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University of Idaho
2013-2014 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #16

3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, February 11, 2014
Brink Hall Faculty-Staff 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 2013-14 Faculty Senate Meeting #15, February 4, 2014 (vote)

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.
   - FS-14-025: Resolution on SB1254 (vote)
   - Tuition Discount vs. Scholarship (Davenport/Ickes)
   - Online Fee Distribution (Ickes)

VI. Committee Reports.

   Committee on Committees:
   FS-14-024: FSH 1640-86 - Teacher Education Coordinating Committee (Ytreberg) (vote)

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Trish Hartzell, Chair 2013-2014, Faculty Senate

Attachments:
   Minutes of 2013-2014 FS Meeting #15
   Handouts - tuition
   FS-14-024 and 025
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University of Idaho
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
2013-2014 Meeting #15, Tuesday, February 4, 2014

Present: Aiken (w/o vote), Awwad-Rafferty, Baillargeon, Bird, Brandt, Cobb, Couture (Boise), Davis, Eckwright (w/o vote), Flores, Frey, Hartzell (chair), Miller, Morra, Murphy, Ostrom, Pendegrift, Pregitzer, Qualls, Safaïi, Stoll, Stuntzner (Coeur d’Alene), Wolf, Ytreberg Absent: Becker, Karsky, Kennelly, Manic, Perret, Smith Guests: 6

A quorum being present, Senate Chair Hartzell called the meeting to order at 3:35pm.

Minutes: It was moved and seconded (Awwad-Rafferty, Murphy) to approve the minutes of meeting #14. Motion carried.

Chair’s Report. The Chair reported on the following items:

- Senate leadership met with Staff Affairs leadership to discuss common issues, including the tobacco/smoking issue and the HR recalibration process for staff who have appealed their classifications. Staff are pleased and impressed that Provost Aiken has attended the staff recalibration interviews. We also discussed a Staff Affairs request to hold their monthly meetings in the Brink Lounge. Based upon our discussion and feedback from members of the original Brink Lounge Advisory Committee, the consensus is that it should be allowed.

- Thank you to the senators who have volunteered to serve on a subcommittee to modify the language of faculty evaluations. Faculty Affairs Committee looked into this matter last fall but were unable to reach a conclusion. We welcome any additional senators who would like to volunteer to serve on this committee.

- University Judicial Council (UJC) met last Friday to put the final touches on changes to the Student Code of Conduct – FSH 2305, Student Disciplinary Process. Guilherme Costa from the Office of General Counsel has been working with UJC and senate leadership on this policy and it likely will be ready for senate in a few weeks.

- State Board of Education (SBOE) voted unanimously yesterday to oppose Senate Bill 1254, sponsored by Senator Curt McKenzie, Nampa, that would allow firearms on college campuses. All Idaho college presidents have voiced their opposition to this measure. Chair Hartzell would like Faculty Senate to weigh in on this matter. A similar, though not identical, proposal was made in 2011 and at that time both Faculty Senate and Staff Affairs passed resolutions opposing it. Senators Bird and Flores volunteered to serve on a subcommittee to draft a senate response. For additional information about the 2011 resolution follow this link to the minutes for 2010-2011 meeting #21: [http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/facultycouncil/2010-11FS/Agendas/2010-2011_agendas.htm](http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/facultycouncil/2010-11FS/Agendas/2010-2011_agendas.htm)

Provost’s Report. Provost Aiken reported on the following items:

- The start of the 125th anniversary celebration of the University of Idaho held in the UI Commons last week was a particularly glorious and festive event. It was student-focused, and also included faculty, staff and stakeholders. Thanks to all who worked on it.

- The classification appeal process and the Focus for the Future process are moving forward and we should be getting close to a time when we will be communicating something about those processes.

- Additional information regarding Senate Bill 1254 relating to firearms’ regulations on Idaho college campuses:
  - Presidents at all Idaho institutions of higher education oppose the passage of this bill.
o UI Board of Regents voted 6-0 against this change.
o President Burnett will testify against the bill on February 12, 2014.
o UI and presidents at other state institutions and SBOE will make the argument that this is a local control issue. They are not arguing the issue of guns on campus.
o If senate wishes to make its opinion known on this bill, it needs to do so before testimony takes place.
o While individuals are allowed to contact their legislators, they do so as Idaho citizens and not as representatives of any University of Idaho office. For more information see Faculty-Staff Handbook 6230, Political Rights of University Employees: http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/6230.html
o Senate Bill 1254 is available here: http://www.legislature.idaho.gov/legislation/2014/S1254.pdf

Improve/Enhance Communications. Chair Hartzell then invited guest Dan Ewart, executive director and CIO of ITS, to speak about improving and enhancing communication throughout the UI community. Mr. Ewart highlighted a few points from his written report, including:

- A variety of electronic communication solutions are available at this time: email, telephone services, videoconferencing (VCS), Microsoft Lync, BBLearn.
- Some UI units use and/or contract for other solutions, such as WebEx, GoToMeeting, independent VCS solutions, independent telephone conferencing solution, Dropbox, Google Docs, Google+, Facebook and other social networking sites.
- ITS is working on improving institutional communication through changes to VCS, telephone services, document collaboration and training on existing tools.
- ITS does not have the funds to provide significant upgrades to the VCS infrastructure. ITS currently has a service center funding model supporting VCS that annually runs more than $100,000 in the negative.
- ITS is looking to improve the current telephone system which is over 20 years old and works well, but could probably be done more cheaply.
- ITS will roll out some new functionality with document collaboration in the next few months which will mirror Google Docs and Dropbox.
- We need to train more people to use the solutions that we have.

Mr. Ewart responded as follows to senators’ questions:

- Could you say more about security on cloud-based services, such as Google Docs? We have to be very careful about using those external services. We are very careful with services that UI contracts for, not only with the language of the contract to ensure that university records are protected, but also with the physical and logical security surrounding those. One of the key concepts in research is export control and when you put a document on Google Docs or Dropbox, you cannot depend on that information not leaving the U.S. Institutional contracts with providers enable us (at least, contractually) to ensure that this is the case (i.e., information does not leave the U.S.). We also are able to inspect the cloud-based service providers to make sure that the providers are doing what they say they are doing. For these reasons, ITS encourages UI employees to use institutional solutions.
- What has become of the Center for Teaching Innovation (CTI)? It left ITS 4-5 years ago. I cannot speak to distance and extended education – it is not part of ITS.
- Email addresses for UI retirees have been changed. What is the advantage of doing this? Is this a change in university policy and if so, when will it be coming to Faculty Senate? It is important that we retain our connections with emeritus faculty. This is in part a licensing issue with
Microsoft email and in part something we have done for the protection of UI records. It is not about only the email address – it also has to do with authentication and how you gain access to other institutional resources. We have heard from faculty members that this is something we need to revisit, because of the obviously valuable role of emeritus faculty at UI. To my knowledge this is not a policy change but rather a process change so there is nothing forthcoming to Faculty Senate regarding this change.

- **Several times a year there is a physical disruption of the cable that connects UI campuses. This interferes with videoconferencing and internet, as well. Can we better protect this cable and/or move away from a physical cable?** Yes, this is a fiber optic cable and it runs through Washington, Oregon and into Boise. Farmers dig in places that disrupted the cable three times last year and there is nothing we can do to protect the hundreds of miles of cable buried underground. It is not a UI-owned cable but our internet service provider IRON (Idaho Regional Optical Network) is working closely with us to establish an alternate path so that when a cable is damaged we do not experience a disruption of service. There is a cost associated with establishing an alternate path, but our connection with the remote centers is so important that it is worth the cost from ITS’s perspective. The alternate path would be up to Spokane, across to Montana and down the other side. Then if one link is cut our communications will continue with the other path. We also would like to ensure that people at other sites are not wholly relying on a connection to Moscow. We are putting more things in the cloud so that regardless of what happens with either of the cable connections, people are still able to do their work without relying on Moscow. Other companies do provide back-up cables but there is a very high cost associated with those back-up cables.

- **The table in your written report shows different options with differing costs. Where are we now with support for ITS and what is the budget for next year? Is it possible to get funding or donated equipment from industry?** Videoconferencing operates on a service center model and we charge for those services. We run about $100,000 in the hole every year and we have no money for repair and replacement or to work on infrastructure and end-point equipment, staffing and so on. We have explored some options with industry but they are in the business of selling equipment and are able to provide some discounts, but universities, especially land-grant institutions, are some of their best customers. We have not explored further any advertising-related subsidies but advertising subsidies can become a slippery slope. Some of these things will become more clear to us as we continue with the Focus for the Future process and we will have to develop some new paths for funding if the funding is not available.

- **There are multiple independent groups on campus that spend their grant funds to buy videoconferencing equipment. Do they go through you and what efforts are being made to get them to work with ITS to pool their resources?** Most of them work very well with ITS and check with us before purchasing equipment. Videoconferencing will not work very well, however, if the infrastructure is not working well or if it does not have the capacity. Our current infrastructure is ancient and not working very well.

- **The new Graduate and Professional Students (GPSA) office has no working technology, including computers or telephones, who do we contact?** Contact me! We will work to help you get what you need.

- **It is difficult to see the faces of our senate colleagues at sites on the screen we use for videoconferencing senate. Could we improve this by putting up several more screens?** No. Solving this problem requires different technology and it is also part of the infrastructure limitations.

Mr. Ewart closed by asking all to reach out to him with technology problems and concerns.
University Curriculum Committee. FS-14-023 (UCC 14-050). Chair Hartzell next invited Professor Traci Craig, chair of psychology and communication studies, to speak about a proposed PhD in experimental psychology (human factors focus). Professor Craig explained that the department and college have been working toward putting this degree together for many years:

- External reviewers in 2008-2009 agreed that the department had taken the right steps toward offering this degree and made a few recommendations such as adding a faculty line and collaborating with Idaho National Laboratory (INL), which have been done.
- Additional resources from outside of the department are not needed other than for the library.
- Lab space and other resources needed for the program currently exist within the master’s program and the department has been investing in upgrading these resources.
- The department would like to leverage currently available resources to bring in PhD students. Every year there are students who apply to the UI master’s program but then go elsewhere for a PhD.

Professor Craig responded as follows to senators’ questions and comments:

- Are you changing the name of the degree? We refer to the current master’s degree as a human factors degree but it is more accurately a master’s degree in experimental psychology with a human factors focus. The PhD also will be in experimental psychology. Idaho State University teaches clinical and counseling psychology and they have been adding some areas of experimental psychology in the past two years. It has been made very clear that UI would continue to offer human factors education.
- Is this on the SBOE’s 5-year-plan? Yes.
- The College of Art & Architecture (CAA) offers environmental and social design studies and I would hope psychology and CAA could collaborate on some of these programs. Absolutely, we are always looking for new collaborations and ways to utilize resources.
- This program will not require additional funding because your department generates sufficient revenue through outreach. As that revenue is gathered back to the university or college, does that mean that you are currently using these monies or that these monies will flow back to you for this program? The College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences (CLASS) has created a sustainable plan that will allow a department to keep some portion of their budget back, although we are not referring to it directly as “outreach”. Those funds, in addition to the web-fee portion that was not affected by changes in outreach funding, will help support the program. We have assistantship budgets funded from the college that are used for the master’s degree program but may be used for PhD students in the future.
- How do these revenue changes affect other departments or units in CLASS? For example, the Writing Center is also part of CLASS and their hours were cut recently due to funding. Our revenue is the same as other departments and it is proportional to the number of hours delivered. For example, this past year psychology delivered about 10,000 credit hours. There is no additional money – this is what the department was allocated. If there are cuts in the future we will have to make adjustments just as other departments will do.
- There are two full-time-employee faculty members in this program and of the five faculty involved in this program, three are untenured. One of the tenured faculty members is currently on leave and if that faculty member does not return, four of the five faculty in the program will be untenured. I am hoping that one more faculty member will be tenured after this semester which would leave two junior faculty teaching in the program – and one of those two junior faculty came to UI with time toward tenure, so it will not be six years before that tenure decision is made. Our faculty currently support a number of master’s degree students. We understand that PhD students will require more time and energy as they continue, but we hope that they will also help support the research programs.
Is this a pretty good area for funding opportunities from granting agencies? Not predominantly grants, but certainly contracts, e.g., the Department of Transportation, NIATT, and some energy work through INL.

Are there no additional courses planned for this PhD program? That is correct, there are no additional courses. In a typical psychology PhD program, the required coursework is taken in the first two years and the student may go on to take specialized coursework in other areas. Most of the post-prelims work is research that is lab-based or internship-based. We currently offer a “pro seminar” that we encourage our graduate students to attend.

Provost Aiken added that the State Board of Education/Board of Regents chooses an external review team to look at proposals for new PhD programs. That has been done for this program and the team found that everything is as it should be for this degree program. Professor Craig noted that the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society accredited the master’s program and said that there is no need to change the curriculum for a PhD program.

This item comes as a seconded motion from the University Curriculum Committee. Motion carried 21 for and none opposed.

Unfinished Business. Brink Lounge Advisory Committee final report. Senator Bird offered comments about the remodeling of the room and additional people to thank. Sound-proofing was added to the north wall of the room to ensure that the Ombuds Office would not be disturbed by sound from the lounge. Debra Saul, an interior design student of Professor Shauna Corry (and now graduate of the program), did much of the design work for the lounge. Others deserving special mention include: Larry Chin, the original project architect and now retired; Purchasing Services staff including Julia McIlroy, senior buyer, and Cynthia Adams, Valerie Bollinger and Doug Vandenboom. Senator Bird then provided the following dates for this semester’s Faculty Gatherings (also known as Interdisciplinary Research Receptions), which will be held from 4-6pm in the Brink Lounge: February 21, March 28 and April 25. Senator Bird acknowledged the role of former UI president Duane Nellis in making the Brink Lounge remodel a reality and he asked senators to sign a card for Dr. Nellis, thanking him for his crucial and timely support of the project.

Adjournment: It was moved and seconded (Cobb, Pendegraft) to adjourn at 4:35pm. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Gail Z. Eckwright
Secretary to Faculty Senate and Faculty Secretary
February 11, 2014

Idaho Senate State Affairs Committee
Idaho State Senators
and

Idaho Governor C. L. “Butch” Otter

RE: Opposition to SB 1254

Dear Idaho legislators:

The University of Idaho Faculty Senate has reviewed SB 1254. We provide here a resolution approved on February 11, 2014 by a special vote of the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate requests your consideration and support of our position on SB 1254, declared as follows:

WHEREAS, each university and college in Idaho possesses unique geographic, physical, financial, and community characteristics that affect safety procedures, and

WHEREAS, a critical tool for maintaining safety on university and college campuses is the ability of individual universities, in collaboration with local government, law enforcement and citizens, to customize firearms policy to fit the unique characteristics of their institution, campus and community; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the University of Idaho Faculty Senate recommends that the Idaho State Affairs Committee, Idaho State senators, and Idaho Governor C. L. “Butch” Otter reject SB 1254; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the University of Idaho Faculty Senate supports existing statutes that promote the value of local decision making in forming policies and procedures to ensure safety for all university employees, students, and visitors to campus.

Sincerely,

Professor Patricia Hartzell
Chair, Faculty Senate

Professor Gail Eckwright
Secretary of the Faculty

c: President Don Burnett, members of the Board of Regents
Faculty Senate Meeting
February 11, 2014

1. Difference between tuition discount vs. scholarships - financial impact on UI
Baseline numbers for discussion: Resident Tuition rate: $4,534; Fees: $1,990;
Financial Aid award: $1,000

   a. External scholarship (UI Foundation; State; local organization):
      Student pays (net): $3,534 tuition to University plus all fees
      University receives: $4,534 in tuition revenue to be used to meet operational expenses

   b. Internal Scholarship (self-funded from institutional revenues):
      Student pays (net): $3,534 tuition to University plus all fees
      University receives: $4,534 in tuition revenue - $1,000 of which goes to cover the
      scholarship leaving $3,534 to be used to meet operational expenses

   c. Internal Waiver – only available for nonresidents:
      Tuition: $17,610; fees: $1,990; waiver $5,000
      Student pays (net): $12,610 in tuition to University plus all fees
      University receives: $12,610 in tuition revenue to be used to meet operational expenses

If we budget $100,000 in internal scholarships (100 x $1,000) and only 90 students actually
enroll, then the remaining $10,000 of unused scholarship funds are available to meet other university
operational costs. Over time, the cash-funded financial aid budget may be reduced as overall utility of
the financial aid plan is better understood – resulting in cash available to meet other operational needs.

If we award $500,000 in tuition waivers (100 x $5,000) and only 90 students actually enroll, then
there is no residual cash value to the unused waivers and there are no additional dollars available to the
institution to meet operating costs. Over time, the tuition waiver budget may be reduced as overall
utility of the financial aid plan is better understood – resulting in more net revenue per student and,
therefore, the potential for more net revenue to meet other operational needs.

2. Support of the linear tuition model

   a. Any academic benefit is very unclear. Since, in a linear tuition model, the student would
      pay for every single credit hour, the model encourages the student to financially
      question each decision to increase his or her number of credit hours. Taking a 1 credit
      hour course for exploration will cost extra; participating in the band will cost extra;
      taking a fifth course in the semester will cost you, on average, an extra three credit
      hours – all subtle or not-so-subtle suggestions that you should take fewer credit hours.
b. Linear tuition can work for institutions with a very high volume of part-time students since part-time students are already paying on a per-credit-hour basis. Example: BSU.

c. It can result in a lot more processing, since any credit hour change brings a financial recalculation; possible refunds or additional charges; and additional policies to account for what happens at various points in the semester in terms of the linear tuition charges.

d. University of Idaho: Currently $267.50 per credit hour up to 10 credit hours. Currently 95% to 97% of UG students take 12 credit hours or more per semester

Two optional ways to move to linear tuition rates

1. Maintain the current rate per credit hour but extend that rate to a larger number of credit hours.

2. Reduce the per credit hour rate and then extend the new rate to a larger number of credit hours.

Under Option 1, if we extend the credit hour plateau from the current 10 credit hours per semester to 12 credit hours per semester, then that represents a 42% increase in tuition for those students who take more than 10 credit hours. In similar fashion, a move to 15 credit hours for the plateau would represent a proportionately higher tuition rate increase, and so on as we extend the number of credit hours that the student must pay for individually.

Under Option 2, there is a balancing act between the tuition revenue the institution loses due to reducing the existing rate per credit hour and the amount of revenue the institution gains, and the resulting effective tuition rate increase, by extending the number of credit hours the student must pay for each semester.

Under both options, there is a balancing act as the institution sees how the students adjust to the new rates by adjusting the number of credit hours they take.

3. update on on-line fee distributions

There was a change to the tuition distribution for all “outreach” courses – of which “on-line” courses are one part. Each college received a base budget equal to 87% of the average outreach tuition revenue over the past three years. Because of sharply declining outreach tuition revenue over the past three years, the College of Education received a different base budget with a three year time line in which to either restore outreach revenue to previous levels (and do the 87% plan) or have a new base budget set at substantially lower levels.

There was no change in the distribution of the $35 per credit hour “web” fee.
Linear Tuition Scenarios
Faculty Senate Discussion
2/10/2014

Indicated rates are for one semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit Hrs</th>
<th>Current Tuition</th>
<th>Option 1 Increase</th>
<th>Option 2 Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$267.50</td>
<td>$267.50</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$535.00</td>
<td>$535.00</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$802.50</td>
<td>$802.50</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,070.00</td>
<td>$1,070.00</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,337.50</td>
<td>$1,337.50</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1,605.00</td>
<td>$1,605.00</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$1,872.50</td>
<td>$1,872.50</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$2,140.00</td>
<td>$2,140.00</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$2,407.50</td>
<td>$2,407.50</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$2,267.15</td>
<td>$2,675.00</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$2,267.15</td>
<td>$2,942.50</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$2,267.15</td>
<td>$3,210.00</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$2,267.15</td>
<td>$3,477.50</td>
<td>$2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$2,267.15</td>
<td>$3,745.00</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$2,267.15</td>
<td>$4,012.50</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>$2,267.15</td>
<td>$4,280.00</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>$2,267.15</td>
<td>$4,547.50</td>
<td>$3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>$2,267.15</td>
<td>$4,815.00</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>$2,267.15</td>
<td>$5,082.50</td>
<td>$3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$2,267.15</td>
<td>$5,350.00</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>$2,267.15</td>
<td>$5,617.50</td>
<td>$4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>$2,267.15</td>
<td>$5,885.00</td>
<td>$4,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>$2,267.15</td>
<td>$6,152.50</td>
<td>$4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>$2,267.15</td>
<td>$6,420.00</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Hrs</td>
<td>Current Tuition</td>
<td>Option 1 Increase</td>
<td>Option 2 % Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NonResident UG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$921.50</td>
<td>$921.50</td>
<td>$650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,843.00</td>
<td>$1,843.00</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$2,764.50</td>
<td>$2,764.50</td>
<td>$1,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$3,686.00</td>
<td>$3,686.00</td>
<td>$2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$4,607.50</td>
<td>$4,607.50</td>
<td>$3,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$5,529.00</td>
<td>$5,529.00</td>
<td>$3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$6,450.50</td>
<td>$6,450.50</td>
<td>$4,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$7,372.00</td>
<td>$7,372.00</td>
<td>$5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$8,293.50</td>
<td>$8,293.50</td>
<td>$5,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$8,805.15</td>
<td>$9,215.00</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$8,805.15</td>
<td>$10,136.50</td>
<td>$7,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$8,805.15</td>
<td>$11,058.00</td>
<td>$7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$8,805.15</td>
<td>$11,979.50</td>
<td>$8,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$8,805.15</td>
<td>$12,901.00</td>
<td>$9,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$8,805.15</td>
<td>$13,822.50</td>
<td>$9,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>$8,805.15</td>
<td>$14,744.00</td>
<td>$10,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>$8,805.15</td>
<td>$15,665.50</td>
<td>$11,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>$8,805.15</td>
<td>$16,587.00</td>
<td>$11,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>$8,805.15</td>
<td>$17,508.50</td>
<td>$12,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$8,805.15</td>
<td>$18,430.00</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>$8,805.15</td>
<td>$19,351.50</td>
<td>$13,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>$8,805.15</td>
<td>$20,273.00</td>
<td>$14,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>$8,805.15</td>
<td>$21,194.50</td>
<td>$14,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>$8,805.15</td>
<td>$22,116.00</td>
<td>$15,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TEACHER EDUCATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE

A. FUNCTION. [See also 4300.] [ed. 7-06]

A-1. To conduct a continuing review of teacher-education policies and to promote quality teacher preparation.

A-2. To act on and submit to the respective college committees proposed changes in teacher education certifications and endorsements majors and minors.

A-3. To provide updates on state and national issues pertaining to the preparation of educators. To function as a standing committee of the university faculty and as a subcommittee of the University Curriculum Committee.

A-4. TECC will meet in September, January and March, prior to UCC deadlines, in order to facilitate curriculum changes. Meeting dates/times will be posted annually by the first week of September.

B. STRUCTURE AND MEMBERSHIP. Faculty members are nominated by the College of Education from each of the following groups: two from programs within the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, including representation from the elementary program, the secondary program, the career and technical education program and the special education program; one from the Department of Movement Science physical education teacher education program; Division of Adult, Career, and Technology Education, and one from the Department of Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance; and one from the Department of Counseling and School Psychology, Special Education, and Education Leadership; Education Certification Officer ex officio; one faculty member (in consultation with other colleges) from each of the following groups: early childhood, agricultural education, music education, English education, mathematics education, social sciences, natural sciences and business; communication, humanities, social sciences, mathematics, and natural sciences; three to four undergraduate students in education and two junior or senior level students in education (one from the College of Education and the second annually rotating between early childhood education, agricultural education and music education); three P-12 school personnel, including a superintendent, a principal and a teacher, representing both elementary and secondary education as well as multiple districts; and the Director of Assessment (w/o vote) and the Dean of the College of Education or designee (w/o vote), who serves as chair. [rev. 7-08, 7-10]