University of Idaho
2010-2011
FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #11

3:30 p.m.
Tuesday, November 16, 2010
BRINK HALL FACULTY LOUNGE

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2010-11 Faculty Senate Meeting #10, November 9, 2010

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.

VI. Committee Reports.

   University Curriculum Committee:
   • FS-11-013: (UCC-11-041) Change Geology to Earth Science (Gunter)

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.
   • FS-11-014: Professional Development and Learning (Christiansen)

X. Adjournment.

Professor Dan Eveleth, Chair 2010-2011, Faculty Senate

Attachments:
Minutes of Meeting #10
FS-11-013
FS-11-014
University of Idaho  
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
2010-11 Meeting #10  
Tuesday, November 9, 2010

Present: Baillargeon, Barlow, Bathurst, Budwig (Boise), Dakins (Idaho Falls), Duval (Coeur d’Alene) Edwards, Christiansen for Baker (w/o vote), Eveleth (Chair), Fairley, Graden, Haggart (w/o vote), Halloran, Hasko, Hopper, Horn, Hoversten, Huber, Joyce (Vice Chair), Lawrence, Limbaugh, Marshall, A., Marshall, J., Mosman, Riesenberg, Stark, Strawn. Absent: Baker, Hopper, Horn, A. Marshall, J . Marshall, Lawrence, Riesenberg, Stark. Guests: 6

Call to Order. A quorum being present, Chair Eveleth called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m. in the Brink Hall Faculty Lounge and via video link with the off-campus centers.

Minutes: The minutes of Faculty Senate meeting #9, held on November 2, 2010, were approved as distributed. With regard to those approved minutes, Senator Edwards asked for permission to speak to the senate and it was granted. Edwards wanted it officially recorded in these minutes that he was troubled by the breakup of the MMBB department. He noted that it was previously a very strong department that provided excellent undergraduate and graduate degrees. He expressed regret that a reorganization was needed to maintain the important elements of this academic program.

Chair’s Report: Chair Eveleth reported on the following items:

- Thanked Ann, Pete, and Paul for taking care of senate business while he was away.
- His absence was due to his taking part in an accreditation at another university. He found it to be a rewarding experience and encouraged others to accept, if offered, to participate in an accreditation review although warning it was time-consuming.
- He and UI president Nellis have signed a letter that is being sent to all faculty members asking for volunteers to serve on university level committees. Faculty members should respond by giving their committee preferences which will be forwarded to the Committee on Committees. He especially encouraged younger faculty to become involved in committee work as a part of their service commitment to the university.
- The senate leadership group will be meeting during the next two weeks with, the registrar to discuss cross-listing of courses with BSU and ISU, with Lloyd Mues to talk about the benefits group, with the president to let him know what the senate is working on and to see what is on his agenda, and finally with the university legal counsel to see about speeding up the legal aspects of the memorandums of understanding process.
- Eveleth reminded the senate membership to be sure and submit their nominations for members of the university level promotion committee.

Provost Report: In the absence of Provost Baker, Vice Provost Jeanne Christiansen gave the following report:

- The provost, along with UI associate deans Larry Stauffer and Mario Reyes, have spent 10 days in China working with seven different institutions who have indicated that they would like to have a relationship with the UI. There appear to be a number of opportunities for partnerships in China.
- A group of people involved in emergency management met today. It is important that the university be prepared to respond to any number of types of emergency situations. A test emergency “scenario” is scheduled for Wednesday.
- Christiansen visited an institution last week that is using the new standards that the UI will be using for its accreditation. The information she gathered about these changes in standards and review periods will be helpful to the UI as it prepares for accreditation. Christiansen offered to make a presentation on the new standards and the accreditation process at a future senate meeting.
- This Friday will be a busy day with the BSU football game and many people will be visiting the campus. She asked everyone to help as best they can to make our visitors feel welcome and comfortable on the UI campus.
In response to Christiansen’s remarks, Senator Dale Graden suggested that on the UI’s next visit to China the administration consider taking along some of our Chinese faculty members. The inclusion of these faculty members would offer “an immense benefit” to the establishment of partnerships with educational institutions in China.

Other Announcements and Communication. Four members of the Benefits Advisory Group (BAG), Susan Clark (Director of Payroll Services), Niki Jones (Benefits Administration Manager), Holly Wichman, (Biological Sciences faculty), and Mark McGuire (Animal and Veterinary Sciences faculty), provided the senate with background information on the deliberations of this group in their role in advising the university administration about the UI health benefits program.

These representatives of BAG told the senate that details about health benefits are available on the web and all employees should have received printed communication about all of the changes to the plan for the coming calendar year. The big changes were: going from three to two plan choices, dealing with federal health care changes, bringing in new opportunities for vision and dental care, the reduction in benefit coverage dollars which also included a reduction due to forced premium holidays from the state, and changes in the way that benefits are paid (the removal of the “choice dollars” plan) to make it simpler. Ninety-five percent of those completing the process of enrollment for next year have done it on the web without any staff assistance.

Chair Eveleth then asked for comments and questions from the senate. The discussion period covered the following areas of interest:

- Employees were having trouble comparing the cost of last year’s premiums with the costs for the coming year. The representatives responded that there is a new simpler system now for figuring the cost and reporting that to the employee. Therefore direct comparisons are difficult to make. In the past, payroll information showed the total cost of an employee’s plan and then gave them back the dollars that the university and state were paying. Now it just shows the difference between the two figures – the amount that the employee actually pays each month.

- Employees who have spouses working less than full time for the university seem to be paying more for health care than those whose spouses do not work for the UI and are on the family plan. There cannot be double coverage on the extra offerings like vision and dental care. Since medical and dental are no longer tied to the main health plan, the part-time spouse can choose the dental or vision plan or be included on the full-time employee’s dental or vision plan.

- Was there any thought given to engaging the employees in a dialog about what appears to be a disparity in changes in medical coverage costs between single and married employees? We knew that the cost of those plans were not actuarially correct during the previous two years. The family plans were subsidizing the single employee plan. This year we started to bring those costs back to a more balanced actuarial cost risk of those two groups. Family plans saw a reduction in cost while single plans increased. Part of the problem is that you don’t know what that risk is until after the fact. The benefits group’s goal is to recommend a system that is as fair as possible. All plans are thoroughly discussed by the benefits group which is representative of the university employee population.

- What is the process that the benefit group uses in making its recommendations? We have consultants that are licensed to produce actuarial information on which we can base our recommendations. The same actuarial information is also available to the administration.

- What year are we in the current plan and what is the history of the UI providing a plan different from other Idaho peer institutions? We seem to be paying more than they are. We are now almost three years into the self-funding plan. Yes, we are paying more than Idaho peer institutions. In 1967 the UI decided to offer full health care to its emeritus retirees, something not offered to any other state retiree. That plan was stopped when we changed to the self-funding plan in 2005, but we are still obligated to offer health coverage to retirees at the same cost as we do for current employees.

- Does a person making $300,000 a year pay the same health care premium for an identical plan as the employee making $25,000 a year? Yes. However, using some other system is something that does come up in the benefit group discussion. Senator Dale Graden urged the benefits committee to seriously consider a graduated health care premium system that would require those with a higher income to pay more in premiums than those with a lower income.
The recreation center benefit is now gone. What kind of discussion went into making that decision? The group found that benefit to be very expensive. We have a set amount of money for wellness and we felt that there were better ways to use that money with a broader view of wellness that would produce more dramatic wellness results.

What does the state pay for employee benefits? The average is about $7,400 per employee, which is less than the previous year by almost a thousand dollars.

Professor Wichman commented on her service on the benefits group. She said that it took her three years just to learn the language that is used in discussing health care benefits and costs. Putting together health plans is very complicated. Premiums are based on actual costs and you are trying to balance the financial impact on several different employee scenarios as well as working with a minimal allowance per employee from the state that has decreased. Because of the way the system works, the real cost of a new plan is not known until you are already into the second year. Federal mandates often come without any guidelines and now we have a new federal health care reform program that has many parts still being ironed out. We also spend a lot of time talking about wellness and how to get people to buy into a wellness program. The people working in benefits are doing an incredible job at keeping the costs reasonable and are amazing in their ability to decipher the new mandates without guidelines.

Senator Strawn and others spoke in favor of the high deductible plan and also the $1,000 match in the health savings plan that allows employees to build up a health savings reserve fund. In answering a question from Strawn about raising the matching funds, the benefits representatives indicated that raising the match would result in higher premiums.

The senate felt that it would help the employees to know more about the issues we have been talking about. The more information the benefits group can get to the employee in advance will help the employee understand the changes. Good communication with the employees can only lead to less misunderstanding and better public relations for the benefits group.

The benefits group is looking for a new faculty member to represent the younger members of the faculty. Chair Eveleth urged the senate to identify faculty members who could fill that role and encourage them to apply for that open spot on the BAG.

University Curriculum Committee:

- FS-11-009 (UCC-11-032) Change in Catalog Regulation I. After a brief discussion and information from the registrar’s office, the seconded motion from the University Curriculum Committee was approved by unanimous vote.
- FS-11-010 (UCC-11-033) Change option name: Food and Bioprocess Engineering to Bioengineering. The seconded motion from the University Curriculum Committee was approved by unanimous vote.

University Faculty Affairs Committee: Chair Eveleth reminded the senate that the following items had been approved by the 2009-2010 senate and also approved at the spring 2010 general faculty meeting. However, despite the personal approval by UI president Nellis, he turned down the recommended changes based on advice from university legal counsel. Counsel believed the definition and use of the term “partner” instead of “spouse” would not be legal in the state of Idaho.

At an earlier meeting of the current senate, these two items were sent back to the Faculty Affairs Committee for reconsideration based on the opinion of the UI president and counsel.

The Faculty Affairs Committee has now returned those two items to the Faculty Senate with the word “partner” removed and replaced by “spouse.”

Eveleth then read to the senate the memorandum from Professor Don Crowley, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee that accompanied the return of the items. The chair, prior to reading the memo, noted that he
appreciated Professor Crowley’s comments because they are similar to the chair’s feelings about the “partner” versus “spouse” issue.

The Faculty Affairs Committee is sending two proposed policies back to the Faculty Senate with the troublesome word “partner” removed. It is the view of the Faculty Affairs Committee that the wording of the proposals sent in last year was the proper wording. We feel the University of Idaho should make the benefits it provides eligible to all our employees on an equal basis. However, the Committee does not wish to continue to have worthwhile policies sent back while we engage in a quest for the magic words to allow us to avoid a potential conflict.

Professor Crowley addressed the senate and told them that for a university that considers itself welcoming and open, it seemed a shame not to approve the original items sent to the president last year. Senator Graden saw this issue as a real opportunity for the university administration to show leadership and for the president to take the lead in making same sex partner accommodation a reality at the University of Idaho. It was also pointed out that seven miles away, at Washington State University, partner accommodation is embraced. Crowley asked what we were protecting ourselves from, except a discussion at the state level of this important issue. However, some expressed the opinion that we needed to approve these policies to accommodate spouses and then tackle the partner issue as a separate problem. The chair noted that they would be meeting with the president this Friday and they would include the partner issue in their discussion.

- **FS-11-011: Dual Career Accommodation** This is a new university policy. In response to a question, it was noted that staff did participate in the discussion of these changes and the Staff Affairs Committee, although noting it was not in the best interests of staff, recognized it should go forward and offered changes that were incorporated into the policy. The seconded motion from the Faculty Affairs Committee was approved by majority vote.

- **FS-11-012: FSH 3750 Educational Fee and Tuition Deduction** The primary purpose of the changes to this policy are to make it less restrictive. After the overall discussion points noted above, the seconded motion from the Faculty Affairs Committee was approved by unanimous vote.

In response to a question, Vice Chair Joyce commented on an item that he had brought up at a previous senate meeting concerning the possibility of an enhanced educational benefit for university employee dependents. He said that the faculty senate chair from BSU had told him that there could be a trial run for offering educational benefits to either a spouse or dependent at a 50% reduction in fees. However, when the UI provost was told of this proposed trial he said that he had never heard of it. Another UI administrator said that it had been part of an overall discussion of educational benefits at an SBOE meeting. Joyce said that the issue appears to be a “non-starter” at the administrative level at the UI and we will have to wait and see if BSU does attempt to offer that benefit. The UI already offers a substantial educational benefit to spouses, but not to dependents.

Adjournment: There being no other business to come before the senate, a motion to adjourn was accepted and passed by unanimous vote. Chair Eveleth adjourned the meeting at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter A. Haggart
Acting Faculty Secretary
TO:    University Curriculum Committee
FROM:  College of Science
RE:    Change of name for an existing teaching minor  [Summer 2011]
DATE:  November 02, 2010

The College of Education is requesting that the teaching minor in Geology be change to Earth Science. Note, the curricular changes have already been reviewed and approved by UCC and appear in General Curriculum Report 258.
POLICY COVER SHEET
(See Faculty Staff Handbook 1460 for instructions at UI policy website: www.webs.uidaho.edu/uipolicy)

Chapter & Title: Chapter 3, Employee Professional Development and Learning

All policies must be reviewed, approved and returned by a policy sponsor, with a cover sheet attached to apm@uidaho.edu or fsh@uidaho.edu respectively.

*Note: If revision/deletion request original document from apm@uidaho.edu or fsh@uidaho.edu, all changes must be made using “track changes.”

Originator(s): Jeanne Christiansen June 8, 2010
(Please see FSH 1460 C)

Telephone & Email: 208.885.7941 jeannec@uidaho.edu

Policy Sponsor: Mike Jolly June 8, 2010
(If different than originator.)

Telephone & Email: 208.885 3478 jolly@uidaho.edu

Reviewed by General Counsel X Yes ____No Name & Date: Kent Nelson 2010-10609 / FAC rev./appr. Sept. 29, 2010/ SAC 11/3/10 /HR

I. Policy/Procedure Statement: Briefly explain the purpose/reason of proposed addition, revision, and/or deletion to the Faculty/Staff Handbook or the Administrative Procedures Manual.

The Professional Development Task Force reviewed the policies and procedures supporting opportunities for employees to engage in professional development, learning, and training. The university does not have a specific policy addressing professional development opportunities for employees; the Task Force recommends the adoption of policy for supervisor and employee reference.

II. Fiscal Impact: What fiscal impact, if any, will this addition, revision, or deletion have?

The policy adoption in and of itself does not carry direct fiscal impact. The university currently employs staff to develop and direct university-sponsored professional development and learning programs, working in concert with internal experts for program design, delivery, and assessment.

University employees may continue to be engaged in professional development with costs associated with access (e.g., webinar fees, professional meetings). These costs have been borne at the unit level in the past and will continue to be budgeted locally.

III. Related Policies/Procedures: Describe other policies or procedures existing that are related or similar to this proposed change.

The review of existing policies included identification of Faculty Staff Handbook and Administrative Procedures Manual policies and procedures and included FSH 3320, 3340, 3360, 3370, and 3710. No changes are recommended for these policies.

IV. Effective Date: This policy shall be effective on July 1, or January 1, whichever arrives first after final approval (see FSH 1460 D) unless otherwise specified in the policy.

If not a minor amendment forward to: ________________________________

Policy Coordinator
Appr. & Date: __________________
[Office Use Only]

FSH
Appr. ____________
FS ____________
GFM ____________
Pres./Prov. ____________
[Office Use Only]

APM
F&A Appr.: ____________
[Office Use Only]

Track # __ UP-11-006__
Date Rec.: __11/3/10__
Posted: t-sheet ____________
h/c ____________
web ____________
Register: ____________________
(Office Use Only)
EMPLOYEE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND LEARNING

PREAMBLE: This section describes the university’s commitment to professional development and learning opportunities for employees. The organization, culture, and climate at the University of Idaho are enhanced by employees who are innovative, knowledgeable, and engaged in life-long learning through a system of professional development. These opportunities lead to a positive, dynamic, adaptable, and vital work climate in which employees share a passion for knowledge, innovation and creativity while maintaining high academic and ethical standards. For more information on Employee Professional Development and Learning, visit www.uidaho.edu/pdl.

A. Introduction
B. Definitions
C. General
D. Miscellaneous

A. Introduction: The University of Idaho is a dynamic learning community committed to high quality, ongoing, and sustainable professional development opportunities for all employees. The university encourages employees to meet professional and personal goals through a comprehensive system of flexible learning opportunities that build and increase knowledge and skills, facilitate networking with colleagues, and support career advancement.

B. Definitions.

B-1. Professional Development: a learning process that expands the capacity of an employee to advance in the responsibilities defined in his/her position description and/or personal aspirations and aligns with the university’s goals, enhancing an employee’s expertise and ability.

B-2. Self-directed: chosen by the employee to enhance personal skills, knowledge and abilities, or for career advancement. Examples include: taking an unrelated class taken for personal interest, attending a conference, obtaining additional training.

B-3. University-directed: work-related education and training required by the University in general, the employee’s supervisor and/or the position description. Examples include: performance management and supervisory skill development, teaching, technical skills (such as grant writing, Banner training or software programs), regulatory requirements (such as certification, legal compliance), and university policy and procedure.
B-4. Training, Workshop, or Conference Presentations:
development and dissemination of material that conveys an employee’s expertise, experience and knowledge to advance professional development at the University.

C. General. The focus and means of an employee’s professional development and learning activities, University-directed or self-directed, shall be guided by university and unit objectives and needs, available resources, and individual goals. Supervisors/unit administrators shall encourage, foster and expect participation in ongoing professional development and learning opportunities. Examples include: training, workshops, or conference presentations, faculty sabbatical leave (FSH 3720) or staff professional leave (FSH 3710 P), university academic courses (FSH 3740), and other activities agreed upon.

C-1. Advance Approval: Participation in professional development and learning activity shall be discussed with the employee’s supervisor or unit administrator and approved in advance.

C-2. Supervisor Responsibilities: Supervisors/unit administrators will support professional development and learning for all employees. During the annual review, professional development and learning opportunities shall be discussed with the employee’s supervisor/unit administrator in developing the goals for the upcoming year. The types and reasonable hours for same will be agreed upon based off the overall unit’s expectations and strategic plan.

C-3. Expenses: Reimbursement for participation in professional development and learning opportunities may be obtained from the unit (at the unit’s discretion) or other appropriate university source, resources permitting, and may include: travel, per diem, living expenses, and registration fees.

D. Miscellaneous.

D-1. Professional Development Time Reporting for Classified Employees:
   a. Self-directed professional development and learning outside regular work hours is not considered time worked and is ineligible for compensatory time or overtime (see FSH 3460).
   b. University-directed professional development and learning is considered part of the employees work time and as such is eligible for compensatory time or overtime (see FSH 3460 and APM 70.04).

D-2. Alternative arrangements can be made for external professional development and learning opportunities through flextime and flexplace (see FSH 3250).

Comment [a1]: It was suggested that on the Staff evaluation form, a checkbox be inserted with the following statement: 1) I have had the opportunity to discuss professional development with my supervisor; 2) I have engaged in the following professional development ……