Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2010-11 Faculty Senate Meeting #25, April 19, 2011

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.
   • Report from Finance & Administration (Lloyd Mues)
   • Benefits Advisory Group Report

VI. Committee Reports.

   UCC:
   • FS-11-033: Regulation J-3 (Aiken, Chandler, Henscheid, Storrs)

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.
   • FS-11-044: FSH 3450 – Presidential Actions to Manage Expenditures to Respond to Financial Challenges (Nelson)

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Dan Eveleth, Chair 2010-2011, Faculty Senate

Attachments:
   Minutes of Meeting #25
University of Idaho
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
2010-11 Meeting #25 Tuesday April 19, 2011

Present: Baillargeon, Barlow, Baker (w/o vote), Bathurst, Bird, Budwig (Boise), Dakins (Idaho Falls), Edwards, Eveleth, Fairley, Halloran, Brandt for Hasko (w/o vote), Hopper, Hoversten, Krug, Marshall, A., Marshall, J., Riesenberge, Stark, Strawn. Absent: Duval (Coeur d'Alene), Garrison, Hill (w/o vote), Huber, Joyce, Limbaugh, Mosman, Padgham-Albrecht. Guests: 6

A quorum being present, the Chair called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m.

Minutes: It was moved (Barlow/Krug) to accept the minutes of meeting #24 as distributed. Approved unanimously.

Chair’s Report: The 2011 Excellence Awards ceremony the previous evening had many impressive candidates (faculty, staff and students). The chair made particular mention of the three faculty chosen as Distinguished Professors: Daniel Bukvich, J. Michael Scott, and Jeanne Shreeve. This new title was discussed by many including President Nellis upon his arrival, Goal 3, Faculty Affairs, and General Counsel. In the true spirit of shared governance, all worked on its inclusion into the Faculty-Staff Handbook and approval by this body and the university faculty last year. The state board is meeting in Moscow this week, and student fee increases will be presented. Marty Peterson reported the legislative session had gone well, including successfully opposed the gun bill. Information Technology Services (IT) has been exploring alternatives to save money e.g. lab closures, student license for Windows, etc. Tony Opheim of Information Technology Services sought input from the Senate IT committee on ways to also save money. Mr. Opheim reported to Chair Eveleth that he valued and appreciated the committee’s review noting several of ideas from the committee will be considered. Unsure of the answer to a senator’s question of when the IT changes will be shared with the broader community, Chair Eveleth said he would check and will report back later. The Chair concluded his report reminding all of the University Faculty Meeting on May 5th and encouraged senators to spread the word to their constituents as a quorum is important.

International Faculty: The chair invited Rebecca Brown, Director of the International Programs Office (IPO), Tammi Johnson, International Student, Scholar and Faculty Services Coordinator, Sunil Ramalingam, Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) and Hoey Graham, Sr. Assoc. General Counsel to provide senate with a quick overview of the processes involved in inviting and hiring international staff and faculty to the University and assisting with integration into the University and Moscow communities. Federal regulations and the university’s compliance with same were addressed to provide a better understanding of the many challenges we face. The process is very lengthy and time consuming involving many individuals and reliance on outside entity’s responses. However, if everyone understands the process of getting faculty and staff here and through the visa process, it can work well. All handouts, PowerPoint, flow-charts, and lists (including an academic advisors of international students information sheet) will be posted on the International Program website and Faculty Senate website http://www.webs.uidaho.edu/facultycouncil/.

J-1 Scholar: temporary positions, faculty or researcher, non-tenure track - Tammi Johnson.

- 5 year limit, proof of funding ~$13,620 (125% of poverty level) plus $500 per dependent, offer letter should specifically state the scholarly activity and expectations, no job posting requirement (waiver from HR), approval from the unit chair, college and provost;
- Obtain J-1 Sponsor Request form from Ms. Johnson who also provides a step-by-step checklist. Includes list of documents, how to fill out, by whom (scholar and sponsoring faculty), payment of
fees, required signatures, sent to OSP for a Restricted Party screening review conducted by Mr. Ramalingam.
- DS-2019 form (initiated by department, issued by IPO, completed packet express mailed to scholar to begin US Visa application process),
- SEVIS I-901 - a government program used by the Department of Homeland Security and required before scheduling an interview. Fee of $180 is paid by scholar or sponsoring faculty/department,

- Department Responsibility (every effort should be made in welcoming the scholar):
  - Assist with, and if possible, inspect possible housing facilities before sponsor’s arrival, arrange airport pickup, UI Vandal card, email, and application for a social security number (required if the scholar is paid by the UI, can apply after 10 days being in the U.S.).
  - Check in with IPO as soon as possible so Ms. Johnson can verify SEVIS and all documents. A 30 day window exists before and after the begin date on the DS-2019 or documents become invalid. It is important to verify they are not out of status or the documents do not become invalid.
- A one hour orientation of Moscow, the community and University is given by IPO.
- Scholar needs a home address and health insurance to cover what the UI is unable to: 1) medical evacuation, and 2) repatriation, if scholar must return home (or becomes deceased) and their scholarly duties cannot be fulfilled.
- If salary is paid by UI and benefits are received, they must attend new employee orientation; if not, they must visit Risk Management to complete a liability waiver form.

H1-B process: permanent positions, tenure track, or long term temporary positions, for those who are in a specialty field (B.S. degree or higher is required) - Tammi Johnson
- Once the position is offered and been accepted, contact Ms. Johnson in IPO who sends a checklist.
- Submit documents and budget number for Department of Labor (DOL) and Homeland Security fees.
- DOL process that previously took seconds now takes 7-21 days for approval, the days of last minute H1-B’s are gone. At least 3-4 weeks advance notice is necessary for the DOL and the newly required Export Control review.
- Fees may be paid by the department or scholar (beware that if paid by scholar it could affect the prevailing wage requirement as it comes out of their salary).
- DOL certification sent off to USCIS, via FedEx (paid by department) for tracking this petition application that involved many hours of work.
- Labor Conditions Application is posted in a public area in the department and IPO for 10 days.
- USCIS sends a notice of receipt of application (1-2 weeks). Factors that affect this include:
  - an employee outside US or different visa category - must wait for approval notice before arriving, could take 3-7 months for processing at USCIS, or
  - porting (or transferring from another position) - can begin work when notice is in hand.
- All of these processes are outside of the university’s and IPO’s control.
- Regular fees are $825 ($500 anti-fraud and $325 petition fee). If you need the person here sooner, a premium processing fee of $1,225 extra will produce a guaranteed answer (may not be approval) within 15 business days.
- Employee must have packet in hand, pay fee on line, and make appointment with U.S. consulate. This could be a day to several months depending on location of the consulate and its workload. A website on the U.S. government site (http://travel.state.gov/visa/temp/wait/wait_4638.html) tracks each consulate’s day to day processes.

Legal Permanent Residency Process: The next step after an H-1B, a visa category where the employee can have dual intent (non-immigrant intent and immigrant intent) - Hoey Graham. When applying for a specific type of Legal Permanent Residency (LPR), labor certification is required. Federal law requires
that the labor certification must be paid by the employer. Employees use outside lawyers for the LPR process. There is a lawyer in Louisiana who does get a lot of business from UI employees/faculty who are applying for LPR. They work closely with our IPO and Counsel’s office throughout the entire process.

IPO’s role is as a liaison between employee and lawyer e.g. providing information, taking care of agreement with lawyer, and assisting in collecting signatures and documents. Fees for the LPR process may be paid by the departments or by the employee. But work will not begin until the lawyer is paid. The lawyer assures that:

- proper recruitment and position requirements have been met, e.g. printed ad in professional journal or Chronicle of Higher Education. In response to a Senator’s comment that a print ready ad would be ideal and has been a cause of past issues, IPO has straightened this out with HR.
- 30 days following publication the labor certification is filed with DOL (6 months to a year for DOL approval).
- Immigrant Petition I-140 is filed within 90 days after approval of the Labor Certification. Approval of the I-140 can take 1-2 years. An 18 month window exists once a position has been, for making application for permanent residency, and employees can be on a fast track to permanent residency within that time. Start the process for permanent residency at least 12 months after offer date, preferably not later than 5 years into H-1B (H-1B valid for a maximum of 6 years.)

In closing, Graham noted that we are lucky to have such experienced people in the IP Office who are very good at what they do. Tammi’s checklists and processes are invaluable even private lawyers and Boise State seek her advice.

Export Control Certification I-129 – Faculty/Graduate Students H-1B Status – Non-US Person - Sunil Ramalingam. Federal government requires universities to state whether or not a person coming on an H-1B requires a license to work on or with export-controlled technology. Export control issues we usually deal with involves two federal agencies: 1) Department of Commerce the Export Administration Regulations (EAR) – “dual-use” items susceptible to commercial and military use, and 2) Department of State Directorate of Defense Trade Controls for International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR) - items directly related to defense e.g. ammunition, canons, firearms.

These agencies maintain lists of controlled technology or technical data or items that may require licenses before they can be released to specific foreign internationals. It is important to understand that this certification process is for international scholars on H1-B visas who may be exposed to controlled technology and/or technical data which will require getting them licensed. The I-129 is a one-time certification. However, it may be that a year or two down the road work might come in that the university may want the non-US person to work on that now involves export-controlled technology. They will need to obtain a license before they use or are exposed to this new work. The University is bound by export control law and we will need to put a process in place making sure we are in compliance with licensing at all times. [Clarification was sought following the meeting on the difference between certification and licensing. Mr. Ramalingam stated that although related they are two separate processes. The I-129 certification is only required once (regardless of status change later), but the need for licensing is ongoing and depends on any future change where a non-US person will be exposed to controlled technology and/or technical data.]

It is the University sponsor’s responsibility in determining whether or not a license is required. Casey Inge, General Counsel’s Office, developed the questionnaire that the University is using. Faculty sponsors will need to answer and sign off as they are in the best position to know which technologies and items the person will be exposed to. If there is more than one faculty sponsor we will need each sponsor to answer and sign off on the questionnaire. If the faculty sponsor answers ‘No,’ to all the
questions, then Mr. Ramalingam will run the person (and dependents, if necessary) through Visual Compliance, which is the export control program we are using. If no issues are found, then he will forward the certification to Vice President of Research and Economic Development Jack McLver for approval and return to IPO.

Since this is a new process (February 2011) we have yet to deal with any ‘yes’ answers. We will all be learning this together and will need to work together in determining if the technology involved will trigger requirements for licensing. If so, we will need to make sure there is no exposure to that technology by the scholar until a license is obtained.

The process and questionnaire distributed today are in draft form and Mr. Ramalingam welcomes any comments and edits. He is very willing to visit units and present/discuss the process presented today.

Responding to questions of what is considered controlled or not (e.g. supercomputer, desktop) Mr. Ramalingam answered possibly the supercomputer but not the desktop. He hopes to obtain clearer answers at a workshop scheduled in about a week. If he is unable to answer himself, he will seek out someone who can and stated that if in doubt check yes -- don’t guess. He did note that some countries are on an embargo list and exposure of an unlicensed non-US person to any listed item could run a PI afoul with the government. Compliance is important as the University could lose big in fines and grants and the PI could face criminal prosecution (in Tennessee a faculty member was sentenced to 48 months in prison).

Director Brown concluded the presentation stating that the IPO’s doors are always open. Walk-ins are welcome, as are email and phone calls. IPO is a resource for all and we work closely with General Counsel and OSP. Tammi Johnson was then given a round of well deserved applause for her excellent work.

FS-11-041: FSH 1640: Dismissal Hearings Committee and Faculty Appeals Hearing Board. Both proposed changes address appointments to these committees and come as seconded motions from Committee on Committee. Approved unanimously.

FS-11-042: FSH 4130 – Standard Course Numbers. The chair provided a brief overview of pending issues regarding Directed Studies (concerns from Faculty Affairs) and Special Topics Courses (discussed in Senate) that date back to last fall. A small group of UCC members reviewed the policy and identified the proposed changes as distributed now come before Senate. Directed study courses can be offered more than once but not to the same student; they cannot be used for courses that already exist; they need not be limited to one student (one-on-one); and Special Topics can now be taught three times before officially filing the paperwork for permanency (responding to the fact that these courses take time to develop). The first time a Special Topics course is taught one is learning, the second time some revising is done, and the third time one is fine-tuning and adding final touches to the course.

Registrar Nancy Krogh noted that UCC had gathered data from our peers who all had slightly different approaches for these courses. She noted it will be important to reach out to faculty and those who schedule courses to make sure they understand all options. For example, some wanted a subtitle added to a Special Topics course when they can just create a new one. Directed Study courses have been used in the past so students could graduate; however, rather than using Directed Study courses, the course listed in the catalog should be opened with restricted enrollment of 1, 2, 5 or with instructor’s permission. In response to a senator’s question of why restrictions on course numbers are part of the Faculty-Staff Handbook (FSH) and whether the catalog will need adjustment, the Registrar said Charles Tibbals in her office will be sure to catch these changes. She was unable to answer the historical reason
for the placement in the FSH. A comment was made that this change was good and addresses many concerns expressed last fall. There being no further questions this seconded motion was unanimously approved.

**FS-11-043: NOI Martin School:** This NOI consolidating the departments of Philosophy, Political Science and the Martin School created considerable discussion. Senator Bird provided Senate with Dean Aiken’s overview of the NOI: 1) faculty initiated, 2) does not impact students and/or programs, 3) primarily designed to facilitate synergies of International Studies, Political Science and Philosophy faculties, and 4) currently sharing one administrative assistant with potential future savings through one director and two coordinators rather than two chairs. Don Crowley, Political Science Chair, was present for questions.

- *This is the Martin School, not a School of Policy or International Studies?* We did not want a hopelessly long title and we could not agree on a short one.
- *Are degrees being combined?* No, we are not disturbing existing programs. Students in Philosophy will get a degree in Philosophy, those in Political Science a Political Science degree.
- *How many faculty are we talking about?* Philosophy has 3 tenure and 1 tenure track; Political Science 8 or 10, 8 are teaching faculty; and International Studies Program use faculty from various departments including Political Science. Student wise we become larger, some 450 undergraduates combined.
- *What is a school, a formally defined administrative unit between a department and college?* Yes.
- *Is this proposal consistent with the way schools are defined?* Yes, although one could argue that point. Rather than eliminate or undercut existing departments, we were combined under a school with shared interests and concerns.
- *So these departments will be preserved even though one of them only has 4 faculty?* Yes, but one won’t have a chair and Political Science and Philosophy already share an administrative assistant.
- *Will there be a chair or head of Philosophy or Political Science?* A director will be appointed at some point to the Martin School.
- It is disturbing that in Art & Architecture (A&A) many were not in favor of a similar situation in losing a department, yet faculty numbers were larger than those discussed today. This has the appearance of a lack of equality on campus.
- Education also went through similar processes after being told they couldn’t have a department of less than 9 faculty subsequently restructuring the college.
- *If it was purely for financial reasons and a smaller department with no financial cost was allowed, where does the rule come from?* The Provost clarified that there is financial savings. The economy-of-scales are quite different in this situation than in A&A, although the degree programs have stayed the same in A&A as they will here. We really wanted to combine units that made sense academically, administratively and created efficiencies, this was accomplished with one administrator over one program. A chair for four faculty did not make sense. Crowley noted we also wanted to preserve the integrity of the departments by retaining oversight over the tenure and promotion processes, allowing internal committees to remain intact with the respective department.
- *Can any group start a school and, if so, are there codified rules for doing so e.g. starting an institute is now very regulated?* The Martin School already existed. We are not starting a new school, just moving more in to give more intellectual power.

Senator Bird provided a historical foot note with regard to the School of Communication formed in 1973 from a merger of departments of Journalism, Radio-Television and Speech. These three departments comprised the school until their identities blended into the new unit which may happen in this case as well. There being no further questions this seconded motion from UCC passed by a majority vote.
FS-11-044: FSH 3450 – Presidential Actions to Manage Expenditures to Respond to Financial Challenges. The chair provided an overview of this seconded motion from Faculty Affairs. He wished to give credit to Jack Miller, last year’s Senate Chair, for his work in assuring that the board would incorporate language so that the presidents at each university would seek input from faculty and staff. A temporary emergency policy was put in place (FSH 3710 R) and this proposed new policy FSH 3450 will replace the emergency policy. Many drafts had been worked on by General Counsel, Senate Chair, Staff Affairs Chair, and Faculty Affairs. Two positive additions that came out of these groups include identifying other sources or avenues considered before the decision of a furlough and consultation of the same with faculty and staff. Each group has a 21 day response period. Also discussed was a more formalized appeal process that will be added later.

- If this passes and becomes part of the FSH, will this new section be referenced in next year’s Salary Agreement? Language currently existing on the salary agreements states that they are subject to all university policies and it is unnecessary to specifically mention this policy by number.
- Was there something added last year where salary is subject to a possible furlough? Yes, something to that effect and will be consistent subject to this policy.
- Last year it seemed like we had little time following the state budget decisions to implement furloughs, and this still doesn’t seem like much time? We will have a process in place that allows deliberation after the state budget decisions, Staff Affairs and Faculty Senate will have at least 21 days to provide input, and the President is required to provide 30 days written notice to all affected employees. Chair Eveleth noted last year when Keith Ickes brought this to Senate many changes were made based off Senator’s suggestions. [Upon review of the draft minutes, Counsel’s Office has asked to provide additional clarification to this question. The time pressures last year did not result from actions taken by last year’s legislature. The furloughs arose from holdbacks that occurred in the fall of 2009, and the time pressures reflected the university’s consideration of alternatives and the time required to develop a fair and equitable process for implementing furloughs. It is unlikely that the legislature, in any given year, will take action that requires a holdback or otherwise affects the balance of the current year’s budget.]
- Is there a triggering mechanism, e.g. financial challenge determination and are changes made pursuant to this policy only related to terms and conditions of employment or only fiscal concerns? What are the larger limitations on policy? The purpose of board policy is to give each president the flexibility to respond to specific financial situations faced at their institution and our policy flows from board policy. This is something short of declaring financial exigency.
- Faculty Affairs Chair, Don Crowley, noted that Faculty Affairs wanted to make sure this was very limited and did not take the place of any existing policy. As such, the two concerns addressed were: to make sure we were talking only about short term employment changes like furloughs and that it includes language to make sure other avenues would be pursued e.g. raising money.
- Is it possible that the section in B that states “not less than 21 days” be reworded? The discussion that followed of whether this change affected intent, prompted another senator to ask whether this proposed policy could be postponed one week.

It was moved and seconded (Budwig/Krug) to delay further discussion on this motion until next week. 13 yes, 0 no. Motion passed.

Adjournment: It was moved (Marshall J./Krug) to adjourn at 5:20 p.m. Approved, unanimously.

Ann Thompson, Assistant to Faculty Secretary
J-3. Subject Requirements (Core Curriculum). All students entering the University of Idaho with fewer than 14 transferable credits after high school graduation are to complete the University of Idaho core curriculum. A university education is a preparation both for living and for making a living. It offers an opportunity not only to lay the foundations of a career, but also to develop the mind to its highest potential, to cultivate the imagination as well as the power to reason, and to gain the intellectual curiosity that makes education a life-long enterprise. A central component of this preparation is the requirement that a student working toward a baccalaureate degree must complete the necessary course work in the four categories described below. This requirement is to be satisfied by earning the minimum number of credits specified for each category. (Transfer students have two options for fulfilling this requirement; these are described under “General Education Requirements for Transfer Students” in the Undergraduate Admission section in Part 2 of this catalog). Courses that fulfill requirements in each category are reviewed each year and the list is updated in the Spring. Students and advisors are encouraged to check the list when it is published in the Spring to be aware of any additional courses that have been added to meet specific requirements. Courses that are approved to satisfy a core requirement can be used to satisfy those requirements even if the course is completed prior to being approved as a core course.

Rationale: This change extends the existing catalog definition of “transfer student” (p. 21 in the current catalog) to the core curriculum.
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PRESIDENTIAL ACTIONS TO MANAGE EXPENDITURES TO RESPOND TO FINANCIAL CHALLENGES

PREAMBLE: This section outlines policy and procedures required by Regents policy II.B.2 with respect to implementation of employment actions such as temporary furloughs or similar short term work hour reductions. Except as specifically set forth in the body of the section, this section does not alter existing faculty-staff policies and procedures related to employment.

CONTENTS:

A. Authority for Management of University Expenditures
B. Consultation with Faculty and Staff
C. Implementation of Employment Actions

A. Authority for Management of University Expenditures. The President has the duty to respond to university financial challenges, and to maintain sound fiscal management. As set out in Regents’ policy II.B.2., this includes the authority to take certain actions such as temporary furloughs or other short term employment actions in response to financial challenges.

B. Consultation with Faculty and Staff. In considering employment actions outlined in Regents’ policy II.B.2, the President shall seek input from the Faculty Senate and from the Staff Affairs Committee. The chairs of the Faculty Senate and the Staff Affairs Committee shall be given written notice from the President of the need for a reduction in university expenditures (including a description of any other cost reductions or additional ways to increase income that have been considered) and of the nature of any proposed employment action to accomplish the reduction. Each group shall have not less than 21 days to consider the President’s proposed action and to give such guidance or recommendations (including recommendations for other cost reductions or additional ways to increase income to be considered) as each group sees fit. No action shall be implemented until the President has considered any such guidance or recommendation timely given.

C. Implementation of Employment Actions. After consultation with the Faculty and Staff as described in paragraph B above, and consideration by the President of any guidance or recommendations timely given, temporary wage adjustments such as furloughs or similar short term employment actions may be implemented. Implementation of such temporary wage adjustments by the President will comply with Regents’ policies under Section II.B.2, including:

   a) uniform application of the employment action across the University or affected budgetary unit;
   b) 30 days written notice to affected employees (which may be accomplished via e-mail); and
   c) an opportunity for affected employees to be heard regarding application of the furlough to the affected employee.
LEAVE POLICIES FOR ALL EMPLOYEES

PREAMBLE: This section describes the various kinds of leaves that are available for all UI employees. (See section 3720 for Sabbatical Leaves limited to faculty members.) This section and the following one were original parts of the 1979 Handbook. The most substantive changes since that time have been the addition (under Governor Andrus) and subsequent deletion (under Governor Batt) of service leave for children at school and changes to subsection L that reflect changes in federal regulations. In 2002 extensive changes were made to subsection K that reflected Regent policy and current practice. In 2008 extensive changes to this policy were approved following many years of committee work involving Faculty and Staff Affairs, General Counsel, and Human Resources and a new section M was added on servicemember family leave due to a federal law change. In March 2010 an emergency section R was added to address implementation of furloughs through the end of FY2010. Unless explicitly noted, the text is as of July 1996. Further information is available from Human Resources (208-885-3609).

CONTENTS:

.....
N. Personal Leave
O. Extended Family Medical Leave
P. Leave for Professional Improvement
Q. Exceptions
R. Furlough - Fiscal Year 2010 [add. 7-10]

---
R. FURLOUGH - Fiscal Year 2010. [add. 3-10]

R-1. Furlough is a mechanism used to create salary/benefit savings, which can be applied across an organization to alleviate budget shortfalls. Furlough is leave without pay, but with all benefits other than leave accrual and retirement contributions.

R-2. The general delegation of authority granted the President by the Regents includes the discretion to institute furloughs to respond to financial challenges. The President has consulted with and received input from faculty and staff representatives regarding the need for furloughs as well as the mechanism for implementing furloughs for fiscal year 2010. The President has determined that furloughs are necessary to assist the institution in addressing the funding shortfalls caused by the holdbacks in its appropriated funds for fiscal year 2010.

R-3. Furloughs implemented by the President for fiscal year 2010 will comply with Regents' policies under Section II.B.2, including uniform application of the furlough across the University, 30 days notice to affected employees and an opportunity for affected employees to be heard regarding application of the furlough to the affected employee.

R-4. This temporary emergency policy shall be effective immediately and remain in effect though the end of fiscal year 2010.