University of Idaho
2009-2010
FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #26

3:30 p.m.
Tuesday, April 13, 2010
BRINK HALL FACULTY LOUNGE

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2009-10 Faculty Senate Meeting #25, March 30, 2010

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.

VI. Committee Reports.

   Faculty Affairs:
   • FS-10-042: FSH 3750 – Employee Spouse Educational Fee and Tuition Reduction
   • FS-10-043: FSH 3780 – Dependent Educational Fee Reduction

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Jack Miller, Chair 2009-2010, Faculty Senate

Attachments:
   FS 2009-10 Minutes #25
   FS-10-042
   FS-10-043
University of Idaho  
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
2009-10 Meeting #25  
Tuesday March 30, 2010


A quorum being present, the Chair opened the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

Minutes: Some points of clarification had been provided with respect to meeting #23. Acceptance of the minutes of meeting #23 was moved (Marshall/Graden). Approved.

Some edits to the draft minutes of meeting #24 were suggested. It was moved (Evelth/Marshall) to accept the minutes as amended. Approved.

Chair’s Report: The Regents will be considering fee increases in the next few weeks, as proposed by all of Idaho’s four year higher education institutions. The range of requested increases was: Lewis-Clark at 8.6%, ISU and BSU at 10% and UI at 12%. It is extremely important for the future of the university that requested fee increases are approved. For FY11 we will face a state-funded budget cut of $11.3 million compared to the appropriation for FY10. In addition, this represents approximately $23 million reduction in state base funding over the last two years. He went on to note that review of the general education curriculum was in full swing and would be finalized by early fall. Today in the Commons there was a forum to discuss “What we know about general education”. This topic will also be discussed again in the Whitewater room at 8:00 a.m. tomorrow. On April 5th and 6th, there will be session on the state of general education, focusing on best practices and will be followed up by a SWAT analysis session on April 13th and 14th. A report on findings and next steps will be presented on April 20th. The Chair encouraged those who had an interest in the general education curriculum to attend these meetings.

Two dean searches are progressing: College of Education and College of Natural Resources. Candidates for the College of Education had visited campus. Finalists were not yet announced for the College of Natural Resources role. The Interim Dean of Engineering, Don Blackketter had been confirmed as Dean.

President of Lewis-Clark State College, Dene Thomas has moved on to the role of President at Fort Lewis College in Colorado.

Vandal Friday last week was an outstanding success. Student numbers attending were up approximately 20% on any prior year.

Provost’s Report: The Provost confirmed that the budget reduction over the past two years represented approximately a 21% decrease in state funding. This was in the context of $100 million in state funds, from a total university budget of approximately $400 million. The Provost pointed out that the other funds were for dedicated purposes: federal research funding, scholarships and financial aid, etc. These funds could not be transferred to cover expenses such as salaries and the only two elements of the budget with any flexibility in allocation to expenditures are the state funding and student fee components. With the assistance of the Senate, the university had cut 35 programs in FY09 and another 10 in FY10. This, along with restructuring three colleges, the elimination of over 100 faculty and staff
positions (largely open positions that were frozen and funds returned to the state), the implementation of furloughs this year, and savings accrued through the ESCROW (power saving program) have enabled us to balance revenues and expenditures. However, we have reached the limit of our ability to cut costs and a fee increase is essential. The SBOE apparently has some concerns about proposed fee increases, however our fees are now almost only half of the fees charged at WSU. The Provost went on to thank the ASUI fee committee for working with the administration in proposing a realistic fee increase that was focused toward an increase in the matriculation fee.

*How much of the $22 million shortfall in state funds would be made up by the proposed fee increase?*

The proposed fee increase would only make up about $6 million of the shortfall.

The Secretary of the Faculty noted that it had been announced that WSU would not be facing furloughs and this in part is likely due to the much higher fees that are paid by WSU students.

The Provost went on to note that the College of Education dean search had turned up three very interesting candidates, each with a very different background. He noted requested feedback on the candidates from faculty. Comments could be provided using the link on the Provost’s web-page.

Candidates for the College of Natural Resources Dean would be finalized this week.

The national census is an important tool to ensure that all residents are counted. He especially encouraged students to fill out and return census forms. Allocation of federal funds are based on census numbers, thus their importance to the university. He also noted that he was very pleased with attendance at Vandal Friday and concluded by emphasizing the importance of improving student retention rates as this too has a large effect on overall enrollments.

**Announcements:** The Secretary of the Faculty conveyed a request from the Research Office that senior faculty step up to assist in review service for UI Seed Grant proposals. It is an important leadership role to provide peer review for seed grants that provide an avenue for young faculty or faculty changing their program focus to establish preliminary data. The work-load for seed-grant review is not onerous but is coming up soon. Reviewers will be required in April. Please have faculty respond and self-nominate directly to Sarah Koerber skoerber@uidaho.edu.

**FS-10-041 – NOI HPERD title change:** Professor Browder was present to answer questions about the proposed changes. A senator asked whether the terms “leisure” and “movement science” were widely recognized and would students seeking to enroll be aware of this terminology? Professor Browder responded that both terms are used to describe about 1/3 of similar degrees across the discipline. She also acknowledged the more important point that particular care will be needed in marketing the degree so that there is no confusion or potential loss of students coming into the program. There being no further discussion, the question was called. Approved.

**FS-10-021 rev Regulation M:** This policy change had gone through several iterations between UCC and Senate. There was some difference in interpretation especially around the section of M-1 that states in the revised version “Instructors will provide reasonable opportunity for students to make up work .....“. The discussion centered on whether the policy as now drafted provided adequate opportunity for instructors to make a judgment call about student attendance. For example, classes requiring student group activities where the entire group must be present such as in a music class that requires a series of quartet performances. The consensus was that the present wording would adequately cover the
possible scenarios considered in the discussion. There being no further discussion, the question was called. Approved, with one opposed.

**Parking Fee Changes:** The Chair noted that the following parking charges were proposed for FY11: Gold, $300 to $312, Red $157 to $172, Purple (residential), $99 to $126, Blue, $61 to $64, disability, $74 to $90 and daily visitor no change, at $2.

Carl Root, Director of Parking and Transportation Services was invited to join the meeting. Mr. Root provided an overview of the proposed parking charges. He noted that the proposed changes were related to improving safety on campus and to preparing for future parking needs. In FY07, a six year plan had been adopted and changes requested for years 3 and 4 of this plan. There was an underlying intent to raise the residential rate to the same level as the Red permit, and to implement overall increases to balance the budget of the parking office, allowing some future planning for expansion of parking. The policy on citations had changed with the aim of improving student recruitment. Thus, there was a more developed system that included warnings for infringements. Total revenue from citations was predicted to be down from $400,000 to around $250,000. For violations such as non-display of a parking permit, software was now in place that allowed a warning to be made without any penalty for up to three occurrences of the violation.

*With no salary increases and in a time of implementation of furloughs, is it fair to implement increased parking charges?* The issue for the parking office is that to skip a year in revenue increases will delay projects designed to improve safety. Examples of proposed changes to crossings and restriction of traffic flow were the Sixth Street crossing between the Living Learning Center and Ag Biotech/CNR and in Deakin Street, between the SUB and the Bookstore.

*Is it common practice to use funds derived from parking for improvements in parking infrastructure?* The revenue is usually inadequate to fund major projects.

*What is the level of revenue generated from parking fees and citations?* Permits bring in around $1 million and events $300,000-$350,000.

*How is the revenue used?* About half goes to paying salaries and expenses and the other half to maintenance, such as resealing of parking areas, line-marking and signage.

The Chair asked if there were any further questions of if any senator wished to make a motion on an aspect of the discussion. He went on to note that President Nellis would be making his recommendation on the proposed parking fee changes within the next week and if anyone wished to provide comments, they should be directed to the President.

**Adjournment:** It was moved (Wilson/Padgham-Albrecht) to adjourn at 4:33 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Rodney A. Hill, Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Senate
Dear Jack, Dan, and Rod,

Faculty Affairs is sending Faculty Senate two proposals for expanding employee benefits (see attached). (1) FSH 3750. FAC amended FSH 3750 in three ways. First, we replaced “spouse” with “domestic partner” in order to increase the number of employees who would benefit from the policy. Second, we eliminated the requirement of “four continuous years of employment” to receive the full benefit (i.e., C-1) in order to enhance the effectiveness of this benefit as a recruitment tool. Third, we edited (what is now) section H to make it more clear and succinct. (2) FSH 3780 (Dependent Educational Fee Reduction) represents a new benefit.

Both of these proposals were developed with the assistance and support of Staff Affairs, and have been reviewed by Human Resources and General Counsel. General Counsel has advised us that both of these proposals will face legal obstacles. Specifically, by expanding educational benefits to domestic partners, FSH 3750 may be perceived to violate the Idaho Constitution’s “marriage amendment”. And FSH 3780 may be perceived to violate SBOE policy (Subsections V-R and V-T), the relevant sections of which I will append to the end of this message. Counsel’s conclusion was: “This subsection does not “specifically authorize” (subparagraph c.) waiver of any portion of resident fees/tuition, as it does for non-resident fees/tuition. While one might argue that your proposed fee reduction achieves one or more of the listed purposes of fee/tuition waivers (subparagraph b.), you’re up against the omission – presumably intentional – of any specific authorization for resident fee/tuition waivers. Unfortunately, I think the only way to accomplish the Senate’s goal is to first propose an amendment to Board policy.”

FAC nonetheless encourages Faculty Senate to support these proposals and, furthermore, to exhort the university administration to support these proposals and endeavor to overcome any legal obstacles to their implementation. Given that salaries at the University of Idaho are not competitive, we need to offer other incentives for employees to come here, to stay here, and to commit themselves to the well-being of this institution. Educational benefits for partners and dependents are such an incentive, and are benefits that we are uniquely positioned to provide at relatively low cost to the institution. Moreover, our peer institutions are using these tools. The following spreadsheet shows that almost all of our peer institutions offer dependent educational benefits, and approximately half offer benefits to domestic partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Educational benefits for dependents?</th>
<th>Benefits for domestic partners?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U Arkansas</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico State</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Arizona</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Nebraska</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Wyoming</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Montana</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana State</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do we really want the University of Idaho to be known for lagging behind our peers not only with respect to salaries, but with respect to other benefits too? Instead, by pursuing these policies, the university has an opportunity to show that it is a welcoming community that seeks whenever it can to help the members of its broader family.

Thanks,
Ken

Kenneth Locke
Professor and Chair
Department of Psychology and Communication Studies
University of Idaho
Moscow ID 83844-3043
Office: (208) 885-4453
Fax: (208) 885-7710

Idaho State Board of Education GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
SECTION: V. FINANCIAL AFFAIRS Subsection: T. Fee Waivers April 2009

T. Fee/Tuition Waivers
1. Purpose and Authority for Fee/Tuition Waivers

a. Definition

A fee/tuition waiver shall mean a reduction of some or all of the approved fees/tuition specified in Section V, Subsection R, attributable to a particular student as the cost for attending an Idaho institution of higher education.

b. Purpose

The purpose in authorizing fee/tuition waivers includes but is not limited to the achievement of the following strategic objectives:

(i) The enhancement of education opportunities for Idaho residents;

(ii) To promote mutually beneficial cooperation and development of Idaho communities and nearby communities in neighboring states;

(iii) To contribute to the quality of educational programs; and

(iv) To assist in maintaining the cost effectiveness of auxiliary operations in Idaho institutions of higher education.

c. Authority

An institution shall not waive any of the applicable fees/tuition specified in Section V, Subsection R, unless specifically authorized in this subsection. Special fees are not defined as a fee waiver.

2. Waiver of Nonresident Fees/Tuition
Nonresident fees/tuition may be waived for the following categories:

a. Graduate/Instructional Assistants
Waivers are authorized for students employed as graduate assistants appointed pursuant to Section III, Subsection P.11.c.

b. Students Participating in Intercollegiate Athletics
For the purpose of improving competitiveness in intercollegiate athletics, the universities are authorized up to two hundred twenty-five (225) waivers per semester and, Lewis Clark State College is authorized up to one hundred ten (110) waivers per semester. The institutions are authorized to grant additional waivers, not to exceed ten percent (10%) of the above waivers, to be used exclusively for post-eligibility students.

c. Waivers to Meet Other Strategic Objectives

The chief executive officer of each institution is authorized to waive nonresident fees/tuition for students, not to exceed the equivalent of six percent (6%) of the institution's total full-time equivalent enrollment. The criteria to be followed in granting such nonresident waivers shall be as follows:

(i) A waiver may be granted to place a nonresident student in an institutional program only when there is sufficient capacity in the program to meet the needs of Idaho resident students; and

(ii) A waiver may be granted only when its use is fiscally responsible to place a nonresident student in an institutional program in order to meet a strategic state and/or institutional need, as identified by the chief executive officer of the institution.

d. National Student Exchange Program - Domestic

Waivers are authorized for nonresident students participating in this program.

e. Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

Waivers are authorized for nonresident students participating in the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education Professional Student Exchange Program and the Graduate Student Exchange Program. An institution may include a participating nonresident student in its enrollment workload adjustment calculation, provided the figure does not exceed the maximum approved for an institution by the Board.
POLICY COVER SHEET
(See Faculty Staff Handbook 1460 for instructions at UI policy website: www.webs.uidaho.edu/uipolicy)
[3/09]

Faculty/Staff Handbook [FSH] □ Addition ☑ Revision* □ Deletion* □ Emergency
Minor Amendment □
Chapter & Title: FSH 3750 – Educational Fee & Tuition Deduction

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):
(Please see FSH 1460 C)

Name Date

Telephone & Email:

Policy Sponsor: (If different than originator.)

Name Date

Reviewed by General Counsel 

Name & Date: Hoey Graham, 4/2/2010

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.

To promote employee recruitment and retention, and improve culture and climate at the university, by means of a modest expansion of an existing employee benefit. We also sought to clarify some of the policy language.

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

The fiscal impact is difficult to predict, but the costs associated with increased course enrollment in the absence of increased revenue are likely to be minimal compared to the fiscal benefits associated with enhanced recruitment, retention, and morale.

III. Related Policies/Procedures: Describe other policies or procedures existing that are related or similar to this proposed change.
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If not a minor amendment forward to: ________________________________

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

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

FSH
Appr. ___________
FC ___________
GFM ___________
Pres./Prov. ___________
[Office Use Only]

Track #: UP-10-061____
Date Rec.: __4/6/10____
Posted: t-sheet ______
h/c ___________
web ___________
Register: ___________
(Office Use Only)
EMPLOYEE SPOUSE PARTNER EDUCATIONAL FEE AND TUITION REDUCTION

PREAMBLE: This section outlines the policy by which spouse partners of employees may enroll in the university for reduced fees. See 3740 for historical background. Further information is available from Human Resources (208-885-3609). [ed. 7-97]

CONTENTS:

A. Definitions
B. Policy
C. Spouse Partners of Student Employees Excluded
D. Limitation of Spouse Partner's Eligibility
E. Spouse Partner Registration Data Form
F. Registration for Other Than Regular Credit
G. Termination of Employment
H. Limitation to Regular Programs and Terms
I. Limitation to Academic Services

A. Definitions.

A-1. Domestic partner (partner): For purposes of this policy partner shall include a married Partner 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. Under the Educational Fee and Tuition Reduction Program, enrollment in the university for reduced fees ($20 registration fee plus $5 a credit) is extended to the spouse partners of board-appointed UI employees on regular appointment who work at least half-time (including those on official leave). The Educational Fee and Tuition Reduction Program is a qualified tuition reduction plan under Section 117 of the Internal Revenue Code. Under this program, fees waived for enrollment in undergraduate courses are exempt from federal, state and social security taxes; fees waived for graduate level courses (above 500) are subject to tax; tax is payable by the employee. Provisions of federal or state law may, however, change at any time. Participation in the Educational Fee and Tuition Reduction Program is subject to the provisions, interpretations, and limitations contained in the following subsections. [ed. 7-02]

B.C. SPOUSE PARTNERS OF STUDENT EMPLOYEES EXCLUDED. Spouse Partners of employees who are full-time students, including spouse partners of instructional assistants and graduate assistants, are not covered by this policy, except as provided in C-2, and are required to pay full fees and applicable tuition. [Consult the Graduate Bulletin for information concerning assistantships.] [ed. 7-02]

C.D. LIMITATION OF SPOUSE PARTNER'S ELIGIBILITY.

C-1. The spouse of an eligible employee having less than four continuous years of employment may register under this policy for only two courses (not to exceed nine credits) in a semester, for only one course (not to exceed four credits) in the summer session, and for three intersession credits per year. If these limits are exceeded, full fees and applicable tuition are charged for those credits that exceed the specified limit.

C-2. A spouse partner who is also an eligible employee cannot register for more academic credits than other employees are entitled to under Section 3740.
Section 3750: Employee Spouse/Partner Educational Fee and Tuition

ED. SPOUSE/PARTNER REGISTRATION DATA FORM. A Spouse/Partner Registration Data Form needs to be completed by the employee and attached to the registration form. Spouse/Partner Registration Data Forms are available from the Student Accounts/Cashiers Office. [ed. 7-02]

FE. REGISTRATION FOR OTHER THAN REGULAR CREDIT. In applying the credit limitations in B, courses taken for audit, zero-credit, or CEUs are counted as if they were taken for regular credit.

GF. TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT. If an employee’s appointment is terminated during an academic period for which the employee’s spouse/partner is registered for academic work under this policy, the academic work must be terminated unless the applicable fees are paid, except that if employment is terminated due to disability or death, the spouse/partner or surviving spouse/partner is not required to pay full fees for the remainder of the academic period during which the spouse/partner was enrolled at the time of disability or death of the employee.

HG. LIMITATION TO REGULAR PROGRAMS AND TERMS. This tuition reduction program does not apply to continuing education courses or courses offered through Independent Study in Idaho. It applies only to courses that are offered as a part of the regular program on the Moscow campus during a regular academic session or intersession period. Specifically, courses offered through correspondence or continuing education are excluded from this program.

IH. LIMITATION TO ACADEMIC SERVICES. A person who is registered under this policy is entitled only to academic services (e.g., instruction and use of the library). Other services covered by regular fees, such as student health services, insurance, ASUI membership, student activities, and admission to athletic events, are not included. Special fees imposed for certain aspects of instruction, such as for special courses and programs, web-based courses, individual instruction in music, and course-related field trips, must be paid.
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DEPENDENT EDUCATIONAL FEE REDUCTION

Preamble: This policy was created in 2010 with employee recruitment and retention purposes in mind as well as improving the culture and climate at the university.

A. General: The dependent educational fee reduction benefit (benefit) is a 50% reduction in residential (in-state) student fees (including costs of matriculation) for University of Idaho undergraduate or graduate academic credit courses. No other fees are waived; for example, the benefit does not include additional fees associated with specific courses (e.g., web-based courses), specific academic programs (e.g., professional fees), or specific services (e.g., insurance or student activities). The benefit does not apply to noncredit courses, intersession or summer session courses, continuing education courses, or courses offered through Independent Study in Idaho, the College of Law, the Executive MBA Program, or the WWAMI Medical Program. There is no limitation on the number of credits that may be taken per semester.

A-1. Students who are eligible for other tuition or fee waivers or scholarships awarded by the university are only eligible to receive the dependent fee reduction at the discretion of the university. In general, the dependent education fee reduction will not be awarded in amounts that cause the total fee reduction provided by University of Idaho sources to exceed 50%. Scholarships awarded by outside entities are not included in this calculation.

B. Employee: An eligible employee is board-appointed and employed 50% or more for at least 6 months prior to the academic term in question without a greater than 2-week break in service. Dependents may receive the benefit when the eligible employee has met the aforementioned requirements by the first day of the academic term.

C. Dependent: An eligible dependent is a dependent as defined by the Federal income tax code. The university reserves the right to request copies of tax returns or other supporting documentation.

C-1. An eligible dependent:

(a) must be an admitted student who has met all normal academic requirements for the course(s) taken.

(b) may receive only one 50% dependent educational fee reduction per semester, and may use the fee reduction benefit for a maximum of eight semesters.

(c) of an employee whose employment terminates due to death or permanent disability shall continue to be eligible for this program until the dependent child meets one of the below, whichever comes first:

- completes a degree
- reaches the maximum age for eligibility
- reaches the maximum number of semesters

D. Application: Applications require approvals/signatures of the employee, the dependent, and Human Resources. The benefit is not automatically renewed; it must be applied for each term.
Fraudulent certification of dependent eligibility is grounds for discharge and the employee shall be required to repay all costs associated with the benefit.