University of Idaho  
2009-2010  
FACULTY SENATE AGENDA  
Meeting #18  
Tuesday, February 2, 2010, 3:30 p.m.  
BRINK HALL FACULTY LOUNGE  

Order of Business  

I. Call to Order.  

II. Minutes.  
   • Minutes of the 2009-10 Faculty Senate Meeting #17, January 26, 2010  

III. Consent Agenda:  
   • Confirmation of sabbatical leaves for 2010-11  

IV. Chair’s Report.  
   • Faculty Spouse Educational Waiver  

V. Provost’s Report.  

VI. Other Announcements and Communications.  
   • Final Discussion on Efficiency Cost Reduction Policy Memo  
     1. Travel freeze  
     2. Open/vacant faculty/staff lines  
   • FS-10-033: Partner Accommodation  
   • Structure of Furloughs  

VII. Committee Reports.  

VIII. Special Orders.  

IX. Unfinished Business and General Orders.  
   • FS-10-021rev: NOI Regulation M  

X. New Business.  

XI. Adjournment.  

Professor Jack Miller, Chair 2009-2010, Faculty Senate  

Attachments: Minutes of 2009-2010 FS Meeting #17, January 26, 2010  
               FS-10-033  
               Sabbatical Approval (distributed earlier)  
               FS-10-021rev (distributed earlier)
University of Idaho  
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
2009-10 Meeting #17  
Tuesday January 26, 2010

Present: Baillargeon, Baird, Christiansen for Baker (w/o vote), Battaglia, Eveleth, Fritz, Geist, Graden, Guilfoyle, Hill (w/o vote), Huber, Joyce, Limbaugh, Marshall, Miller (chair, 4:00 to 5:00)), Stark, Williams, Wilson. Center-Campus Senators: Budwig (Boise), Dakins (Idaho Falls). Absent: Baker (w/o vote), Barlow, Edwards, Holbrook, Mihelich, Miller (chair, 3:30 through 4:00), Murphy, Padaghm-Albrecht. 8 guests.

A quorum being present, the Vice-Chair opened the meeting at 3:32 p.m.

Minutes: It was moved (Guilfoyle/Wilson) to accept the minutes of meeting #16 of the Faculty Senate. Approved.

Chair’s Report: The Chair had been delayed. Vice-Chair Eveleth requested to begin with the Provost’s Report until the Chair’s arrival.

Provost’s Report: The Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs, Jeanne Christiansen was representing the Provost who was traveling. The Vice-Provost noted that President Nellis had presented to JFAC yesterday and the presentation could be viewed on the JFAC web-site.

The Vice-Provost was working on two initiatives – assistance into higher education for students from low income backgrounds and assistance for first generation higher education students. There would be a forum for first generation students and interested people could e-mail Bruce Pitman with RSVP.

The Secretary of the Faculty announced that post cards advertising Faculty Gatherings were distributed. The dates and times for the next gatherings were listed. The inaugural event last Friday evening was well attended and the gathering provides an important cultural connection that has been missing from faculty life at UI. He encouraged faculty to attend the future gatherings.

FS-10-032 RE-Organization of CNR. Dean of Natural Resources, Bill McLaughlin addressed the meeting. He provided a hand-out highlighting the process that had been followed in bringing previously five departments to three. The process had begun in December, 2008. A retreat was conducted and input on reorganization was sought from the faculty. During the next year several iterations proposing restructure occurred. According to the CNR by-laws, a 2/3 majority was needed to implement such changes. The NOI presented today had evolved and the final vote from the CNR faculty was 43 in favor, 11 against and 3 abstentions, providing the 2/3 required majority. The NOI had also unanimously passed UCC.

The changes included the consolidation of 5 departments to 3: 1) Conservation Social Sciences, 2) Forest Ecology and Biogeosciences, and 3) Fish and Wildlife Resources. Undergraduate academic programs remain largely unchanged (7/8). The operations option in the Forest Products program has been moved to the Department of Forest Ecology and Biogeosciences. With this modification that programmatic area could now become accredited by the Society of American Foresters.

Two task forces would address outstanding issues that related to outreach and research activities in the areas of Rangeland Sustainability and Biomaterials. The dominate focus of these is to provide services to external groups. It was likely that recommendations would evolve that would result in further
proposed NOIs for new programs. These would likely include involvement of faculty across multiple colleges and interdisciplinary programs outside of the college structure may be one of the models that is adopted to move forward.

The motivation to change was prompted by the Provost’s Efficiency Memo, bringing departments and programs to sustainable scales. The redesign of the supporting structures for the CNR programs was expected to provide greater student satisfaction. Long term savings in administration costs were estimated at $212,000 per year.

Questions: The term biogeosciences covers a broad spectrum served by several interdisciplinary programs including some already being offered in the College of Science. There was a concern that the terminology for the new department would lead to confusion for students who were searching for graduate programs and encountering the term as part of a department name.

Dean McLaughlin responded that the term was proceeded by the adjective “Forest” that should help to distinguish the CNR department from other programs. In addition, the name was not used to describe an academic degree program, only the department. He indicated that he would welcome and encourage those faculty who were uncomfortable with the name being used for the new department to discuss the issues. Most faculty working in this department in CNR are already collaborating with other faculty across the campus.

What were the major issues for CNR faculty with the re-organization?

There were several issues that received extensive discussion: How to handle tenure and in which department would faculty be tenured. Faculty wished to chose the department in which they would be tenured and it would not be a decision that could be made by the dean. Finding names for the departments that would be acceptable to the majority. Another issue was that CNR in the past had been dominantly perceived as applied profession based college. It has evolved to include more basic science in the social and biophysical sciences now offered in the curriculum and as substantial parts of faculty research programs. The new structure was needed to provide a better representation of these changes.

Following some further discussion, there was a motion to amend the NOI (Geist/Joyce) to strike the term “biogeosciences” from the proposed name of the new CNR department as stated.

There was a concern that there had been little input from faculty working across the interdisciplinary area of biogeosciences and that use of the name by the CNR department would disadvantage other programs attempting to attract graduate students.

There was further discussion with suggestions that varied the proposed name of the department.

Dean McLaughlin noted that these changes had been reviewed and discussed at length by a large number of CNR faculty. The counter argument was that there had been little opportunity for input from faculty outside of CNR. Clarification was sought with reference to the spectrum of disciplines that was represented in faculty expertise in the department.

Would there be future joint appointments of faculty in this department with departments in other colleges?

The dean was strongly in favor of pursuing such joint appointments.
It was noted that the process to bring the re-organization forward was impressive, but the UI community would benefit from on-going discussions about the issues raised today.

There being no further discussion the question of the amendment was called. Five in favor, 10 against, motion to amend defeated.

*It was noted that for a small number of faculty, the new structures were not a good fit.*

The dean responded that the majority of the faculty were sympathetic to the dilemma of faculty for whom the fit was difficult, and they were highly supportive. He saw this as a positive aspect.

*There were still several open questions about the Forest Products program.*

The dean noted that in his view, the Forest Products discipline needs to continue to be forward-looking and embrace changes such as a focus on biomaterials. There was potential for this area to engage with faculty across engineering, chemistry and agriculture to determine if there was critical mass to make this a focus area. He added that the VPR was assisting by setting up a task-force that would assist the group in looking at issues such as new product development and needs for a changing workforce.

A student member of the senate noted that the overall changes would be of long-term benefit to the students.

There being no further discussion with respect to the NOI, the question was called; 17 in favor, approved.

The Chair had joined the meeting. He thanked Vice-Chair Eveleth for conducting the first part of the meeting in his absence. He then addressed an issue raised at the General Faculty Meeting last week. The meeting had moved to direct the senate to take up the question of the exact place of residence of tenure as it was not clearly addressed in SBOE policy nor in the FSH. Did it reside in the department or in the university? Tenure is awarded by the Regents at the recommendation of the President. However if a program is closed, this is one of a few mechanisms that can lead to the lay-off of tenured faculty. [There are also indirect references in the FSH to where tenure resides, for example see FSH 3520 E2 - faculty appointed to an academic administrator position retains tenure in that department.] It was moved (Miller/Williams) to refer this matter to the Faculty Affairs Committee to study and bring forward their recommendations, approved unanimously.

The new Budget Director, Keith Ickes was welcomed to address the senate on current budget issues.

He noted that at present the state budget was in flux as legislators were currently debating projected revenues and likely ramification for the budget. In his presentation to JFAC yesterday, president Nellis had recommended that the federal stimulus funds should be directed to higher education as this was the original intent.

The Governor had recommended that the 6% hold-back that was imposed earlier this year should be implemented as a permanent change. The additional 1.4 to 1.6% rescission would impact UI at a level of $1.8 million. This was presently a one-time change but it was likely that it would also be made a permanent change. He noted that the legislature have multiple, complex challenges to deal with in the present fiscal situation.
On an encouraging note, the SBOE had agreed that UI can engage in discussion of double digit fee increases for the up-coming year. This change in philosophy by the SBOE was supported by the Governor. The options will need to be explored in the context of Idaho median income level.

The Chair asked Mr. Ickes to address the short-term issue of possible furlough implementation. Discussions had proposed a tiered model in which one hour of furlough would accrue for every $2,500 of salary with a cap of six furlough days.

There was discussion about how the calculation would affect those on nine month appointments. The effect would be that furloughs for faculty on nine month appointments would be proportionately larger than for those on 12 month appointments.

*If the model were changed to take out the cap, how would that effect furlough days taken by others?*

Mr. Ickes replied that there were very few employees in pay levels above the cap (equivalent to $130,000 salary). There was little change in the effect of this model on the furloughs that would accrue to most employees.

There was further discussion about issues such as the effect of the calculation of furlough days for employees who were on split appointments for example those who received salary from grants or from Hatch funds.

Mr. Ickes replied that federal funded salary components were not included in the calculation of furlough days. The exact situation for those partially funded on Hatch funds was less clear-cut.

*When will a decision be made about if/when furloughs will be implemented?*

Mr. Ickes replied that it was very difficult to speculate because the state legislature had yet to decide the magnitude of the rescission that would be passed on to the university.

The discussion turned to the effect of implementing furloughs in conjunction with cancelling classes.

Cancelling classes sends a powerful message. This would be a tough decision as it may have negative impact on perceptions from the diverse range of university constituents.

It was noted by one senator that the faculty are often asked to carry the burden of such issues and if there were no classes cancelled this again puts much of the burden on the faculty who would then in effect, be taking a pay cut and not a furlough.

It was further discussed that closing the institution for a day (period undecided) impacted the many activities of the university, not only teaching. It is difficult to make the message heard by the legislators that the university is involved in a broad array of activities and teaching is only one of these.

The notion of what message is sent to present and future students if some classes were cancelled was also debated.

It was further suggested that if classes were to be cancelled a compromise might be to cancel classes on days continuous with scheduled breaks in teaching such as spring break or exam week.
It was noted that an increase in student fees would facilitate the university’s long-term commitment to providing a quality education for our students.

A student senator noted that there would be broad support from the student body for an increase in fees. Students see the extremely good value they are getting for a quality education and they would be in favor of supporting fees at a level that enables UI to sustainably offer quality programs.

As the hour was late, the Chair thanked the Budget Director for his willingness to meet with the senate.

**Adjournment:** It was moved (Battaglia/Fritz) to adjourn at 5:06 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Rodney A. Hill, Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Senate.
PARTNER ACCOMMODATION

A. Definitions.

A-1. Domestic partner (partner): For purposes of this policy partner shall include a married spouse or a person who is neither married nor related by blood to the employee but is the employee’s sole domestic partner, lives together with the employee in the same residence and intends to do so indefinitely, and is financially responsible with the employee for the other’s welfare. The university reserves the right to request documentation establishing financial responsibility or qualifying status.

B. Policy. In recognition that professional employment opportunities for partners can enhance faculty and staff recruitment and retention, the University of Idaho may aid in the employment of an employee’s partner. Any such help will be consistent with the principles of affirmative action and fairness and available to both new recruits and established employees. Partner accommodation is a non-mandated program available to the university to assist units in recruiting and retaining employees. No unit is required to participate in this program. Prospective employees are not to view partner accommodation as an entitlement.

NOTE: It is illegal to ask a job candidate if he or she needs partner accommodation. However, the appointing authority or employing official may provide the information included in this section and the candidate may then request consideration for such support.

C. Process. Human Resources shall assign a staff member who will be responsible for aiding a faculty member’s partner in finding local employment. This person shall maintain an information base and support network pertaining to local employers, both on and off campus and will actively coordinate with other educational institutions in the area. This person will contact and offer service to all new hires, will be available at the time of interview, and will be available to existing employees.

C-1. Existing Vacancy. Initially, the university may attempt to find accommodation in existing vacancies, including jobs listed as “open only to current UI employees.” However, the candidate’s qualifications must be competitive with other applicants in the pool.

C-2. Temporary Position. If there are no appropriate existing vacancies and if a partner’s qualifications meet a demonstrated need at the university, a one to three year temporary position may be created to provide appropriate employment opportunity. In order to safeguard individuals, departments, and other units, any offer of employment under these circumstances must be approved through the
ordinary channels, i.e. the unit’s administrator or hiring committee, and following approved HR and/or affirmative action hiring procedures. The Office of the Provost & Executive Vice President (Provost) may assist with the funding of created positions for the purpose of temporary accommodation. These temporary accommodations are supported in part by limited funds set aside by the provost for this purpose.

Hiring units must advise candidates of the time limits for temporary accommodation support. Support beyond the initial temporary accommodation period of one to three years may be available if the candidate has completed a successful performance evaluation rating of “meets expectations” or above each year and if:

1) The position becomes permanent and funding is available outside of the Office of the Provost, or
2) The hiring unit has planned for future permanent funding.

a. Requirements:

1) There must be an appropriate fit between the qualifications of the candidate and the proposed position, and
2) The university must benefit if the accommodation is provided.

b. Written Proposal. Units requesting temporary partner accommodation submit a written proposal through the responsible dean (or equivalent administrator) to the Provost. Units are to provide the following:

1) An explanation of the situation,
2) An explanation of how the university will benefit from the accommodation,
3) The vita of the partner,
4) A list of possible positions for consideration,
5) The proposed time period of the temporary accommodation,
6) The proposed salary,
7) An explanation indicating why permanent funds are not available if there is a need for the position in an area,
8) A statement indicating that the requesting unit will provide the required matching funds or an indication of the source of such matching funds, and
9) Information about potential future funding. NOTE: The goal is to move employees from temporary funds to permanent funds whenever feasible and appropriate.

c. Funding. After approval of the proposal, the Provost commits funding for temporary accommodation as follows:

1) One year for .50 FTE (matched by funds from the hiring or receiving unit),
2) Two years for .50 FTE (matched by funds from the hiring or receiving unit), or
3) Three years for .33 FTE (.67 FTE matched by funds from the hiring or receiving unit).

If the position is less than full-time, the funding support is prorated based on the formula described above. Either the hiring unit or the receiving unit may provide the funds to make the position full-time. A unit interested in pursuing a partner accommodation may provide funds to enable the temporary hire to take place in a different unit.

In general units are to view partner accommodations as a university priority. A unit with available funds and a need for temporary assistance should be willing to participate in a temporary accommodation.

Any unused temporary accommodation funds revert to the provost.

d. Approval. Approval by the provost is contingent upon the availability of funds and the evaluation of the temporary accommodation proposal.

C-3. Human Rights Compliance Review. The Provost submits copies of all accommodation requests to the Human Rights Compliance Office for review to ensure that requests conform to EEO policies and regulations.

C-4. Contact Information. TBD