University of Idaho  
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
2015-2016 Meeting #27, Tuesday, April 26, 2016

Present: Anderson, Barbour, Boschetti, Brandt, Brewick, Brown, Caplan, Chung, Couture (Boise), Crowley (w/o vote), Flores, Folwell, Foster, Godfrey (Coeur d’Alene), Hiromoto (Idaho Falls), Hrdlicka, Jeffery, LaPrath, Latrell, Mahoney, Murphy, Nyavor, Nicotra, Stoll, Teal, Wiencek (w/o vote), Wolf.  
Absent: Adams, Dallas, Perret.  
Guests: 10.

The Chair called meeting #27 to order at 3:32. Chair Teal asked for a moment of silence in honor of Dean Paul Joyce. The Chair commented that we would be collecting contributions for flowers.

The Faculty Secretary added a sentence to last week’s minutes since they were distributed. The added sentence pointed out that various Senators had expressed their concerns as to whether it was a prudent use of resources to maintain a law faculty in both Boise and Moscow. A motion (Latrell/Nicotra) to approve the minutes as amended passed without objection.

Chair’s Report: The Chair briefly discussed the possibility of renaming the Faculty Lounge in Paul Joyce’s honor. Paul had been a former chair of the Faculty Senate and played an instrumental role in getting this space dedicated for faculty activities. Chair Teal suggested that Senators contact him if they had thoughts on this idea. He reminded Senators that next week the University Faculty Meeting would be at 3:00. The last meeting of the Senate would be May 10th. The current Senate would meet at 3:30, and then at 4:30 the new Senate would meet for the purpose of electing a chair and vice chair.

Provost’s Report: Provost Wiencek commented that it had been a difficult week and his thoughts and prayers were with Paul and his family. He had met with the leadership of the College of Science and would not be making any decisions with regard to its leadership in the immediate future. The college was in capable hands and he would get back together with them after the end of the semester.

The search for a new dean of the College of Education has ended successfully. An announcement will be made next week. The search for a VP for the Vice President for Research and Economic Development is ongoing. He encouraged everyone, regardless of discipline, to attend the open sessions for the candidates. Three or four of these candidates would be invited back for further interviews at Boise and Idaho Falls. There will be a search for a Vice Provost of Strategic Enrollment Management chaired by Brian Foisy. He wanted to clarify that this is not a new position. It was a position that once existed. It had been combined with another position and now they are going back to the previous structure.

Spread Pay: Provost Wiencek thanked Professor Becky Tallent (Chair) and the task force created last fall for their hard work. He commented that the issue of spread pay had been brought up before. When he arrived on campus early last summer a recommendation to eliminate the use of spread pay was brought forward. After considerable concern was voiced by faculty he created this task force to fully examine the issue, investigate a range of options, and make recommendations. Provost Wiencek introduced Professor Tallent and VP Brian Foisy to further discuss the task force’s recommendation.

Professor Tallent stated that originally the task force was half staff and half faculty. There was a split on the task force as faculty tended to see spread pay as a benefit, while the staff on the task force saw considerable problems with its continued implementation through Banner. Not all the faculty members voted for the final recommendation, but a majority of the task force did vote for the recommendation to be presented today. Professor Talent discussed the fact that the task force tried hard to get those who had a view on the issue to provide input. She was gratified that most respondents to the survey stated that they felt the task force had met their expectations in seeking the views of the university
The task force did a lot of research and tried to come up with a solution that would do no harm. The proposal being presented today would:

- Allow current employees on spread pay to stay on spread pay.
- Keep employees on nine-month pay on that system.
- Create a system designed to provide incentives to move current employees on spread pay to a nine-month system.
- Not allow new faculty to choose spread pay.

Vice President of Finance Brian Foisy came forward to present some of the details of the proposal. He commented that some people had told him that, if it wasn’t broke why fix it. He responded that staff who sought to implement the current system thought something was broke. Current employees who are on spread pay will be allowed to select an option keeping them on spread pay. They would not be forced off of spread pay. He noted that to some extent those on spread pay were making an interest free loan to the University. Since the University has an administrative interest in moving people off of spread pay, the University would be offering a financial incentive to encourage those on spread pay to move to a nine-month system. In the first year, those moving to the nine-month system would be encouraged to move to a direct deposit system. Employees would need to divert 12% of their salary from each pay period to a savings plan offered by local financial institutions. In the 2nd year, employees on nine-month pay would need to save 25% of their pay to adequately cover the summer months.

There was a general discussion of how well people managed money. Some argued that the evidence overwhelmingly suggested that people have trouble saving enough to cover the months they aren’t getting paid. Others suggested that employee’s should be given the choice. Mr. Foisy stated that the university would work with employees as they moved to the new system.

A Senator suggested this was a disappointing plan and would result in the loss of another benefit. It would be particularly difficult on new faculty who would have the most trouble adjusting to three months without a salary. It was also suggested that the proposal did not address the concern that under spread pay faculty were getting paid before the semester began. It had been asserted that this violated state law since they were getting paid before work was performed. The response was that there wasn’t any current attempt by the state to force this change and that this proposal would make some progress toward dealing with this issue.

A Senator asked about the problem of paying for benefits (like health insurance) during the months a person was not on salary. Mr. Foisy stated that this had been a problem, but they had worked out a method so that benefits would be synchronized with pay, so that faculty are no longer billed for benefits during the summer months, if they chose nine-month pay. The same was true for PERSI, which only gives credit for nine months, even if a person was on spread pay.

A Senator asked how the University would monitor the direct dual deposit (the name being used for the proposed savings plan). The answer was that if a person paid into the savings plan, the University would be unable to ensure that the funds actually stayed in the savings account.

There was also a concern raised about what the proposed demise of spread pay says about a faculty member’s relationship to the University during the summer. Does this mean that a faculty member is not an employee during the summer? The Provost suggested that this was no different than it was in the past. Whether a faculty member was getting spread pay, or paid over nine months, the reality was the same. The perception may change, but most faculty will do what they need to do to keep their unit functioning over the summer. However, the question about liability was raised. Is a faculty member who comes to campus to work on a project during the summer properly covered? V.P. Foisy responded that
this was a question that deserved more exploration. He didn’t think that the difference between receiving spread pay, or being on standard pay, would result in a difference in worker’s compensation and/or liability. However, he agreed that this is something on which they should obtain a legal interpretation.

The discussion again returned to what the University could do to help new faculty arriving on campus and not receiving a paycheck until September. Unless the person was given a summer class, or similar project, there wasn’t an apparent solution to this concern. Various Senators expressed concern about the effect of this policy on new, as well as continuing faculty. One Senator commented that he believed this would be detrimental in hiring faculty. This Senator’s choice of Idaho would have been quite different had spread pay not been offered. There was a short discussion of the desirability of having some type of short-term loan fund available to employees.

A Senator asked why Banner could not be programmed to handle spread pay. If the problem is that Banner doesn’t work, then shouldn’t we be spending the money to fix Banner? V.P. Ewart responded that this wasn’t a situation where they could buy a module to fix Banner. The existing Banner system has been consistently modified and there is no easy fix for this problem. It would be costly and the fix might lead to other problems. The Senator noted that the proposed incentive to move faculty away from spread pay would probably be around $500,000. He found it interesting that when faculty ask for benefits there isn’t any money, but that funds seemed to be found for other projects. Another Senator wondered if we were doing the necessary research to move away from the limitations of the current Banner system. Some universities obviously have the administrative systems capable of implementing spread pay. V.P. Ewart stated that such research was being done, but it appeared that the cost would be extensive. The Provost pointed out that even if we moved to a system that could implement spread pay; we would still not be in compliance with state code.

A Senator pointed out that there are some staff on spread pay and sought clarification that staff would be treated the same as faculty. V.P. Foisy assured the Senate that staff on spread pay would not be forced off of spread pay, and they would be offered the same incentives as faculty. Having spread the discussion out across the entire time usually devoted to our weekly meetings, the Chair suggested that we move on to other business.

**APM 95.24 - Vandal Alert Protocol.** Chair Teal introduced Matt Dorschel from Campus Safety & Security to discuss developments with the Vandal Alert system. Mr. Dorschel briefly reviewed the basics of the campus alert system. He felt that the new policy (APM 95.24) developed last year, was working well. They do emergency notifications and warnings in compliance with the Clery Act. A question was asked about the developments in Coeur d’Alene when a former UI student was a murder suspect. Should we have been alerted? Mr. Dorschel noted that he was notified that the man hunt involved a former UI student only after the fact. He recommends using the warning system when he is notified by law enforcement of a possible threat. In this particular case, there was no indication that the former student was a threat to the campus. A Senator commented that he recognized this student, but was unsure whether, or to whom to report his concerns. Mr. Dorschel responded that the UI emergency number was available on a 24/7 basis. He encouraged anyone who becomes aware of connections to campus, or has concerns about news unfolding in the media, to please call the emergency number.

**Adjournment:** Chair Teal entertained a motion (Folwell/Brewick) to adjourn at 5:16. The motion passed unanimously.

Don Crowley, Faculty Secretary and Secretary to the Faculty Senate