutional faculty and staff awards were imminent. The deadline for teaching and advising awards were this Friday. Nominations for Distinguished Professor are due by February 21. It is Black History month at the university and a feature event will be a presentation by Jesse Jackson in the Kibbie Dome at 7:15 p.m. on February 7. Admission is free and open to all.

The Chair noted that he had a list of issues to circulate for a brainstorming discussion of issues to be addressed by Senate this semester. He also had a list of items that needed preliminary study and would be brought forward when more information was available. The preliminary items included issues around sabbatical leave, CTI services, where tenure resides, how Washington State University students taking UI courses are counted against teaching loads, and discussion of graduate education fees for graduate students on research assistantships.

On the distribution list for discussion today are the following:
The Core Curriculum is changing as the university does not have the resources to maintain the structure under the current model. The urgent need to address the core has put added stress on both UCGE and UCC to find a viable solution. Each has been diligently working on a solution with UCC passing a portion of the original UCGE proposal, with revisions, and it is now ready for Senate review. However, UCGE recently forwarded a newly revised version to UCC and the Senate Chair has held UCC’s proposal hoping that the newly revised UCGE proposal complements UCC's and that they both come forward together. It was hoped that these items would reach Senate for the meeting of February 15. Planned topics also included a presentation by Vice President for Research and Economic Development, Jack McIver in implementation of ‘Instituting Institutes’ and the status of issues around intellectual property on February 8. The policy revision mandated by the State Board of Education on the topic of furloughs was currently in General Counsel’s office and would be coming to Senate in the near future. A Senate tour of campus hosted by Associate Vice President for Facilities, Brian Johnson was planned for April. The Vice President for Finance and Administration, Lloyd Mues and the Benefits Advisory Group would be invited to present on a bi-annual basis. Although the university worked on a fiscal year, the benefits plan works on a calendar year. Thus, it would be beneficial for Senate to be provided with proposed changes and progress reports on benefits in both the spring and fall.

The Chair noted that the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) presently had many issues for discussion and review. These included adoption of language around civility that would be adopted into the FSH some of which was presently covered in APM 35.31. Other issues include changes to the category of Clinical Faculty, a discussion of changes to the tenure clock, and consistency of college by-laws across all colleges.

The chair provided an update on several additional issues:
- a trial of dependent education benefits was currently being conducted at Boise State University
- UCC formed a two member sub-committee to include among other issues the Senate discussion of last week on Directed Studies and Special Topics.

The chair asked if there was still interest in the following list and if so how should they be prioritized:
- grade inflation
- bottle-neck courses that cause delays in student progression to degree
- partner-orientated policy and
- calculation of faculty loads for large classes

Senators were asked to suggest any other topics for the discussion list. Suggestions included:
- an update on short-term hiring procedures and
- hosting of conferences and professional meetings at UI. The conference hosting issue was discussed, receiving broad input. The issue of concern was that the university charges for use of facilities, accommodation and services appeared to be excessive. The effect was an inhibition toward hosting professional meetings at UI. It was suggested that local hotels were less expensive than university dormitories. One senator recalled as a high school student wanting to attend a summer function at UI and to gain the most from the experience through a stay in the dormitories. However, the cost was a deterrent and hotel accommodation was in fact less expensive.

The Chair suggested that this issue should be referred to the Facilities Scheduling Policy Committee [FSH 1640.40 and APM 35.35, APM 40.10] for their recommendations to Senate.

Another suggested issue for discussion is the lack of support for our highly valued international faculty. There was insufficient help to cover issues such as language training (otherwise available to international students), legalities of status and assistance with visa and immigration issues and little social/cultural support. It was noted that there had been serious concerns over some visa issues that were time-sensitive and had caused
some international faculty significant distress and personal expense. It was suggested that new institutional collaborations and formal linkages, for example the new linkage in China, that it would be crucial for the university to enhance its support in this area.

The current status of the policy change to standardize “affiliate” and “adjunct” faculty was raised. The Secretary of the Faculty noted that indeed this policy had been approved by Senate last year. There had been much discussion about the major effort that would be needed to change many documents in policy and throughout the Banner system. It had been agreed to recommend the policy change, but to allow additional time for its implementation due to the major staff efforts required. The changes were still in process.

There was a broad discussion of bottle-necks in some freshman courses. Full details were not at hand. One example course, Biology 115, was required by courses in several colleges including the College of Natural Resources, the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and the College of Science. One senator pointed out that the burden to those who teach these courses has steadily increased yet with little support. It was noted that with the President’s objective of increasing the size of the student body over the next several years, that a broad discussion at all levels of the institution to consider support to avoid the bottle-neck phenomenon, was needed. It was also noted that providing teaching labs and additional facilities for such courses, needs to be included in this broad discussion.

The discussion turned to partner orientated benefits. The Chair suggested that a productive way to bring this issue forward would be to attempt to work across the institution and include discussion with broad constituencies: Staff Affairs, Human Resources and the Senate to reach a united voice. It was noted that there were some recent examples of such policy development obtained from other universities and discussion would be enhanced by this information.

Out of state graduate fees was an issue about which several senators had heard mention. The Chair responded that the issue would initially be discussed by faculty leadership with the Provost, and direction on the topic would ensue thereafter.

The notion of faculty training in response to a terrorist attack or shooting such as in Arizona or Virginia was discussed. Vice Provost Christiansen noted that there was a responders group with representatives from UI and the Moscow and Pullman communities. The group had identified structural procedures. It was suggested that UI’s Risk Management Officer, Nancy Spink, is a good resource person for information on this issue. The Chair agreed to invite Ms. Spink to present to Senate on this issue. The discussion expanded to consider people in need of help and counseling support. The Office of Student Affairs was vigilant on this issue and works to identify students who may need assistance. The Chair noted that Student Affairs was a useful resource on this topic and that the Vice Provost for Student Affairs would be invited to present to senate along with Ms. Spink.

Adjournment: It was moved (A. Marshall/Stark) to adjourn at 4:37 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Rodney A. Hill, Faculty Secretary and
Secretary to Faculty Senate
DATE: January 26, 2011

TO: Dan Eveleth and Paul Joyce
Faculty Senate

FROM: Doug Baker
Provost and Executive Vice President

SUBJECT: Items for Faculty Senate

The following members of the faculty have been recommended for sabbatical leave for 2011-2012:

David Atkinson  Electrical & Computer Engineering  2011-2012 Academic Year
Gary Austin  Landscape Architecture  2011-2012 Academic Year
Barbara Cosens  Law  Spring 2012 semester
David Egolf  Electrical & Computer Engineering  Spring 2012 semester
Robert Heckendorn  Computer Science  2011-2012 Academic Year
Thomas Hess  Biological & Agricultural Engineering  Spring 2012 semester
Karen Humes  Geography  Fall 2011 semester
Peter Isaacson  Geological Sciences  Fall 2011 semester
Timothy R. Johnson  Statistics  Fall 2011 semester
Anne Marshall  Architecture & Interior Design  2011-2012 Academic Year
Sandra Reineke  Political Science  Spring 2012 semester

This is a request for approval by Faculty Senate.

cc: Rod Hill
## Idaho State Board of Education

### Academic/Professional-Technical Education

#### Notice of Intent

- **Institution Submitting Proposal:** University of Idaho
- **Name of College, School, or Division:** College of Education
- **Name of Department(s) or Area(s):** Leadership & Counseling

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

For a New, Expanded, or Off-Campus Instructional Program, or Administrative/Research Unit (circle one), and list the title/name:

**Professional Practices Doctor of Education Degree**

College of Education, University of Idaho

Proposed Starting Date: Summer Semester, 2011

### For New Programs:

- **Program (i.e., degree) Title:** Professional Practices Doctor of Education Degree, College of Education, University of Idaho
- **CIP 2010 Code (consult Institutional Researcher/Registrar):** 130101

### For Existing Programs:

- **Education Major: Education Major**
- **Program (i.e., degree) Title:**
- **CIP 2010 Code:** 130101

### For Other Instructional Activity:

- Program Component (major/minor/option/emphasis)
- Off-Campus Program Activity
- Instructional/Research Unit
- Addition/Expansion
- Discontinuance/consolidation
- Contract Program/Collaborative
- Other

**Dean Approved 1/6/2011/mds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Dean (Institution)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>VP Research and/or Graduate Dean (as applicable)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chief Fiscal Officer (Institution)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>State Administrator, SDPTE (as applicable)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chief Academic Officer (Institution)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Chief Academic Officer, OSBE</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>SBOE/OSBE Approval</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Before completing this form, refer to Board Policy Section III.G., Program Approval and Discontinuance.

1. Briefly describe the nature of the request.

The University of Idaho College of Education requests approval for a Professional Practices Doctor of Education specialization, an expansion of its current education doctorate (Ed.D.) degree program. The program will be delivered as an off-campus, limited enrollment, cohort degree program, partnering with higher education institutions in need of advanced degree preparation of its faculty. Delivery will include a combination of face-to-face, online, and hybrid course delivery; the program will be administered out of the University of Idaho Boise Center, where we have sufficient faculty in educational leadership as well as adult and organizational learning. We do not seek a new degree but rather an expansion of our current degree, along with delivery of the program in locations where a minimum cohort of students desire and are accepted into the degree program.

Nationally, there is a growing trend that distinguishes the Doctor of Education (EdD) as the applied research degree for practitioners (Levine 2005, Waddle 2006, Gutherie 2009) and that establishes a professional practice or “executive” versions of the EdD (see Texas A&M, Seton Hall, Fordham, University of Pennsylvania, University of Kansas, Indiana University, University of Alabama, University of Houston, Vanderbilt) for audiences requiring a doctorate for career placement/advancement. An Idaho higher education example is the faculty at BYU Idaho. BYU Idaho has invited all state doctoral granting institutions to deliver the program; only the UI College of Education indicated initial interest and pursued this possibility with BYU Idaho. (see attached MOU)

Over the past three years, the University of Idaho College of Education has studied the trend and, in response, redefined its EdD program (2009) as a degree which “prepares students as professional leaders, educators, and practitioner-scholars who actualize the knowledge base in their respective fields.” Within Idaho and the region, the national EdD trend has captured the interest of higher education audiences, some of whom have turned to the University of Idaho, as the state’s land grant institution, for a relevant Professional Practices EdD with an emphasis in higher education leadership and teaching.

The Professional Practices Doctor of Education degree course-of-study proposal responds to the demand with a focus on applied research in educational leadership. The course of study for the Professional Practices specialization will exceed the University of Idaho minimum of 78 credits with a requirement of 84 credits in content, cognate, research, and dissertation. The Professional Practices EdD differs only slightly from the traditional EdD through a unique combination of inter-disciplinary courses, sequence of applied research courses, and practitioner based dissertation study and product. The latter being a focused, problem-solving research experience that benefits the student, stakeholders, and academe. The course-of-study would be delivered over three years.

Therefore, the University of Idaho College of Education proposes expanding its Doctor of Education degree to include a cohort-based Professional Practices degree, deliverable to off-campus locations/partnerships through negotiated Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) between the University of Idaho and the partnering institution(s). An MOU example would be an off-campus partnership for the Professional Practices Doctor of Education cohort with BYU Idaho in Rexburg.

The MOU for the Professional Practices Doctor of Education would require a minimum cohort of 21 students paying fees that cover all program delivery expenses.
2. Provide a statement of need for a new program or a program modification. Include (but do not limit to) the following:

a) A projection of full-time and part-time enrollment over a three year period of time

   The proposed Professional Practices EdD projects a cohort of 21 part-time students per semester over a three year period, culminating in matriculation at the end of the sixth semester. The projection is based on a series of meetings with BYU Idaho administration and faculty which produced over 100 attendees who completed “Confirmation of Interest” surveys. The proposed procedure for selecting a cohort includes applications, financial statements, interviews, and final selection by a UI admissions committee.

b) A projection of state work force needs such as job titles requiring this degree. Also include Department of Labor research on employment potential.

   Because the proposed Professional Practices EdD degree responds to a specific audience and is structured via an MOU, the work force need is based on work force requirements of the partnering institution, in this case, BYU Idaho. According to BYU Idaho, the Rexburg campus needs at least 25 faculty holding EdDs by 2013. We will contribute to their stated need by at least having a cohort of students in process to completing their terminal degrees.

   Because the partnering institution, BYU, guarantees continued employment, the proposal is similar to an entrepreneurial contract. Therefore, Department of Labor statistics are not relevant to this proposal. The work force need exists within the partnering institution and the partnering institution will continue to employ doctoral students enrolled in the program and will, in fact, subsidize part of the University of Idaho’s required cost to complete the degree.

c) A description of how the proposed change will act to stimulate the state economy by advancing the field, providing research results, etc.

   The proposal will stimulate the state’s southeastern economy by advancing the professional status of its largest institution of higher education, BYU Idaho. It will provide research results which will contribute to the growing national trend of offering Professional Practice EdDs, referenced above in Part 1, and stimulate the northern and central Idaho economy by advancing employment and research opportunities for University of Idaho College of Education faculty. Furthermore, the program’s students will conduct and disseminate research focusing on practitioner and state needs, advancing each student’s disciplinary field and providing the institution and the state with increased knowledge that is relevant to practitioner stakeholders. Current BYU Idaho faculty seeking the terminal degree (Ed.D.) will study higher education leadership and instructional leadership, as well as intern with professionals in their disciplinary field. For example, a mathematics faculty member may intern with a professional at the Idaho National Laboratory who is using mathematics in product development. A biology faculty member may intern with a nursing faculty member at Idaho State University. The internships are designed to further the content knowledge of the doctoral student and engage the community’s professional resources in the programs of study. We include stipends for internship supervision and for program mentors in the budget.

   Attach a Scope and Sequence, SDPTE Form Attachment B, for professional-technical education requests.

3. Briefly describe how the institution will ensure the quality of the program (e.g., program review, accreditation, professional societies, licensing boards, etc.).
The College of Education will ensure quality of the program by a) assigning an internal reviewer who will regularly monitor the programs and submit quarterly reports to the College of Education Dean, b) requiring doctoral committees for each candidate that will ensure doctoral scholarship standards, c) studying the program as part of a scholarly research project with the intention of publishing results in peer-reviewed journal(s), and d) providing a College based “oversight committee” which will review the above activities and make program policy suggestions. We will review student course evaluations each semester, conduct focus group interviews once each year, and create an committee structure whereby faculty who teach in the program meet to align instruction each semester. Program assessment will include a review of student outcomes as they relate to program goals.

Because of the cohort nature of the program, we will learn quickly of program elements that need revision.

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

There are no similar programs in Idaho or in the region. The proposal is unique to the state and the northwest, though it does reflect the influence of other cohort, Professional Practice EdD programs at other prestigious land grant and private universities. However, we have recently learned that Boise State University is interested in accepting BYU Idaho faculty into their on-line Ed.D. program that specializes in Educational technology, once the specialization of Curriculum and Instruction is Board-approved to expand to numerous areas within Education. While BSU's intention is not a cohort-based delivery specifically for BYU Idaho, it is an example of offering multiple options to a university where the need for terminal degrees is extensive. We see no conflict with BSU's future intent and our proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution and Degree name</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Specializations within the discipline (to reflect a national perspective)</th>
<th>Specializations offered within the degree at the institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSU</td>
<td>EdD</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWI</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>EdD, PhD</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Educational Leadership Higher Education Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCSC</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI</td>
<td>EdD, PhD</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Educational Leadership Higher Education Governance and Policy Curriculum and Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enrollment and Graduates (i.e., number of majors or other relevant data)
By Institution for the Proposed Program-Last three years beginning with the current year and the
5. Describe how this request is consistent with the State Board of Education's policy or role and mission of the institution.

The University of Idaho’s SBOE mission (approved 8/2007) is “high research activity, land-grant institution committed to...graduate research education. ...responsive to Idaho and the region's business and community needs. ...with primary emphasis on... teacher preparation program. ...[with] a wide range of... doctoral and professional programs and also coordinates and conducts extensive research programs. ...consistent with state needs. ...provides lifelong learning opportunities and uses a variety of delivery methods to meet the needs of select, yet diverse, constituencies in the state and region. . .”

The request is consistent with multiple aspects of the SBOE approved mission in terms of graduate research that advances teacher preparation at the doctoral level with a Professional Practices emphasis that responds to lifelong learning needs of select audiences—in this case BYU faculty members.

6. Describe how this request fits with the institution's vision and/or strategic plan.

The request is consistent with the University’s “progressive, professional stewardship” of research and its mission to “collaborate with university and external partners” and “providing instruction and expertise” needed for teaching, learning, research, and outreach. The request aligns with the University’s strategic plan’s Goal 1A Build and sustain competitive advantage through innovative curricula of distinction, 1A(4) Expand partnerships with governments and schools; Goal 2A Promote an environment that increases faculty engagement with interdisciplinary research, 2B(7) Enhance scholarly modes of discovery that address issues of importance to the citizens and government; Goal 3A(5) Partner with other educational institutions to enhance outreach delivery and quality, and 3B(2) Develop an array of academic and outreach programs based on community needs and University expertise.

The request aligns with the above as an innovative response to the needs of other state education institutions.

7. Is the proposed program in your institution’s regional 8-year plan? Indicate below.

Yes  x  No ____

If not on your institution’s regional 8-year plan, provide a justification for adding the program.

8. List potential ways your campus can collaborate with other institutions on this program to reduce cost and expand learning opportunities in Idaho. For example, what courses, if any, can be
delivered electronically by another state institution.

The primary collaboration in Rexburg will be with BYU Idaho. BYU Idaho may provide, through the MOU, classroom and office space, supportive tuition to its faculty members, and necessary logistical support to the UI faculty who deliver the program. We will utilize both on-line and hybrid course delivery to ensure efficiencies in program delivery. We will only deliver the program when we have a minimum cohort of 21 students and sufficient faculty resources to provide high quality advising and course delivery. We do not anticipate accepting a new cohort every year, but rather when we have a guarantee of sufficient students and capacity within faculty teaching and advising loads to offer the program to a new cohort.

9. Explain how students are going to learn about this program and where students are going to be recruited from (i.e., within institution, out-of-state, internationally).

Because the programs are cohort, MOU based, students will learn about the program directly, from their employers and from UI orientation meetings held on site.
10. This section requires institutions to reference all cost savings and/or additional resources needed. (Use additional sheets if necessary.):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Fiscal Impact</th>
<th>FY__2011__</th>
<th>FY__2012__</th>
<th>FY__2013__</th>
<th>Cumulative Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recurring</td>
<td>Non-Recurring</td>
<td>Recurring</td>
<td>Non-Recurring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@ $65k</td>
<td>1.0 Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.25 staff</td>
<td>@ $65k</td>
<td>.25 staff</td>
<td>@ $65k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@ $9k</td>
<td>@ $9k</td>
<td>@ $9k</td>
<td>@ $9k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$93,710</td>
<td>$93,710</td>
<td>$93,710</td>
<td>$93,710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$22,435</td>
<td>$45,535</td>
<td>$45,535</td>
<td>$45,535</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(inc benefits)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(inc benefits)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(inc benefits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>$116,145</td>
<td>$139,245</td>
<td>$139,245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Operating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$69,500</td>
<td>$69,500</td>
<td>$69,500</td>
<td>$69,500</td>
<td>$208,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Facilities</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$185,645</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$208,745</td>
<td>$603,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Source of Funds**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Appropriated - Reallocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appropriated - New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Federal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BYU cohort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student fees $30k x 21 = $630,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$185,645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>