Call to Order and Minutes: The chair called the meeting to order at 3:30. A motion (Vella/Brown) to approve the minutes passed.

Chair’s Report:

1. The General Policy Report #65 is available. Petitions seeking further consideration of any item in the report are due to the chair of Faculty Senate, hrducka@uidaho.edu, by February 15, 2018;
2. Sabbatical applications for academic year 2019-20 must be received by the Sabbatical Leave Evaluation Committee by March 30, 2018. More information is available in the Sabbatical Section of the Provost’s web page.
3. Nominations for Honorary Degrees for the December 2018 commencement ceremony are due by April 15, 2018. More information is available here.

Provost Report: Vice Provost for Faculty Jeanne Stevenson explained that Provost Wiencek is travelling to attend the State Board of Education meeting. She did not have any announcements.

FS-18-047 (UCC-18-014a) – Family Consumer Science Restructure. The chair asked for a motion to change the order of the agenda to consider one of the items on the University Curriculum Committee report regarding changes to the major in Child Family and Consumer Sciences. A motion (Seamon/Watson) to change the order of the agenda was approved unanimously. Prof. Beth Price presented the change on behalf of the School of Family and Consumer Sciences. She explained that the major has had three options that have had varying levels of success meeting student needs. As a result of the proposed re-organization, all students in the major will be required to take a series of core classes. They will then be able to choose one of three emphasis areas. The proposal passed unanimously.

Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives Cher Hendricks. Vice Provost Hendricks updated senate on a new directive from the State Board of Education (SBOE) regarding general education. The SBOE wishes to implement common course numbers and names for general education courses to facilitate student transfer between Idaho institutions. Some of the changes that will result from this directive are relatively simple to implement. For example, the name of our English 101 course will have to change to English Composition 101. Some of the changes are not simple and will require us to examine the content of certain general education courses to determine whether they should align with the common courses. Hendricks explained that the directive does not require the university to change course names and numbers if the content of our courses is significantly different than that identified by the SBOE. In addition, we are not required to add courses identified in this process that are not currently part of our curriculum. Hendricks indicated that faculty can give feedback to the SBOE about this process, but that the directive is unlikely to change. Required changes need to be part of our 2019-20 catalog.

A senator asked whether this is something that other states are doing. Hendricks responded that many states are implementing similar changes. She added that some have taken a more aggressive approach by developing a common state core curriculum for all higher education institutions. She also explained that the directive affects our 100-200 level general education courses. There is some discussion at the board level about whether all general education courses should be offered at the 100-200 level.
A senator asked if Hendricks could give more background on the reasons for the directive. She indicated that the registrars at the eight Idaho institutions have been working on the transferability of credits within the Idaho higher education system for some time. Detailed articulation agreements exist and are available online. We have requested, but have not been able to see, data regarding the number and nature of problems transfer students experience. We are suggesting that a state-wide website be created where students can report and describe problems they experience when trying to transfer between Idaho institutions.

A senator asked how this directive relates to the UI core requirements. Hendricks explained that the directive does not require the university to change its core requirements, but rather only requires parallel naming and numbering of the courses that are identified as common to most Idaho institutions. Hendricks also explained that concern has been expressed that students will focus on these “transfer courses” to the exclusion of other courses that are part of our core.

Dean Jerry McMurtry, College of Graduate Studies (COGS). Dean McMurtry updated senate on the new TA compensation system. The new system reflects a complete reorganization of the way we support TAs across campus along with a significant infusion of resources to provide in-state and out-of-state tuition waivers as well as market compensation to TAs. The new system creates a central fund to support TAs that is comprised of resources made available through the University Budget and Finance Committee (UBFC) process ($2.3 million), resources from COGS ($0.9 million), and resources from individual colleges that were previously used to fund TAs ($2-3 million). The tuition numbers in the proposed TA budget reflect an estimated 4% increase in tuition for the 2018-19 academic year. Under the new system TA compensation will increase from approximately the 9th percentile of the national average to near 50th percentile, in-state fees will be covered, and resources for out-of-state tuition will be available. Compensation levels are based on the Oklahoma State Salary Survey and applicable CIP codes. In order to establish a baseline for the program, the number of TA packages in 2018-19 will be based on the number of TAs used in 2017-18. 280 TA packages were distributed to colleges in 2017.

Dean McMurtry provided a document to senators that shows by college and, sometimes, department, the prior average TA compensation, the new TA compensation, the value of the compensation package considering both in-state and out-of-state tuition, as well as other information. McMurtry also stated that in the future, TA compensation will be eligible for change in employee compensation (CEC). The Graduate Council is developing ways to evaluate requests for new TAs.

A senator commented that it appears that the TA budget for some colleges is less under the new system than it was under the prior system. McMurtry explained that some units were artificially inflating the hourly rate for TAs to allow students to pay in-state fees. He worked to identify these units and separate out the inflated amount from the actual compensation levels for the TA. No college will see a decrease in the value of the TA compensation packages. A senator from one of the colleges commented that even though their new TA budget appears to be lower, the new proposal will actually result in a substantial increase in compensation to TAs.

A senator asked how the decisions about where to deploy TAs would be made in the new central system. McMurtry responded that deans would make the decisions about where to deploy TAs. It appears that most of the deans have decided to put the money back into existing TA positions. McMurtry has not seen reallocations under the new system so far.

Another senator asked how the need for a TA will be evaluated. McMurtry responded that he hopes to evaluate the allocation every semester, but particularly in fall. If a unit isn’t using its TAs, those resources will be re-deployed. A subcommittee of Graduate Council will make decisions regarding such reallocations of funding. A senator commented that it will be important to make sure that counterproductive incentives are not created by such allocations. McMurtry responded that COGS is working to ensure that the university maintains the
quality of TAs. He added that COGS must approve the Employee Personnel Action Form (EPAF) for each TA that is hired.

A senator thanked McMurtry for his efforts and commented that the new system is “a game changer.” Another senator commented that currently we are very short of TAs in some disciplines. He asked whether departments should request new TAs. McMurtry acknowledged that both the College of Science and the College of Letters Arts and Social Sciences are short of TAs to adequately support their responsibilities in the general education curriculum. He indicated that COGS is working to develop proposals for additional monies to support TAs.

A senator asked whether there is an effort to improve the experience of TAs along with increasing their compensation. McMurtry stated that COGS is working to increase the professional development opportunities for TAs. It currently offers a support program for international TAs as well as a “TA boot camp.” The senator followed up by commenting that she had seen some documentation that appeared to impose minimum requirements for TAs. She asked McMurtry if he could explain these requirements. He responded that the university is working to embed new national standards into the TA appointment guidelines. In addition, he added that the goal of the program is to foster academic-year TA appointments. Departments may still offer one-semester TA appointments which are sometimes appropriate. TA awards must be either for one semester or a full academic year. A senator asked about the emphasis on awarding TA appointments to students in terminal degree programs? McMurtry confirmed that this is a preference and is aimed at increasing the number of terminal degree students. Departments may still award TA appointments to students who are not in a terminal degree program. A senator urged other faculty to consider committing to the continuation of TA appointments until a student completes his or her degree. McMurtry commented that some units start by offering a TA appointment and later move the student to an RA appointment.

A senator commented that in his college there is a historic inequity in the allocation of TAs. He asked for clarification on whether and how these historic imbalances would be corrected. McMurtry confirmed that he has observed such imbalances. He stressed that he relied on the current allocation of TAs in order to establish a baseline for the new program. He anticipates that changes in TA allocations will be made in the future and stated that the system will be continuously evaluated. He anticipates that allocation decisions will continue to be made by deans. A senator asked whether steps are being taken to ensure that TA compensation rates keep up with the market. McMurtry commented that TAs will be eligible for CEC. He realizes that this does not necessarily ensure that such salaries will keep up with market conditions. He added that the tuition aspects of the compensation will keep up with increases in tuition. In the end, increases in TA compensation will have to be included in our budgeting process. Finally, McMurtry pointed out that we have a cap on the number of out-of-state tuition waivers we can offer. We did not hit the cap this year, but he believes we will do so in the future. A senator asked whether “foundation dollars” could be used for TA compensation. McMurtry responded that some departments have monies for TAs from gifts. He encouraged units to think about TA compensations as a development priority.

Committee on Committees Report:

1. **FS-18-042 - FSH 1640.74** - Sabbatical Leave Evaluation Committee. Vice Chair Miranda Anderson presented the report for the Committee on Committees and the Sabbatical Leave Evaluation Committee. Last semester senate approved revisions to the sabbatical leave application policy. The proposal aligns the committee process with the earlier changes. Under the proposal, a committee member would not be required to recuse themselves for a full semester if they are applying for a sabbatical. Rather, the policy now requires that the committee member need only recuse themselves from consideration of their own application. Anderson explained that sabbatical proposals are not in competition with each other. The recusal system caused disruptions while the Committee on Committees located an alternate committee member. The proposal passed unanimously.

2. **FS-18-043 - FSH 1640.54** - Institutional Review Board. Jenn Walker from the Office of Research and Economic Development presented the proposal. The changes in the proposal are minor and bring the Institutional Review Board into compliance with earlier changes in the university’s human participant
review policy *(Faculty-Staff Handbook 5200)* approved by senate earlier in the semester. A senator suggested the abbreviation for the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) be spelled out. The edited proposal was approved unanimously.

**University Curriculum Committee Report.**

1. **FS-18-044 (UCC-18-038a), FS-18-045 (UCC-18-038b) and FS-18-046 (UCC-18-038c):** Catalog Change J-3-c, J-3-f, J-3-g. Rebecca Frost from the Registrar’s Office presented the changes. These changes were approved by the University Committee on General Education this year using rubrics for this section of our general education requirement. The changes add two courses to science core offerings, deletes two courses from the diversity core offerings and adds two courses to the international core offerings. The proposal was approved unanimously.

2. **FS-18-048 (UCC-18-014b):** Plant Sciences - new Crop Management minor. Professor Joe Kuhl presented the proposal. He explained that since the major in crop management was created in 2017, a number of students have expressed interest in a minor. The proposal was approved unanimously.

**Andrew Brewick, Executive Director, Global Student Success Program.** Director Brewick provided an overview of the Global Student Success Program (GSSP). The program is a partnership between UI and Navitas. Their goal is to put the Navitas name in the background. GSSP is a UI program relying on UI courses, and UI faculty. The program includes courses that are the equivalent to the first year of a bachelor’s degree program. In addition, it includes courses that focus on helping undergraduate students to be successful in traditional college courses, and that focus on the transition and language skills. For graduate students, the program offers a 12-credit course sequence. The graduate courses are not UI courses and do not count toward a graduate degree. Rather, they are designed to help graduate students to be successful in graduate-level courses. The program has admitted two cohorts of students this year. In the fall, 13 undergraduate and 13 graduate students were admitted representing eight countries. The applicant pool was very encouraging and included students from over 30 countries. In the spring cohort, two undergraduate students and 17 graduate students were admitted. This initial reaction is very encouraging and indicates that the UI program has broad appeal in the global market. The program is currently recruiting its fall 2018 class. They have two recruiters who will be visiting 14 countries in the next three months to recruit students.

Navitas has ten university partners in North America. The goal of Navitas is to form a true partnership. The company wants to facilitate the offering of UI courses, not dilute those offerings. Each course they offered to the GSSP students is approved by the course coordinator who is a department chair. Faculty offering the courses are identified and approved by the chair. These faculty receive the same compensation as a comparable UI faculty member would receive. The course coordinator also monitors the grades in the course to ensure they correspond to UI standards and practices. Brewick pointed out that he reports to both institutions through a joint strategic management board comprised of both UI and Navitas representatives. One issue Brewick wished to clarify is that GSSP is not an English as a Second Language (ESL) Program. While GSSP offers support for language skills, it cooperates closely with UI’s ESL program – the American Language and Culture Program (ALCP).

In terms of student recruitment, Navitas has 27 country offices and over 3500 agents throughout the world. A senator asked about the list of countries in the GSSP brochure provided with the senate agenda. Brewick explained that the list is not exclusive, but instead represents those countries identified as most likely prospects for students. Another senator asked about what graduate students are told about graduate support at UI. Brewick responded that students are told they are not eligible for TA or RA appointments while they are in the GSSP. The first cohort contained two students who had some unique qualifications and subsequently were hired as TAs/RAs. However, the program is maintaining a firm line regarding eligibility for TA and RA appointments. Once the students progress out of the GSSP, they may be eligible for such appointments. In addition, all program participants are eligible for jobs on campus. The GSSP makes clear that students must be self-funded.
Brewick also explained that most of the graduate programs they are working on, are non-thesis programs that can be completed in 2 years. A senator asked how the initial GSSP programs were selected. Brewick explained that the programs were identified during the creation and launch of the project as being the most marketable. The GSSP is open to new partnerships with additional programs and are trying to identify those programs that would benefit from GSSP. A senator asked about the specific admission requirement for students from Nigeria (set forth in the brochure). He commented that the requirement was very low compared to normal college admissions expectations. Brewick explained that the students in the GSSP generally have admissions profiles that are borderline for being admitted to a US college. However, he explained that the pathway/cohort model employed in the program has proven successful in bringing these students up to the level necessary to succeed. Because the program is new, it does not have data on student outcomes. However, initial results are promising. In the first cohort of students, 85% persisted from fall semester to spring semester. Those who transitioned away did so for family reasons. Furthermore, in the first cohort of 13 undergrads, 7 were directly admissible to UI. They opted to participate in the GSSP to get the additional support. Brewick added that the delivery model employed by GSSP for a 3-credit course is to provide students with hours of contact time thereby building in tutoring, language, and writing support.

A senator asked whether students participating in the GSSP are eligible for the full range of student benefits, such as use of the Student Recreation Center. Brewick responded that they were eligible for the full range of student benefits and activities.

Another senator asked about the UI cost of the Navitas program, and whether the program is cost effective. Brewick responded that the program uses a revenue share model. Both UI and Navitas get a share of the student tuition. Moving forward, the university will capture all the tuition that is paid. The program is not currently breaking even. Navitas has made a significant investment and hopes to expand the program. Brewick reminded senators that the US has seen a 30% decline in international enrollment. In addition, it appears that visa denials have increased recently. 54% of students in the spring cohort of the GSSP were denied visas. Brewick also added that UI has provided space and paid to have it renovated. Navitas is paying the overhead and salaries. A senator asked how long the UI is committed to the Navitas partnership. Brewick answered that there is a 10-year obligation that can be reviewed in the 5th year.

Brewick closed by announcing that the GSSP is sponsoring a speaker series. The program has identified faculty colleagues around campus and asked them to share their experiences. He encouraged faculty to contact him if they are interested in participating. He also indicated his desire to secure a senator to serve on the GSSP Academic Advisory Committee. The responsibilities of the committee include evaluating the progress of the program, evaluating new program partnerships, and keeping the GSSP apprised of policy and curriculum changes at UI. Concern was expressed that senators might not be in a position to commit the additional time to the committee. Brewick was encouraged to consider to seek committee members from the faculty in general.

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned (Morrison/Tibbals) at 4:55.

Respectfully Submitted,

Liz Brandt, Faculty Secretary &
Secretary to the Faculty Senate