University of Idaho
2012-2013 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #7

3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, October 9, 2012
Brink Hall Faculty Lounge
IWC Room 390 – Boise
213 – Coeur d’Alene
TAB 321B IF4 – Idaho Falls

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2012-13 Faculty Senate Meeting #6, October 2, 2012

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.

VI. Committee Reports.
   • Campus Planning and Advisory Committee (Hasko)

VII. Special Orders.
   • General Education (Frey/Porter)
   • Athletics (Spear)

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Kenton Bird, Chair 2012-2013, Faculty Senate

Attachments:
   Minutes of 2012-2013 FS Meeting #6
   University General Education Curriculum
Present: Baker (w/o vote), Bathurst, Bird (Chair), Budwig, Cobb, Flores, Frey, Goddard, Hartzell, Hasko, Hopper, Karsky, Kennelly, Manic (Idaho Falls), Miller, Morra, Pendegraft, Qualls, Wilhelm for Smith, Safaii, Strawn, Stuntzner, Teal, Ytreberg  Absent: Aiken, Baillargeon, Eckwright, Ostrom, Smith  Guests: 6

A quorum being present, Senate Chair Bird called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. welcoming guests who were presenting today and members of the press.

Minutes: The minutes of meeting #5, September 25, 2012, were moved, seconded (Goddard, Hasko) and approved as distributed.

Chair’s Report:

- Chair Bird met with Miranda Anderson, Chair of the Teaching and Advising Committee, to discuss senate retreat issues: advisor holds for Summer Session, currently non-existent; plus/minus grading option; student evaluation changes to improve response rates and adjust for outlying scores that may be skewing averages. Bird will meet with the committee later this month and asked senators to forward any other suggestions.
- Campus Planning and Advisory Committee meets Thursday to discuss the renovation of Brink Hall Faculty Lounge for the faculty/staff club. Chair Bird and former senate chair Paul Joyce will be in attendance. Executive Vice President for Planning and Budget, Keith Ickes, has proposed a cost sharing plan:
  - $7,000 - facilities, exterior masonry repairs to prevent water damage
  - $39,000 - central administration
  - $38,000 - 9 colleges, plus the Library (deans have been asked to contribute $3,800)
- Next week’s featured speakers:
  - Rob Spear, Athletic Director to discuss future conference affiliation and football as a nonaffiliated independent program.
  - Rodney Frey, Director of General Education accompanied by Jason Porter, Chair of University Committee on General Education, a senate committee.
- A preview of coming events could be found on the “Future Meetings” link on the Senate website:
  - http://www.webs.uidaho.edu/facultycouncil/future_meetings.htm
- The Graduate and Professional Students’ Association and Student Bar Association will celebrate Homecoming with a tailgate party (food provided) Saturday, October 6, 12:00-2:00 p.m., north field of Kibbie Dome. Senators are encouraged to stop and meet our graduate and law students.

Provost’s Report:

- Homecoming celebration and festivities is a great time to say hello to our friends and alumni.
- Two big events are scheduled this Thursday, Kenneth R. Feinberg and Gloria Steinem:
  - http://www.uidaho.edu/law/newsandevents/signature/bellwood-lectures
  - http://www.uidaho.edu/studentaffairs/womenscenter/40th-anniversary/gloria-steinem
- “Take back the night walk” had an impressive turnout and involved a wonderful evening march across campus focusing on violence against women.
- Last year’s new governance system that university wide programs report to a board composed of deans, vice president for research and director of community partnerships, met for the first time this year. There have been great discussions, cross communications and dialogue regarding a program’s direction, performance and needed enhancements for moving forward.
- Some 20 faculty and staff from the College of Western Idaho (CWI) who have an impressive student body of 9,000 since its inception 4 years ago, visited the University of Idaho (UI) last week. The College of Business suggested this visit which became a great opportunity for everyone. CWI faculty and staff (some of whom are UI alums) were impressed with the UI and opportunities afforded to CWI students and collaborations with faculty. There are many ways to capitalize and continue this relationship e.g. John Foltz suggested busing students up for Ag Days. Chair Bird commented that transfer students with whom he visited had very positive experiences not just academically, but socially, and were impressed with the
overall support system at our university. All of these factored into faculty and advisors of CWI knowing their students would be warmly received and looked after at the University of Idaho. The provost noted that we needed to do more of this type of outreach.

- Ag Days is this weekend, October 5 & 6th: [http://www.uidaho.edu/cals/agdays](http://www.uidaho.edu/cals/agdays)

**Academic Petitions Committee:** Chair Bird introduced Rebecca Tallent, Chair of the Academic Petitions Committee to present on her committee’s activities. Changes Senate effected last year, deadline for adding/dropping courses, appears to have had a ripple effect on our student body. Tallent distributed a handout that provided figures clearly showing an increase in petitions (including both undergraduates and graduates) e.g. last year’s average at this time was 75-80 petitions; this year it is 193. Various contributors to the rise in petitions include:

- change in drop/add deadline
- students/advisors not paying attention
- lack of awareness
- failure to grasp earlier deadline (Tallent will request last year’s figures from Registrar to compare)
- reminders/notices are mixed within other notices/announcements
- students on waiting lists have to wait until after 10th day to know whether there is room in a course
- deadline is too soon, decisions that need to be made are not easy - yet critical
- advisors’ solution for students on waiting lists or other critical reasons, was to file a petition.

The committee, mindful of the increased petitions, explored options on how they could expedite the process while also considering they are a judicial body. They are fearful of what lies ahead for their next meeting. Answering a senator’s question about whether they could recommend changes, Tallent noted that at this time the committee does not have enough data to propose any changes. Although too late to make changes for the 2013-14 catalog, perhaps next semester the committee could revisit and propose modified deadlines, better implementation or communication. Chair Bird recognized and thanked all members of Academic Petitions for their hard work.

**FS-13-006: Master’s Degree General Requirements:** Mr. Dwaine Hubbard, Assistant Registrar, said the rationale of increasing from 9 to 12 credits that can be moved from a non-degree transcript to a graduate degree was to expand into international markets. Coming as a seconded motion from UCC, FS-13-006 was unanimously approved.

**FS-13-007: Final Exam Schedule:** Mr. Hubbard again spoke to this item coming from UCC and distributed a corrected version of page two. He explained that the process used for this schedule is a rotation of dates each semester, each year. A senator noted that he and colleagues have had students with exam conflicts for rescheduled exam conflicts and suggested it would be helpful to include language within this document on how this might be addressed. Chair Bird, having long been concerned about the effectiveness of our current final exam schedule, took the floor. He asked that UCC explore, perhaps through a survey, the following:

- determine the number of classes actually using the final exam week for finals (seems more and more final projects are due during dead week to avoid a final exam)
- failure to hold a class session if a final exam is not scheduled as the instructions direct, should this be removed if we have no means of enforcing, or perhaps amend or delete this language
- explore the possibility of shortening the final exam week looking at how other universities handle finals, especially since so few faculty seem to be using it for the traditional final exams.

Provost Baker asked Mr. Hubbard to explain when grades are due and the importance of this date. Grades are due 72 hours (includes the weekend) following the last day of finals, typically noon on Tuesday. See the online Academic Calendar for details: [http://www.uidaho.edu/registrar/calendar](http://www.uidaho.edu/registrar/calendar)

The sooner grades are turned in the sooner the below can be processed for students’ benefits:

- final transcripts to graduate
- employment opportunities
- student’s financial aid eligibility
- admission to graduate program or law school
University Budget and Finance Committee (UBFC): Senator Budwig, chair of UBFC called senators attention to the list included in senate’s packet highlighting a few:

- 10 page document, Financial Critical Enabler, prepared by Keith Ickes and others. He noted of particular importance was the move away from Responsibility Center Management (RCM).
- state enrollment workload funding change to performance based funding
- moving from spread pay to another model for faculty pay
- ability to retain funds for emergency repairs of research equipment

Chair Bird thanked all three senators serving on this committee and on Senate.

Keith Ickes, Executive Director of Planning and Budget: Mr. Ickes commended Senator Budwig for his summary and the UBFC’s prepared list saying they had a good start for the year. He then presented a few deadlines and highlighted how the university’s budget works, noting that there is not a rigid set of dates or processes.

President Nellis meets with the Permanent Building Fund Advisory Council, a legislative body, in the next two weeks in Boise, seeking funding for:

- $2-3 million in maintenance monies to address our critical needs. We work on campus with Facilities to determine the university’s critical needs, what will fail and high priority items. We had an outside consultant group affirm that by addressing critical systems internal to the buildings it expands the impact of our dollars.
- $5 million from the state for permanent building fund to begin the Integrated Research and Innovation Center (IRIC) building north of Brink.

The Governor submits a budget in November which we watch carefully. If what we have requested is in this budget, then we have a head start. We also know the legislature will take it seriously at the same time recognizing they may reject. This gives us a clue what the governor has on his mind for higher education. We will be watching the following:

- 3% change in employee compensation (President’s highest priority)
- $2 million for Complete College Idaho initiative to increase number of graduating students in the state (last year the Governor supported IGEM). The State Board has designated that the $2 million will go towards remedial education and general education reform asking each institution to submit proposals. The UI submitted a $1.3 million comprehensive proposal. If funding appears likely, the Board will appoint a committee to evaluate each institution’s proposal to determine the distribution.
- 5 additional seats for WWAMI
- Expand law program to second year and asking for state support, and
- $5 million in support from the Governor for the IRIC building, about a 50 million project.

January: Education week in the capital will be the president’s opportunity to spend one hour with the Joint Finance and Appropriations Committee (JFAC) to highlight the university’s achievements/outstanding accomplishments and what the university brings to the state. The President will also have an opportunity to discuss his highest priority and financial needs. Our students also meet one-on-one with state legislators to help legislators understand our highest priority financial needs.

We will be asked to rank proposals coming out of the State Board based on what we would like funded. Currently the board has three proposals on the table:

1. $9.6 million for equity – will guarantee by the end of FY12 all four institutions in the state will be funded identically for instruction.
2. $2 million Complete College Idaho a program designed to encourage more Idaho high school graduates to pursue a post-secondary degree or certificate.
3. Performance based funding currently being explored by several other universities is a current hot topic. We may engage in this and the proposal is that each institution would receive a 3% base increase ($2.4 million for UI). We would have to earn the $2.4 by showing positive advancement on key measures set by
the board. Two are identical to every institution: increasing number of degrees you produce; and showing ongoing financial efficiencies. The third measure is a composite of institutionally determined measures, e.g. we would have four different things we would measure and roll together for a composite score. We are still working at the board level to determine how to score these measures.

February:  Budget discussion begins on campus, looking for key issues in terms of new funding, critical and high priorities in academics and administration.
March:  Get a sense of where the legislature stands, what is getting positive support and possibly appropriated.
April:  We host the State Board in Moscow and this is an important meeting for the university where student tuition is determined. The UI works very closely with our students and have received significant tuition increases in the past, in large part attributed to our students and this collaborative effort.
June:  Once we know the tuition increase, we then put the pieces together and set the budget.

How the Budget Works:  We are talking about the General Education Budget, funding of academic programs and central administration resources for the institution. This does not include budgeting for auxiliaries, e.g. residence halls, dining services, bookstore, recreational center, etc. Essentially we begin with a big hole, a need for roughly $153 million. We have three ways to fill this hole:

1. state provides about $80 million;
2. tuition provides about $60 million;
3. supplemented by three sources at the university:
   - retention of 75% of F&A generated on research grants and contracts;
   - charge G&A tax (administrative tax); and
   - interest received through university prudent investments.

We try to estimate as early as we can what gross revenue will be in each of these categories and once understood, we begin looking at base reallocations looking for opportunities to change and move dollars from something that’s gone away or restructured, to something new. Then we look at mandatory items. The first four mandatory items listed below put us at a little over $1 million and the last item at $2 million, which will be required in order for us just to stay in the game.

- $200,000 for faculty promotions
- $250,000 for utility bills
- $250,000 in contractual agreements, depending on nature of agreement
- $320-350,000 is needed to sustain the library’s serial and periodical collections’ current base to remain nationally competitive and to have a solid library
- $1,000,000 will be needed if the 3% salary increase is approved (state funds ~55-60% of the 3%)

The next thing we look at is gross revenue. Some projects/programs are directly linked to tuition value e.g. TA/RA tuition waivers when non-resident fee goes up 10%, for example, so does the value of the waiver, a dollar for dollar offset. Last year the mandatory increases in financial aid were a little over $700,000. Once you are at what you think you can get at the gross level and the state, you then consider how much to devote to financial aid to offset this cost. Also to consider with mandatory monies, are salary and benefit costs, including what benefit support will be provided by the state (last year a substantial amount was needed).

Brief overview, looking at new revenues, any institution must look at reallocations on a regular basis. Each dean is asked to report on reallocations they plan to make within their unit, solve new problems and anticipate new programs. We must constantly be on the lookout for what to change (drop/add), what is needed to stay current, ability to cover mandatory costs and what remains for new initiatives and pressing issues for the university. We whittle away new revenue very fast with mandatory items, when down to final numbers of flexible dollars there are not a lot of dollars remaining on the table.

Is the student tuition increase request automatic that is asked for every year, is there a long range plan? Our board has a strong stance to keep tuition increases small believing citizens in Idaho cannot afford to go elsewhere. Our board pays attention to neighboring states and looks at the percentage not the dollar amount of tuition, a small amount. Our strategy is to make a strong case for as high an increase as possible the board will allow, yet paying
attention to our peers. Ickes provided an example of what tuition covers, the proposed 3% salary increase will require a 5% increase in tuition.

*There has been national discussion about a move of students towards community colleges e.g. CWI has 9,000 students. Does that figure into the evaluation?* Yes. Currently, among the flagship institutions of all 50 states, we rank 47th in resident undergraduate tuition. We are the lowest in western states for undergraduate tuition. Wyoming, rich in gas and oil reserves, has lower tuition rates in the west. Our non-resident tuition is $19,000 – about 90% of peer average with only a few western peers being lower.

*Last year students met with you regarding fees, will this continue?* We have been doing this for many years and will certainly continue with this year’s student leadership. Mr. Ickes noted that it has been a great relationship with students and very positive to have students work with the university in helping solve general education issues, noting how admirable students were in going as far as they could in managing student activity fee increases in a manner that provided the most flexibility in solving university financial issues.

Wrapping up the discussion on a positive note, Provost Baker reported that Newsweek ranked the University of Idaho as the 3rd most affordable university in the country, based on what students look for and actual price.

**Dependent Tuition Reduction:** Dan Davenport, Director of Financial Aid and Andrew Nutting, Chair of Student Financial Aid Committee, were introduced for the next discussion about dependent tuition reduction along with Mr. Ickes who was asked to remain. Mr. Davenport noted that several offices met over the summer to prepare the application and FAQs that were distributed in senate’s packet. Now that the process has been underway, this group met again this morning to discuss possible adjustments. As of last week 67 students took advantage of the waiver (although we could see as many as 75 by end of semester). The total amount waived thus far is $102,350.50 (includes part-time students). This number does not reflect all eligible students e.g. some staff are unaware or do not understand the benefit, some chose awarded scholarships over the waiver. The FAQs state that if one has external funding e.g. local Hamilton Lowe scholarship or an endowed scholarship, or one that represents new monies (non-UI), you would get both. If you don’t use it, it is good for eight semesters, as long as you meet the IRS qualification of dependent. If your grade point suffers and you are ineligible for financial aid, you can use the waiver which requires only that you be enrolled. The plan is to increase publicity and communications this spring to get the word out. The floor was then opened up for comments and questions.

*A senator noted that students are being forced to choose between scholarships and this waiver. This policy was presented, discussed and approved as a benefit to employees, not as a scholarship. In its implementation it does not seem to mirror Senate’s intent, what happened?* Mr. Ickes responded that the policy passed by Senate, the University Faculty and the President, and presented to the Board, with supportive documentation, did not indicate whether financial aid was an additive or not. Providing free education for an employee, as well as a tuition waiver, would have been viewed negatively by the board. The implementation of this policy is consistent with the financial material the board reviewed and approved.

*A senator commented that confusion and frustration comes from the fact that university scholarships are earned for meritorious work, while the dependent tuition reduction is an employee benefit. To be forced to give up something earned that is less than the employee benefit, or its implementation, seems counter-productive and sends the wrong message. I don’t think this was intended when this was designed.*

*A senator asked whether centrally funded scholarships, up front awards e.g. Go Idaho, is when a student receives $2,500 a year automatically and this is funded by the university’s ability to draw on donors? If so, then the release of these institutional funds I see as a leverage that can be used in attracting meritorious students through the Honors Program, am I correct?* Davenport responded affirmatively to both.

*There is a perception among students and their families that has melded together: what we describe as institutional scholarships and outside monies or endowment monies. Is there a way to clarify and distinguish them as: institutional aid/grant rather than scholarship, and tuition discount or reduction, as opposed to meritorious coming from outside sources?* [None of the speakers specifically responded to this question, but Mr. Davenport indicated after the meeting that he would examine ways to better address this distinction in the FAQs.]
What Senate passed had words removed regarding employees having to choose between a scholarship or the waiver, yet in its implementation the language returned. Is that how we want to do things at this university, pass one thing and others choose how they want it implemented? I respectfully disagree with the interpretation of its implementation and believe it was deliberately taken out to avoid the problems we have been discussing today. Ickes repeated again that what was presented to the President and the State Board was silent on the matter of scholarships and that there was no documentation that indicated intent of this body.

A senator asked whether Mr. Ickes was personally aware of the language that was removed. Mr. Ickes responded that he was aware of what was taken out, but that there was nothing to indicate senate’s intent.

Are we at a point where we know how many students waived the institutional money and how many waived the reduction? Mr. Davenport responded that the value of $10,225 was based off 15 students waiving their financial aid to take the reduction. We do not know of other students who may be unaware of the benefit, or elected to retain their scholarships and thus did not fill out an application.

How does the waived amount of $102,350.50 compare to the estimated fiscal impact in the plan former Chair Joyce developed? At that time 113 existing employees could take advantage of the reduction, an additional 35 new students or 148. The calculated loss of approximately $228,000 in tuition is a smidge off the current $100,000 for 67 students.

Chair Bird commented that he had participated in discussions with the Senate’s leadership on this topic and there was tension between the desire to provide a valuable benefit for employees and concern about potential revenue loss. In an attempt to strike a balance, the policy that came out of senate did just that. The impact was not as great as forecasted, and there may be room for expansion or extension of benefits as we go forward. He invited senators with concerns to contact him. It may be possible to revisit the policy at a future meeting. However, Chair Bird did caution that it might not be prudent to go back to the board and that it may be perceived as being changed too quickly. Perhaps next semester we will have a better sense and may be closer to that 148 students or $228,000.

From a budgetary standpoint, was this $228,000 figured into the budget? No, all calculations were hypothetical.

The way the policy is currently worded, dependents of Police officers are ineligible, is that true? As long as one member of the family is a UI employee, the dependent qualifies.

Would it be possible to make an editorial change to address this ambiguity? This can be addressed by Senate where the policy originated.

Mr. Ickes noted that Boise State has a similar policy; however ours allows for employees, spouse and dependent while BSU allows only one family member to benefit. He also noted that the board has been speaking to general counsels at all campuses and may be putting something to this effect in board policy. Mr. Davenport asked senators for advice on how better to communicate this to please let him know.

A senator stated that this was meant to be a positive thing for faculty and staff and felt at the time this passed it was fantastic, especially for staff. But now feels what we have done has created animosity and a greater rift, when we were trying to do something positive. Chair Bird pointed out that 67 employees are receiving a benefit that would not have been possible had the Senate not acted.

Adjournment: The time for adjournment having come and gone, it was moved and seconded (Pendegraft, Goddard) to adjourn at 5:15 p.m. Majority in favor, 3 opposed.

Respectfully submitted,

Ann Thompson, Assistant to Faculty Secretary
University of Idaho General Education Curriculum 2012-13

9 October 2012

Begun with the General Education Steering Committee (August 2010), The University Committee on General Education, University Curriculum Committee and Faculty Senate have approved the following general education curriculum requirements, beginning with the 2011-12 (ISEM 101) and 2012-13 (ISEM 301, American Diversity and Senior Experience) catalog years.

The result is a UI General Education of a 33-35 credit curriculum (compared with State Board Transfer CORE of 36 credits), with an emphasis on a vertical, multi-year broad liberal education (ISEM 101, ISEM 301 and Senior Experience) with both an International and American Diversity component.

Freshman UI General Education class of 1,858 students (which is approximately 350 more students than last year’s ISEM 101 class), with many graduating as early as Spring 2015.

1) General Core Studies – for a total of at least 18 credits. Student takes:

a) An Integrated Seminar (ISEM 101 for 3 credits) course during the Fall or Spring semester of their first year. With an introductory course in the major in the semester not taking ISEM 101.

   Director collaborates with College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences chairs and faculty to offer ISEM 101s. UCGE informed. Emphasize seminar format, community, integration of humanities and social science multiple-disciplinarity, diversity, and University Learning Outcomes.

   Fall 2012 – 27 sections, and Spring 2012 – 23 sections (given enrollment), involving 25 CLASS faculty.

   Link with Common Read and Runstad Lecture, forming a committee made up of ISEM faculty to select Common Read and Runstad lecture.

   First of three points of General Education Assessment, with AAC&U VALUE Rubrics and “assessment artifact.”

b) Two Humanities courses (for 6 credits)

   List of 33 courses (8 cross-listed with International; 2 cross-listed with Diversity; increase)

c) Two Social Sciences courses (for 6 credits)

   List of 28 courses (2 cross-listed with International; 6 cross-listed with Diversity; increase)
d) An **International** course or experience (for 1-4 credits)

   List of 129 courses (20+ are regular offerings; many are languages; need to **review/update**) and study aboard


e) An **American Diversity** course (for 3 credits)

   List of 53 courses (23+ are regular offerings; point of **Assessment**)

f) A **Great Issues Seminar** (ISEM 301 for 1 credit). These seminars are linked to campus-wide events and performances (“signature events” and other events of education relevance) and offered throughout the year. To enroll, need 26 credits and EN 102, though intent is on third year students.

   Fall 2012 – Education is piloting around Gloria Steinem, and Spring 2013 – CLASS piloting around Common Read. May serve as example **templates** for future proposals. (“flexibility with rigor”).

   Director collaborates with Colleges of Agriculture/Life Sciences, Art/Architecture, Business/Economics, Education, Engineering, and Natural Resources to develop ISEM 301s linked with sponsoring “signature” and other campus-wide events (sign off from sponsor). **Emphasize seminar** format, **integration/multiple-disciplinary, campus-wide event of significance**, and University **Learning Outcomes**. Submit to UCGE and upon approval, each college (or designees) submits COWS to Registrar’s Office for scheduling, registration, and classrooms.

   Need to be offering by **Spring of 2014** to accommodate this year’s class (submitting to UCGE **early Fall 2013** to get into schedule).

   **Proportional Share**: of the total enrolled bachelors from these colleges (F’11 of 5,700) and a projected junior class (based upon F’12 of 1,800), each college would then need to provide an estimated number of ISEM 301 seats: Ag./Life Sci.=18% for 324 students, Art/Arch.=12% for 216 students, Bus./Econ=21% for 378 students, Ed.=19% for 342 students, Eng.=21% for 378 students, NR.=9% for 162 students. In addition, Law will offer one and Science offer two ISEM 301s annually. (need to adjust % and numbers annually)

   Depending on format and enrollment caps, this could be an annual minimum of 12 ISEM 301 sections (with seminar breakout sessions) with 150 students each to as many as 47 sections with 38 students each.

   Second of three points of General Education **Assessment** with AAC&U VALUE Rubric; with “assessment artifact”
g) A **Senior Experience** (course, internship, performance, seminar, etc.). This should be an upper-division “experience” that is typically offered through one’s academic major.

List of 20 options (need significantly more)

Director collaborates with all colleges/departments to facilitate development, for UCGE, UCC and Faculty Senate review/approval. **Issue** of viable “senior learning experience” and assessment artifact. **Emphasize integration** and University **Learning Outcomes**.

Need to be offering by **Fall 2014** (submit UCGE by **early Fall 2013** to get into 2014-15 Catalog).

Third of three points of General Education **Assessment** with AAC&U VALUE Rubric, with “assessment artifact”

Courses must be taken in at least **three different academic disciplines** from the approved General Education courses.

2) **UI Core** – for a total of 15-17 credits. Student takes:

a) Two **Communication** courses (English 102 and one additional communication course for 5 credits).

b) Two **Natural** and **Applied Sciences** courses (from two science courses and their labs, or an Integrated Science (CORS) course and one additional science course with a lab for 7-8 credits).

Director collaborates with the College of Science to offer sections of CORS (**increase**)

C) A **Math**, Statistics or Computer Science course (for 3-4 credits)

Direct the **assessment efforts** of the 3-point General Education tiers (ISEM 101, ISEM 301 and Senior Experience), along with entire General Education curriculum. Apply the VALUE Rubrics (or modified version, with rating scales and scoring criteria), with course learning activities and “assessment artifacts” to assess competency and proficiency in addressing UI Learning Outcomes. And make recommendations for any adjustments to General Education to the Provost Council, Faculty Senate and UCGE.

Direct efforts (with Andrew Brewick) to infuse a campus-wide faculty and staff competency in **advising** the requirements, philosophy and value of the General Education curriculum and co-curriculum. Web-page development and workshops.

**For more information:**
Rodney Frey, Director of General Education, Professor of Ethnography
Office: 885-6268  Cell: 208-596-6476  rfrey@uidaho.edu  www.uidaho.edu/class/core