University of Idaho  
2013-2014 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #8

3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, October 22, 2013  
Horizon, Commons  
IWC Room 390 – Boise  
213 – Coeur d’Alene  
TAB 321B IF4 – Idaho Falls

Order of Business

I.  Call to Order.

II.  Minutes.  
    • Minutes of the 2013-14 Faculty Senate Meeting #7, October 15, 2013 (vote)

III.  Chair’s Report.

IV.  Provost’s Report.

V.  Other Announcements and Communications.  
    • Office of Public Safety & Security (Dorschel)  
    • Faculty Evaluations (Provost)

VII.  Committee Reports.  
    • Ubuntu (Dodge)  
    • Teaching & Advising – student evaluations – FSH 2700 (Lighty/Stevenson)  
    • Faculty Affairs (McDaniel)  
      o FS-14-009: FSH 1565 – Ranks and Responsibilities – emeritus title (introduction)  
      o FS-14-010: FSH 3520 – Tenure - hiring with tenure (introduction)

VII.  Special Orders.

VIII.  Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX.  New Business.  
    • Senate support for Cultural Competencies Symposium

X.  Adjournment.

Professor Trish Hartzell, Chair 2013-2014, Faculty Senate

Attachments:  Minutes of 2013-2014 FS Meeting #7  
Public Safety handouts (quick reference 2MB is posted to web)  
Ubuntu Report  
TEAC Report  
FS-14-009; 010
A quorum being present, Senate Chair Hartzell called the meeting to order at 3:30pm.

Minutes: It was moved and seconded (Cobb, Baillargeon) to approve the minutes of meeting #6. Motion carried.

Chair’s Report. The Chair reported on the following items:

- Professor Emeritus Malcolm Renfrew passed away on Saturday, October 12 – his 103rd birthday. Dr. Renfrew was a champion for education, a leader in his field of chemistry and a huge donor to the University of Idaho. He was an amazing man, active until this past year and still painting landscapes.

- More faculty need to become involved in senate committees that carry out essential work for the university regarding curriculum, judicial proceedings, campus climate, policy decisions, and so on. At this time there are vacancies on the following committees: University Curriculum Committee – Art & Architecture representative; University Committee for General Education – Business and Economics representative. Senators from these colleges are asked to contact Secretary Eckwright or Vice-Chair Ytreberg with suggestions for filling these vacancies.

- Senate Leadership recently discussed making changes to how senate minutes are written and in the next weeks we will be exploring time-saving options for providing the minutes. We plan to post abbreviated typed minutes along with a complete audio file which will be marked with signposts. We will consider other options such as purchasing transcription software. Ultimately, the goal is to free up some of the faculty secretary’s time for more critical and mentally engaging activities.

- Three more presidential candidates will be visiting UI during the next two weeks and will be on the Moscow campus on the following dates: Dr. Applegate – Tuesday, October 22; Dr. Staben – Thursday, October 24; Dr. Nichols – October 29. Finalists’ vitae are available here: http://www.uidaho.edu/president/presidential-search/search-finalists. Please provide feedback regarding the candidates via the “Feedback Form” found on the side bar on the left side of the screen.

- At the October 1 senate meeting there were three resolutions proposed regarding the Student Code of Conduct (SCC). Senate voted on only the resolution to send the SCC to the University Judicial Council (UJC) for evaluation. UJC is now reviewing the code and Secretary Eckwright, Ann Thompson, assistant to the faculty secretary, and/or I will be present at their meetings. UJC will review sections at a time and send completed sections to senate for a vote with the hope of keeping a tight timeframe. The plan is to first develop the amnesty section as this is completely new, important for student safety and fairly innocuous. Next, we plan to review the section on jurisdiction, then student rights and finally the appeals section.
The second resolution that was not voted on at senate two weeks ago was a request to post information copies of the existing and proposed SCC online and inform student leaders. We have posted the side-by-side comparison document created by Ann Thompson. The ASUI president and the Argonaut have been contacted.

The third resolution was to request information from the Dean of Students’ office including the number of cases of dishonesty, Cleary Act offenses, cases sent to UIC, outcomes and appeals. Chair Hartzell will meet with Dean Pitman on Thursday to present this request.

- Chair Hartzell attended a Focus for the Future planning meeting and an Administrative Roundtable meeting last week. There were three main discussion items at the roundtable:
  - University of Idaho’s 125th anniversary celebration kick-off will be held in Boise on January 22, 2014 and a gala will be held January 30 in Moscow. Additional events will be held in Coeur d’Alene in July and in Idaho Falls in September. For more information see: [http://www.uidaho.edu/125years](http://www.uidaho.edu/125years). One goal during this period is to raise $125,000 in scholarship funds. Colleges are invited to submit materials for special displays to Bill Loftus, chair of the anniversary celebration committee.
  - Senator Baillargeon presented an update on a staff survey at the roundtable. A surprising finding from the survey is that 1/3 of staff had felt bullied at some point. Additional information about the survey:
    - 58% response rate from mostly classified staff (62% women responded);
    - Respondents were generally happy about working conditions but unhappy about salary;
    - Management conditions are still a big problem;
    - Respondents feel good about technology and organizational climate.
  - Chris Murray and Chad Neilson discussed external email management at the roundtable. They reported that cable companies are blacklisting UI emails to alumni and other interested people in the Boise area. They will be purchasing new software for sending external email and will track email frequency so that we do not bombard recipients with too many email messages. These changes will not affect internal email lists.

- Integrated Research Innovation Center (IRIC) will hold an open house on Wednesday, October 16. All are welcome to attend to learn more about the building plans and to provide input to the architects and designers. For more information: [http://www.uidaho.edu/newsevents/item?name=integrated-research-innovation-center----building-design-presentation](http://www.uidaho.edu/newsevents/item?name=integrated-research-innovation-center----building-design-presentation)

- Governor’s Task Force on Improving Education has released its report and it is available at: [http://www.boardofed.idaho.gov/board_initiatives/education_improvement_taskforce/taskforce_jump.asp](http://www.boardofed.idaho.gov/board_initiatives/education_improvement_taskforce/taskforce_jump.asp)

- Future senate guests and topics include: Faculty Affairs Committee to discuss proposed changes to the handbook, Teaching and Advising Committee to talk about student evaluations, Provost Aiken to discuss faculty evaluations, the University Budget and Finance Committee and a representative from Enrollment Management.

**Provost’s Report.** Vice-Provost Stevenson reported on the following items:

- At last week’s President’s Breakfast for Progress we discussed Focus for the Future criteria, weightings and a timeline. Those present at the breakfast include university leadership, from vice-presidents and provosts through deans, department chairs, unit directors, and student leaders. The process is moving along with additional definition. In response to a senator’s question, Vice-Provost Stevenson said that “programs” are defined as anything university-wide
that has money attached to it. The State Board of Education (SBOE) expects quintiles to be determined holistically on a university-wide basis.

- Please note the recent communication regarding posting mid-term grades. Timely mid-term grades are helpful in the advising process particularly for those students who are at-risk academically. The last day to withdraw from classes is November 1 and spring advising will begin.
- There is a new retention initiative which will bring together all colleges at an event in late October/early November. This is collaboration between the advising center and staff in general studies. Academically at-risk students will be invited to attend but any student may choose to attend.
- Senators are encouraged to participate in and provide feedback to the SBOE for the presidential search process.

Chair Hartzell then invited Nancy Krogh, registrar, to speak about the new online graduation application process. A new system was needed because the homegrown system that had been created 15-20 years ago broke-down during upgrades. Fortunately Banner allows for a no-cost solution which integrates well with the main student information. The steps in the process are as follows: students will access their information online and will ensure that their curricula, majors/minors are correctly represented. They will put information in and hit “submit,” which sends a notification to their advisors. Advisors may then reach out to the student and do those things that may need to be done, such as substitutions or waivers or whatever preparation needs to be done. It then goes to the college for approval where it is reviewed for completeness. If everything is complete, the college representative forwards the information to the registrar’s office. The registrar’s office puts the information into the system and at that point assesses the $25.00 graduation fee. If a student does not have everything they need to graduate that term, the college representative will deny the application and return it to the student with an explanation and no fee will be assessed.

Registrar Krogh responded as follows to senators’ questions and comments:

- **Will notification to the students occur by email?** Yes, they are notified every step of the way.
- **Are students able to use VandalWeb to see where they are in the approval queue?** No, but there is information available describing the steps involved in the process.
- **The handouts you provided indicate the registrar’s office began exploring this new process in February 2012. Could you have come to senate at that time, so that there could have been some faculty consultation with this new process?** We were not changing policy, we were only changing procedures. Also, the faculty representative on the Commencement Committee attended the planning meetings. If the registrar’s office brought every technology project to senate, it would take a lot of senate’s time. For example, we are currently working on a number of technology projects that we hope will be seamless and make services better – without affecting policy.
- **Had this come to senate earlier we could have influenced these changes. With electronic graduation applications we lose the opportunity to meet with a student who has completed his or her requirements. This is the culminating moment and in our college we look forward to meeting with the student and saying “Yes, you have done it! Congratulations, we are pleased to send your application forward.” This personal touch has been severed because the advisor now does not have the opportunity to meet with the student. We got that feedback, loud and clear, and we agree that this is important. We had many conversations about how important this is and how it should not be lost. As a result we made sure that the advisors receive notification**
every step of the way when the student submits graduation application information. Advisors may then reach out to the students and say “I see you have applied for graduation. This is such an important step – please make an appointment with me.”

- **Other universities use the online graduation application process and have also retained the one-on-one connection with their advisors.**
- **In this new system it appears that the approval goes directly to the college office for approval and that will cut-out the advisor?** The college approvers are working with college advisors to ensure that advisors are not cut-out and that they communicate. But we also heard that advisor-approval is an extra step, an administrative step, and doing this would free advisors to spend more time on the important work which is working with their students to help clean things up, as well as the “congratulations” and building/maintaining a relationship.
- **Does this new process bypass the chair? In our department this usually goes to the chair.** The chair is not involved in this process. In the past it was the college officer who collected and reviewed all of the paper graduation applications’ materials and brought them to the registrar’s office for data input – the chair was not part of the process. However, the substitutions/waivers do go through the departmental chair.
- Dr. Krogh added that she is willing to come back to senate or to a committee to discuss standardizing procedures within departments throughout the university.

**FS-14-008** (UCC-1-021). Final Exam schedule 2014. This item is a request for approval of the 2014 exam schedule and comes as a seconded motion from the University Curriculum Committee (UCC). Motion carried.

**FS-14-007** (UCC-14-014) Regulation L. Chair Hartzell next invited Jerry McMurtry, associate dean for the College of Graduate Studies, to discuss proposed changes to catalog Regulation L. This regulation has to do with academic standing for graduate students and it currently resides in part IV of the catalog. The Academic Petitions Committee may address only those issues that are in part III of the catalog. The proposed change will move this regulation to part III so that academic standing for graduate students may be adjusted in a similar manner to what is available for undergraduate students. This change does not affect students in the College of Law (as per Regulation L-12). This item comes as a seconded motion from the UCC. Motion carried.

**Borah Foundation Committee.** Professor Rick Spence, co-chair of the Borah committee, briefly reported on the Borah symposium plans for April 2014, including the three main speakers scheduled for April 7, 8 and 9, as well as the special colloquia scheduled during April 1-4. Local individuals will also be giving talks during the Borah Symposium. In response to a senator’s question, Professor Spence commented that the public is always welcome to attend and participate in this symposium. High school teachers, in particular, are invited to bring students.

**Safety and Loss Control Committee.** Professor Eric Stuen, chair of the Safety and Loss Control Committee (SLCC), explained that the committee has been looking into the issue of a smoking/tobacco ban. SLCC committee members discussed the issue during a series of meetings last year and also polled faculty and staff within their units who generally opposed such a ban. SLCC is divided on whether to recommend that faculty senate move forward with a tobacco ban. Last year two different surveys were conducted by two different groups:

- Student Health Center survey
  - 985 respondents (87% students);
respondents were found at Student Recreation Center and the Commons; some surveys were sent to specific classes, but it is unknown which classes received the surveys or how those classes were selected to participate in the survey;

- 62% of the respondents favored a smoking ban at UI and 51% favored banning all tobacco.

- ASUI survey
  - Administered at random to people walking into the Commons; 304 were polled.
    - Nearly all undergrads;
    - 43% favored smoking ban;
    - 31% favored banning all tobacco;
    - 70% favored further limiting of outdoor smoking to designated areas.

SLCC members feel there is not enough knowledge of public opinion to move forward with a ban at this time. SLCC recommendations:

- Hold a public forum to educate people about the possibilities of banning smoking, banning all tobacco or doing nothing;
- Conduct a comprehensive, unbiased survey to capture input from the entire university. Perhaps Faculty Senate or some other unbiased unit could undertake a survey.

Senators then entered into a wide-ranging discussion and made the following points:

- The catalyst for this proposed smoking ban came from former-President Nellis in August 2012. He asked Senate Leadership if this was something we should look into, after another state institution had adopted a smoking ban. President Nellis did not take a position on the ban.
- Graduate and Professional Student Association surveyed graduate students and some graduate faculty with results similar to those from the ASUI survey. Most of the respondents favored restrictions on smoking areas rather than a ban on all smoking.
- It would be a good idea for members of the Safety and Loss Control Committee to work with ASUI on conducting an unbiased survey. Perhaps some senators could do the leg work for this.
- It would be best for an unbiased group, such as the Social Science Research unit or the office of Institutional Research and Assessment, to conduct the survey.
- There are concerns about biased people administering biased surveys, as well as concerns about populations chosen for the surveys – e.g., students going to the Student Recreation Center may already be predisposed to a certain opinion toward smoking. Some people perceived that those conducting surveys were biased in favor of a smoking ban. Also, if the survey provides a number of options, people will tend to select the less conservative options – the questions asked on the survey will also affect the outcome.
- No one will take on the task of developing a survey if we do not have a goal or a specific outcome established. Is it health, safety or something else? The next step is to determine exactly why we want to do this. We cannot ask people which solution they prefer for a problem that has not been fully identified. If the problem is that we want people to change their behavior so as to live healthier lives, then maybe the solution is education. Different solutions may emerge for mitigating risk from fire damage and second-hand smoke, and so on.
- A poll is a method for gathering information for a discussion by the senate; a poll is not necessarily the determinant of the outcome.
- Who would enforce a smoking ban? Do we have any sense of who would be the enforcing body of such a ban? State law prohibits smoking indoors in state buildings. We need more information about how we would handle enforcement before voting on this matter.
• Enforcement becomes an issue on the Moscow campus because some of the streets used by students, faculty and staff are city streets and anyone could use tobacco on those streets regardless of whether there is a smoking/tobacco ban on campus. Smoking zones that include streets becomes a more acceptable solution.
• What happens if there is not a majority of people who want a smoking ban? If a minority of people wants the ban, will it still be brought forward as a matter of policy that would be good for everyone – whether it has majority support or not? We may be able to reasonably predict that by some small percentage students will favor smoking zones rather than a ban; and that by a similarly small percentage faculty/staff may favor a ban. If this is a health issue, do we want to determine what we do based on a poll?
• All other public universities in Idaho have implemented a smoking or tobacco ban. Did these institutions conduct surveys and have they addressed enforcement? A senator had contacted other institutions and had learned that enforcement “does not happen.” Also, there is more litter on campuses with smoking bans because cigarette-extinguisher receptacles have been removed and those who continue to smoke, despite the ban, throw their tobacco litter on the ground.
• The Idaho Falls campus (for both UI and ISU) does not have a smoking/tobacco ban. It would be a nightmare to enforce.
• We should be very careful about our inclinations toward social control. Smoking is a legal activity. What is the university’s interest in a ban? Is it promoting the safety of the community by preventing second-hand smoke? Is it about avoiding litter? What, exactly, is our interest in such a ban?
• Second-hand smoke is viewed by some as a safety issue, whereas chewing tobacco is viewed as a personal decision because it affects only the person chewing the tobacco.
• Safety and Loss Control Committee has discussed the location of smoking zones and has suggested that there might be a few centralized zones farther away from campus.
• A number of senators supported the concept of public forums for educating people about smoking.
• A senator suggested that people are more prone to changing positively than negatively. Perhaps promoting the concept of a tobacco-free campus, which would result in a healthier place, rather than an outright ban, would engage more people. Some language and signage could be put up that would support the concept of a tobacco-free campus but without requiring it or trying to enforce it. Another suggestion is to push back the current smoking markers another 25 feet and use signage to the effect “If you must smoke, smoke here.”
• Chair Hartzell suggested that the Safety and Loss Control Committee may want to focus future discussion not on an outright ban but rather on encouraging people to think about it.

Adjournment: It was moved and seconded (Murphy, Stoll) to adjourn at 4:47pm. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Gail Z. Eckwright
Secretary to Faculty Senate and Faculty Secretary
The Office of Public Safety & Security was formed by merging Emergency Management & Security Services, Environmental Health & Safety, and Risk Management, in an effort to put better focus on campus safety, to improve collaboration and to continuously improve safety & security processes. Our primary objective is an effective and efficient safety and security program.

This organization enables improved response times and resource allocation to address the highest priorities in safety and security, and it positions UI to evolve and expand safety and security in the future.
UI Public Safety & Security - Functions & Roles

- Threat Assessment and Management Team

The UI threat assessment and management team includes representatives from Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, the Moscow Police Department and Human Resources and a clinical psychologist from the University’s Counseling Center. Legal counsel serves as an advisor to the team. The team is chaired by the Executive Director of Public Safety & Security. The team is charged with developing comprehensive fact-based assessments of students, employees, or other individuals who may present a threat to the university and is empowered to take timely and appropriate action, consistent with university policy and applicable law. The team collaborates with the campus community in the development of preventative measures, including implementing plans and protocols for responding to credible threats and acts of violence, and reviewing and developing threat assessment and response policies and procedures.

- Clery Act Compliance
  - Safety & Security Policies
  - Annual Report (crime stats)
  - Emergency Notification / Timely Warning
  - Campus Security Authority Program

- Liaison with MPD, MFD, Sheriff

RISK MANAGEMENT
Office: 208-885-7177

- Collaborate w/ UI community to assess risk exposure
- Agreements and contracts review
- Routine operations & special events
- Develop innovative approaches to mitigate risk exposure and meet changing needs
  - Risk Transfer programs
  - Certificates of Insurance
  - Waivers
- Liaison to State Risk Manager
- Claims Processing
UI SECURITY / ALLIED BARTON
Office: 208-885-7054 (24HRS)

- Safe Walk
- Crime Deterrence
- Event Security
- Event Planning
- Emphasis patrols
- Building Security

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH & SAFETY
Office: 208-885-6524

- Occupational Safety
- Industrial Hygiene
  o Asbestos Management/Air Quality/Lab Safety
- Hazardous Materials
- Fire Safety
  o Evacuation Plans/Fire Drills
- Radiation Safety
  o Radiation-Producing Equipment Use / Radioactive Materials and/or Waste
- Environmental Compliance
  o Air Quality Program
  o Liaison with Regulatory Agencies
  o Water Quality Programs and Permits

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT
Office: 208-885-2254

- Vandal Alert – Mass Notification System
- Emergency Response Planning / Unit Plan assistance
- Prepare, Respond, Recover – all hazards
- Response Exercises & Drills
**Summary Of The Jeanne Clery Act**

The Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (20 USC § 1092(f)) is the landmark federal law, originally known as the Campus Security Act, that requires colleges and universities across the United States to disclose information about crime on and around their campuses. The law is tied to an institution's participation in federal student financial aid programs and it applies to most institutions of higher education both public and private. The Act is enforced by the United States Department of Education.

The law was amended in 1992 to add a requirement that schools afford the victims of campus sexual assault certain basic rights, and was amended again in 1998 to expand the reporting requirements. The 1998 amendments also formally named the law in memory of Jeanne Clery. Subsequent amendments in 2000 and 2008 added provisions dealing with registered sex offender notification and campus emergency response. The 2008 amendments also added a provision to protect crime victims, "whistleblowers", and others from retaliation.

The Clery Act requires colleges and universities:

**Publish an Annual Security Report (ASR)** by October 1, documenting three calendar years of select campus crime statistics including security policies and procedures and information on the basic rights guaranteed victims of sexual assault. The law requires schools make the report available to all current students and employees, and prospective students and employees must be notified of its existence and given a copy upon request. Schools may comply with this requirement via the internet if required recipients are notified and provided exact information regarding the on-line location of the report. Paper copies of the ASR should be available upon request. All crime statistics must be provided to the U.S. Department of Education.

**To have a public crime log.** Institutions with a police or security department are required to maintain a public crime log documenting the "nature, date, time, and general location of each crime" and its disposition, if known. Incidents must be entered into the log within two business days. The log should be accessible to the public during normal business hours; remain open for 60 days and, subsequently, made available within two business days upon request.

**Disclose crime statistics** for incidents that occur on campus, in unobstructed public areas immediately adjacent to or running through the campus and at certain non-campus facilities including Greek housing and remote classrooms. The statistics must be gathered from campus police or security, local law enforcement and other school officials who have "significant responsibility for student and campus activities.” The Clery Act requires reporting of crimes in seven major categories, some with significant sub-categories and conditions:
1. Criminal Homicide
   Murder & Nonnegligent manslaughter
   Negligent manslaughter

2. Sex Offenses
   Forcible
   Non-Forcible

3. Robbery
4. Aggravated Assault
5. Burglary, where:
   There is evidence of unlawful entry (trespass), which may be either forcible or not involve force.
   Unlawful entry must be of a structure - having four walls, a roof, and a door.
   There is evidence that the entry was made in order to commit a felony or theft.

6. Motor Vehicle Theft
7. Arson

Schools are also required to report statistics for the following categories of arrests or referrals for campus disciplinary action (if an arrest was not made):

   Liquor Law Violations
   Drug Law Violations
   Illegal Weapons Possession

Hate crimes must be reported by category of prejudice, including race, gender, religion, sexual orientation, ethnicity, and disability. Statistics are also required for four additional crime categories if the crime committed is classified as a hate crime:

   Larceny/Theft
   Simple Assault
   Intimidation
   Destruction/Damage/Vandalism of Property
Issue timely warnings about Clery Act crimes which pose a serious or ongoing threat to students and employees. Institutions must provide timely warnings in a manner likely to reach all members of the campus community. This mandate has been part of the Clery Act since its inception in 1990. Timely warnings are limited to those crimes an institution is required to report and include in its ASR. There are differences between what constitutes a timely warning and an emergency notification; however, both systems are in place to safeguard students and campus employees.

Devise an emergency response, notification and testing policy. Institutions are required to inform the campus community about a “significant emergency or dangerous situation involving an immediate threat to the health or safety of students or employees occurring on the campus.” An emergency response expands the definition of timely warning as it includes both Clery Act crimes and other types of emergencies (i.e., a fire or infectious disease outbreak). Colleges and universities with and without on-campus residential facilities must have emergency response and evacuation procedures in place. Institutions are mandated to disclose a summary of these procedures in their ASR. Additionally, compliance requires one test of the emergency response procedures annually and policies for publicizing those procedures in conjunction with the annual test.

Compile and report fire data to the federal government and publish an annual fire safety report. Similar to the ASR and the current crime log, institutions with on-campus housing must report fires that occur in on-campus housing, generate both an annual fire report and maintain a fire log that is accessible to the public.

Enact policies and procedures to handle reports of missing students. This requirement is intended to minimize delays and confusion during the initial stages of a missing student investigation. Institutions must designate one or more positions or organizations to which reports of a student living in on-campus housing can be filed if it’s believed that student has been missing for 24 hours.
University of Idaho - Threat Assessment & Management Team Protocol

Introduction: As part of a larger and institution-wide commitment to a safe campus and workplace environment, the president has formalized the structure of the Threat Assessment and Management Team and appointed its chair. The team includes representatives from the Moscow Police Department, Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Media Relations, Human Resources and a licensed psychologist from the University’s Counseling Center. UI General Counsel serves as an advisor. The team is chaired by the Executive Director of Public Safety & Security.

Charter of Threat Assessment & Management Team: The team is charged with developing fact-based assessments of students, employees, or other individuals whose conduct raises a concern about a potential threat to the UI community and is empowered to take timely and appropriate action, consistent with university policy and applicable law. The team collaborates with the campus community in the development of preventative measures, including implementing plans and protocols for responding to credible threats and acts of violence and reviewing, and developing threat assessment and response policies and procedures.

Reporting or Referring Behavior of Concern to the Threat Assessment & Management Team: Violent or threatening behavior is behavior that would cause a reasonable person to fear for his or her safety, or the safety of others. Examples include, but are not limited to, physical acts that intend to or cause harm to an individual; harassing or threatening oral or written statements, telephone calls, e-mail messages, or gestures; frequent or prolonged shouting; or behaviors such as stalking.

All members of the University community benefit by helping to maintain a safe working, living, and learning environment. Retaliation against individuals who report incidents of violent or threatening behavior is strictly prohibited. The following procedures are outlined in APM 95.33, Reporting Incidents of Violent or Threatening Behavior and should be followed when reporting incidents of violent or threatening behavior at the University of Idaho:

Emergency or Life-Threatening Incidents

All individuals at the Moscow or Coeur d'Alene campuses call 911 at any time during the day or night for immediate assistance. Individuals at the Boise campus should dial 9-911, while individuals at the Idaho Falls campus should dial 8-911 for immediate assistance.

After reporting the incident to the police, the incident should be reported to the appropriate university official as outlined below.

All Other Incidents

Employees should contact their immediate supervisor first; if supervisor is not available, contact the next level administrator; or contact the center dean or manager; or If none of the above are available, contact the Executive Director of Public Safety & Security, (208) 885-7209.
**University Students** should report the incident to the Dean of Students, (208) 885-6757.

**All other individuals** should contact the Executive Director of Public Safety & Security, (208) 885-2254.

**Recordkeeping documentation and disclosure:** All records are maintained by the TAMT chair and treated with strict confidentiality. Case review worksheets and other case records will be saved electronically on a secure shared drive, with access permissions granted on a need to know basis. Threat Assessment & Management Team Core members are granted routine access to the shared drive. Others may be granted access to TAMT files upon approval of the team chair. Hard copy records will be stored in a secure office.

Cases will be reviewed using the following guidelines and methodology, developed by Deisinger and Randazzo. © Gene Deisinger, Ph.D. & Marisa Randazzo, Ph.D. (2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Guidelines</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on facts of specific case.</td>
<td>1. Does the person pose a threat of harm, whether to themselves, to others, or both?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on the person’s <strong>behavior</strong> rather than the person’s traits.</td>
<td>2. If not, does the person otherwise show a need for help or intervention?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on understanding of context of behavior.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine <strong>progression of behavior</strong> over time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corroborate</strong> critical information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Every team member’s opinion matters and must be shared</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on <strong>prevention</strong> not prediction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal: safety of the community and the person in question</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All case reviews will be documented using the University of Idaho Threat Assessment & Management Team Case Review Sheet.

Threat Assessment Team records may be exempt from public disclosure, especially when the disclosure could jeopardize the safety of persons or the public safety. The authority to approve disclosure of any and all Threat Assessment & Management Team records outside of UI rests solely with the office of UI General Counsel.
Ubuntu Committee Meeting Minutes
September 23, 2013, 2 to 3 p.m.

Present: Jeffrey Dodge, Chair, Radhika Sehgal, Rochelle Smith, Tasha Dev, Samantha Hansen, Leathia Botello, Lysa Salsbury, Julia Keleher, Eric Skipper, and Elissa Keim

The Ubuntu Committee met for the first time on Monday, September 23, 2013 to evaluate the work done in the past and discuss the future.

1. Review Year End Report – the Committee reviewed the end of year report submitted by the immediate past chair to discuss the work accomplished and the work we need to continue. In that process, the three subcommittees from last year were discussed: Media, Domestic Partners and the DREAM Act. The Committee agreed to continue the work of the Media subcommittee by first updating the website with the names of current members. Leathia and Lysa agreed to take on that project. The Domestic Partners subcommittee’s main focus was on getting medical benefits for partners of University employees. The University has accomplished this goal and the Committee thinks the main work is now done. Elissa will check in with Human Resources to see if there are any issues with the extension of benefits. The Committee is interested in the expansion of soft benefits, like gym memberships and discounts. The work of the DREAM Act subcommittee seemed to be the most pressing need to continued effort. The group discussed the impact of new enrollment standards and scholarship policies on recruiting a diverse student body. There was also discussion on the need to educate people on the DREAM Act and the intersection between our policies and the impact on undocumented applicants and students.

2. Review the Charge and Purpose – the Committee reviewed and discussed the history, charge and purpose of the group. More specifically, the Committee read aloud the material on the Faculty Senate’s website as well as what is on Ubuntu’s own page. During this process, Committee members noted that the history and charge includes disability services yet there is no formal representation present on the Committee. The chair agreed to reach out to DSS for involvement and to properly connect Ubuntu to the ADA Advisory Board.

3. Brainstorming for the Year – the Committee then engaged in an open discussion on other items which might be of interest to work on this year. Some of those ideas included: the financial aid and scholarship policies at the University, connection with the ADA Advisory Board, awareness of our disability accommodation short falls, both academically and physically, and more. The chair agreed to speak with Gloria Jensen about some of these issues and get back to the Committee. The Committee also discussed the need to firm up the membership of the group in light of student, faculty and staff changes.

The meetings for the semester are set for Wednesday, October 23, 2013 from 10 to 11 a.m. and Monday, November 18, 2013 from 2 to 3 p.m., both in the Panorama Room of the Commons.
Teaching and Advising Committee  
Status report to Faculty Senate: 10.22.13  
**Review of Student Evaluation of Teaching System**

Committee chair: David Sigler, English  
Presenting member: Chris Lighty, Institutional Research and Assessment

We have identified **three main problems** with the current system:
1) low response rates  
2) the questions are too general  
3) the questions aren’t tied to learning outcomes

We are in the midst of formulating **recommendations** to address these problems.

1) We will likely recommend development of a **mobile app** for course evaluations, to supplement the current online process. It could be incorporated into the existing University of Idaho app. With it, instructors could designate time in class for completing course evaluations. This might replicate the high response rates of paper evaluations but generate electronic data.

We are also discussing additional ways to boost response rates.

2) We propose to add approximately **five additional questions** to the questionnaire, these to precede the two existing questions, which will be retained. These questions are still in development, but we’ve agreed on some general topics about which to develop questions. These are:

- Did the instructor express clear expectations for your learning? [Or perhaps: Did the instructor explain the learning outcomes for the course?]  
- Did the instructor’s teaching methods help you learn?  
- Did the assignments for the course aid your learning?  
- Was the instructor helpful to you outside of class time, such as in office hours and by email?  
- Did the instructor challenge you to think? [Or perhaps: Does the instructor expect a lot from you?]  
- Overall, how would you rate the performance of the instructor in teaching this course? [existing question]  
- Overall, how would you rate the quality of this course? [existing question]

Feedback on this work-in-progress may be sent to David Sigler, dsigler@uidaho.edu
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E-1. ELIGIBILITY. A board appointed, benefit-eligible member of the university faculty who holds one of the ranks described in 1565 D and who leaves the university and has a minimum of 8 years of service, has attained the criteria of a minimum of 55 years of age, and has attained the rule of 65 (age plus years of service is at least 65) is designated as “professor emeritus/emerita,” “research professor emeritus/emerita,” or “extension professor emeritus/emerita,” as applicable. A faculty member without such rank has the designation “emeritus” or “emerita,” as applicable, added to the administrative or service title held at the time of retirement. 

In exceptional circumstances the provost, with the concurrence of Senate Chair, Vice Chair and Faculty Secretary, may suspend the above eligibility rules and award or deny emeritus status to a faculty member. 

E-2. RIGHTS, PRIVILEGES, AND RESPONSIBILITIES. Emeriti are faculty members in every respect, except for the change in salary and in certain fringe benefits, the obligation to perform duties, and the right to vote in faculty meetings. They continue to have access to research, library, and other UI facilities. Emeriti may take an active role in the service and committee functions of their department, college, and the university. UI encourages the voluntary continued participation of emeriti in the activities of the academic community.

E-3. EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES. 

a. Emeritus faculty may hold a part-time position at the University of Idaho after retirement, but not a full-time one. When it is in the university’s interest, exceptions may be made and the full-time employment limitation may be waived by the president.

b. Units wanting to employ emeritus faculty without a search must request, in writing, a search waiver from the Director of Human Rights, Access & Inclusion.

c. Search waivers granted to emeritus faculty remain in effect for three full years. Units need only notify Human Resources if they want to continue to employ an emeritus faculty member while the search waiver is in effect. However, a unit is not obligated to employ the emeritus faculty member during this three year period.

E-4. SPECIFIC PROVISIONS FOR EMERITUS PARTICIPATION. 

Commented [TA1]: Attaining emeritus title should be an honor and earned similar to years of service equivalent for attaining tenure.

Commented [TA2]: The intent was a position at the UI.
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F. TIME REQUIREMENTS FOR TENURE ELIGIBILITY.

F-1. Prior to the award of tenure, employment beyond the annual term of appointment may not be legally presumed. (RGP IIG6). Ordinarily a faculty member is not considered for tenure until the fourth full year of probationary service, and consideration is mandatory no later than the sixth full year of service. (RGP IIG6). Credit for prior experience may be given in accordance with the provisions of F-4. In this context, unless otherwise specified, the term “year” means the appointment year, whether that is an academic, calendar, or fiscal year. When the appointment begins after January 1, then the following fiscal year date is the start date to begin counting for consideration for tenure. A faculty member who is not awarded tenure may be given written notice of non-reappointment, or be offered a one-year terminal appointment, or be granted an additional short-term probationary appointment for not more than a twelve-month period by mutual agreement between UI and the faculty member. The decision to offer employment following a denial of tenure is in the sole discretion of the president (RGP IIG6j). [See 3900.] [rev. 7-98, 7-02, 7-05, ren. & rev. 1-10]

F-2. Tenure evaluation procedures must be started in sufficient time to permit completion by the end of the time periods indicated in F-1. When authorized by the president or his or her designee, the year in which the tenure decision is made may be the terminal year of employment if the decision is to deny tenure. (RGP IIG6k). [rev. 7-02, ren. & ed. 1-10]

F-3. Satisfactory service in any tenurable rank may be used to fulfill the probationary periods required for awarding tenure. A maximum of two years of satisfactory service in the rank of instructor at UI may be recognized in partial fulfillment of the time requirement in the tenurable ranks. [rev. & ren. 1-10]

F-4. In cases involving prior equivalent experience, tenure may be granted following less than the usual period of service. In particular, a new faculty member with comparable experience (see FSH 3050 B) from other institutions in relation to the expectations set forth in his/her position description may be granted credit for such experience up to a maximum of four years and may be considered for tenure after a minimum of one full year of service at UI. A faculty member initially employed as an associate and/or full professor, having already attained tenure at an institution comparable to the University of Idaho, may be appointed with tenure. However, before any negotiations for appointment with tenure can begin, the action must be supported by a majority vote of the tenured faculty in the department or equivalent unit and by the university administration. If, otherwise, an associate or full professor is not appointed with tenure, they are is considered for tenure not later than the fourth full year of service. [ed. 7-98, rev. & ren. 1-10]

F-5. In the event that a nontenured faculty member’s service at UI has been discontinuous, prior years in the same or a similar tenurable rank may be counted toward tenure eligibility, subject to the limitation stated in F-3 with respect to instructors, and subject to the conditions that: [rev. & ren. 1-10]
   a. Not more than three years have passed since the faculty member left UI. [ed. 1-10]
   b. Applicability of the prior service toward tenure must be stated in writing before reappointment.
   c. At least one additional year is to be served before tenure is recommended.

F-6. If a tenured faculty member leaves UI and later returns to the same or a similar position after not more than three years, the appointment may be with tenure, or he or she may be required to serve an additional year before a tenure decision is made. Notification of probationary or tenure status is to be given in writing before reappointment.

F-7. When a nontenured faculty member holding academic rank moves from one department to another within UI, the faculty member must be informed in writing by the provost, after consultation with the new department, as to the extent to which prior service will count toward tenure eligibility. (RGP IIG6l) [rev. 7-02].

F-8. When a tenured faculty member moves from one position to another within UI, or accepts a change from full-time to part-time appointment, his or her tenure status does not change. While a tenured faculty member is serving as a unit administrator, college dean, or in some other administrative or service capacity, he or she retains membership, academic rank, and tenure in his or her academic department. Should the administrative or service responsibilities end, the faculty member resumes duties in his or her academic discipline.

Unchanged from here on.