University of Idaho  
2017-2018 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA  
Meeting #22  
3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, March 27, 2018  
Brink Hall Faculty-Staff Lounge & Zoom  

Order of Business  

I. Call to Order.  
II. Minutes.  
   - Minutes of the 2017-18 Faculty Senate Meeting #21, March 6, 2018 (vote)  
III. Chair’s Report.  
IV. Provost’s Report.  
V. Other Announcements and Communications.  
VI. Committee Reports.  
   - Research Council (vote)  
   - FS-18-051: FSH 1640.72 – Research Council (Harris)  
   - Faculty Affairs (discussion)  
   - FS-18-050: FSH 3050 Position Description Policy & Form and FSH 3320 Annual Evaluation Policy (Ytreberg)  
VII. Special Orders.  
   - National College Health Assessment FYI (Lambeth)  
   - FS-18-052: APM 50.16 – Criminal Background Check FYI (Foisy)  
VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.  
IX. New Business.  
X. Adjournment.  

Professor Patrick Hrdlicka, Chair 2017-2018, Faculty Senate  
Attachments: Minutes of 2017-2018 FS Meeting #21  
Handouts
University of Idaho
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
2017-2018 Meeting #21, Tuesday, March 6, 2018

Present: Anderson (Mike), Anderson (Miranda), Arowojolu, Brandt (w/o vote), Brown, Cannon (Boise), Caplan, De Angelis, Foster, Ellison, Grieb, Howard, Hrdlicka, Jeffrey, Johnson, Kern (Coeur d’Alene), Leonor, Morrison, Nicotra, Panttaja, Schwarzlaender, Seamon, Tibbals, Watson, Wienczek (w/o vote), Zhao. Absent: Baird, Mahoney, Morgan, Vella. Guests: 8

Call to Order and Minutes: The chair called the meeting to order at 3:31. A motion (Panttaja/Foster) to approve the minutes was made. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Chair’s Report:
• March 30 is the deadline for sabbatical leave applications for 2019-20 academic year.
• April 15 is the deadline for nominations for honorary degrees for the December 2019 commencement.
• Senators are encouraged to respond to the faculty advising survey circulated by Vice Provost Hendricks
• Faculty are encouraged to make shared leave donations. Director of Human Resources Brandi Terwilliger circulated an email to all employees regarding the procedure for such donations.

Provost’s Report: The provost updated senate on the issue of college mergers and reorganizations. He and President Staben have now discussed the report prepared by the deans. The president called his executive team together to discuss how to proceed. The provost has considered the comments and thoughts that have been forwarded to him and consulted with a number of different constituencies about the process. He plans to distribute a memo to campus in a week to 10 days to clarify the next steps. The most significant comment he has received is that the reorganization process should never be driven by financial concerns. Another key recommendation was to take enough time to facilitate reasoned decision-making and to expand the campus constituencies involved in the conversation. The provost plans to convene a campus-wide committee that is inclusive and informed to discuss the issue. There is no need to bring this conversation to conclusion until January of 2019. He expects the committee to address how we can best serve students by making it easier for them to navigate the university and by clustering programs with common themes together. The provost acknowledged that some of the potential reorganizations discussed by the deans were very sensitive. He has concluded that one possible reorganization, in particular, would not serve the university well and that is a merger between the College of Natural Resources (CNR) and the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (CALS). Both are strong colleges with national reputations and well-defined constituencies. A merger raises the unacceptable risk of diluting the impact of each of these colleges. More likely candidates for reorganization include the College of Science (COS), the College of Letters Arts and Social Sciences (CLASS) and the College of Art and Architecture (CAA). The provost thanked the deans for taking on this difficult task of considering the merger and reorganization issues. He commented that even though we started by asking the wrong questions, better questions have been identified through the ensuing conversations. He concluded the comments on mergers and reorganizations by stressing that we must move forward slowly and deliberately.

Regarding the university’s finances, the provost reiterated information that has been circulated around campus. The institution has a $1-2 million recurring deficit created in large measure because of our declining enrollment. He reported that early information regarding enrollment for spring appears to be positive. If the spring numbers stay strong, this would very much help us. However, as a result of actions
by the legislature, the university’s bottom line will definitely be hit with a $2 million decrease the year after next. The legislature appropriated a one-time amount to assist the university in the coming year. The university plans to continue to use one time funds to close the budget gap for FY 2019 and FY 2020, but will need to make permanent adjustments to our budget and budgeting process for FY 2020.

A senator suggested that the focus of the reorganization conversation should not be solely students. He suggested that another focus should be to reduce barriers for researchers in different units to collaborate. We need to expand the opportunity for this cross-college and inter-unit collaboration. The Provost responded that he is going to convene a university-wide committee and he will look to senate leadership for suggestions as to the makeup of the committee. More discussion will need to take place on key facts and the charge of the committee. Another senator asked what would be the projected cost savings of mergers. The provost reiterated his commitment to move away from financial considerations as part of this discussion. He also added that the timing of the conversation was too compressed to come up with a cost savings estimate that would survive scrutiny. A senator asked how the dean vacancy in CLASS would be handled. The provost responded that he anticipated appointing an interim dean when Dean Kersten leaves. If it looks next fall like a merger is not going to move forward, a dean search will be undertaken at that time. He acknowledged that this approach delays the CLASS dean search by 6 months or so. The CAA will stay with an interim dean. He plans to move forward with a search for the next dean of CNR.

FS-18-038 – FSH 1565 H-2. Graduate Student Appointees. Dean of the College of Graduate Studies (COGS), Jerry McMurtry, presented changes proposed by Graduate Council to Faculty-Staff Handbook § 1565 H. The proposal adds a new non-faculty rank of Graduate Support Assistant (GSA). Such GSAs are graduate students who are undertaking appointments relevant to their program of study, but that do not fit within the categories of Graduate Teaching Assistant (TA) or Graduate Research Assistant (RA). Dean McMurtry gave the example of a graduate student in education leadership serving in a position in the administration of the College of Graduate Studies, or a graduate student who serves in the writing center outside the definition of teaching or research.

A senator asked whether there is a requirement that GSAs have a faculty mentor. McMurtry responded that GSAs must be associated with a faculty member. The senator followed up asking whether there will be differences in compensation between GSAs and TAs. McMurtry explained that compensation of TAs will be based on market compensation rates established by discipline in the Oklahoma State salary survey. The minimum compensation for a GSA of $11,500 is based on the “general graduate assistant” category in the Oklahoma State survey. He stated that units could pay GSAs at a higher rate, if the unit has the resources. McMurtry explained that the Graduate Council and others had some concerns that the new rank would be manipulated by units to avoid the higher compensation rates for TAs. He explained that COGS must approve these positions and has published standards for GSAs on its website. He also emphasized that the compensation for TAs will come from the central TA funding system and RAs are grant funded, while departments must compensate GSAs from departmental funds. A senator asked whether GSAs must be making progress toward their degree. McMurtry responded yes.

A senator suggested that the provision be amended so that the second to last line of FSH 1565 H-2 read “. . . may receive additional mentoring from faculty and/or staff on or off campus. This was accepted as a friendly amendment. The amended proposal was approved with one abstention.

Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives Cher Hendricks. – Vice Provost Hendricks reported that her office has established the Academic Strategic Steering Committee (ASSC). This committee will be part of the process for reviewing new program proposals. Our procedures for program approval were in flux when she arrived at the university. She explained that the State Board of Education (SBOE) requires a market
analysis for all new programs. The university also is committed to the market analysis to ensure that there is student demand/interest in new programs. Hendricks found herself in the position of being the sole person to review market analysis and determine whether a program should move forward. Moreover, proposals were often bounced from place to place in the upper administration while the necessary approvals for aspects of the proposal were obtained. Finally, programs must be part of the university’s 3-year plan to be approved. Yet the process for becoming part of the plan was cumbersome and basically required that a completed proposal be developed. Her goal is to obtain broader input in reviewing the market analysis for new programs, to remove unnecessary barriers in the program approval process and to assist units in developing new program proposals and navigating the program approval process. She stressed that the ASSC will be looking at marketability and assisting in program development. The curricular and quality aspects of programs would still have to go through the regular governance process, UCC, Senate, and faculty.

A senator asked who does the market analysis. Hendricks explained that in the past the department had to figure this out. Now the university works with two outside contractors to assist with this analysis -- EMSI and Gray and Assoc. They have been very supportive and have given us access to the data sources so we can now do the market analysis in house. As a result, we can consider advance requests for preliminary analysis. Hendricks hopes that the process will help departments and units tailor proposals to meet demand. For example, if there is weak market demand in our state but there is strong national demand, a program might be offered online instead of live. She also hopes the ASSC will be able to help units and departments develop the assessment and curriculum portions of the proposal. Her goal is to mentor new program proposals for the entire time while they are working through process. All approvals can happen at one time. A chair should know what needs to happen in order to move the proposal forward.

A senator asked what would happen if we want to “get ahead of the curve” in an area in which there is no program or market data? Hendricks indicated that our external market analysis partners help us evaluate these ideas. They can help us “back design” the program even where there is no CIP code. They will work through what careers and markets the program might connect to by considering skill sets, job availability, and other indirect data. The market analysts can also do a “gap” analysis to determine areas where there are no programs and in which we could potentially do well to start a program. She acknowledged that these sorts of proposals are more challenging. She also recognized that there are issues with market analysis of academic program development and that we are not certain how to deal with all the issues. The provost also pointed out that market analysis is not the only consideration. We have a mission and will always have programs that may not be profitable, but that are central to our mission.

ORP/PERSI Retirement Issues. Faculty Secretary Liz Brant reported on pending issues regarding the Optional Retirement Plan (ORP) in which faculty and exempt staff participate. She explained that in late October, senate leadership was contacted by faculty and staff leadership at Boise State University (BSU) and other state colleges and universities to see if we would support a plan for faculty to participate in the Public Employee Retirement System of Idaho (PERSI). At the time, UI senate leadership convened a group of faculty and staff (including Brandt, Chair Hrdlicka, Prof. Jack Miller, Vice President Brian Foisy, Cindy Ball and Darren Kearney) to look into how we should respond to this inquiry.
After significant study, the group recommended that we contact the faculty and staff leadership at our sister institutions to discuss the issues. The group concluded that we could only support a plan to reinstitute PERSI for faculty and exempt staff if three conditions were met:

1) the ORP remained an option along with PERSI;
2) the process is revenue neutral to the University of Idaho; and
3) the plan would not increase costs or otherwise disadvantage employees who elect to remain in the ORP.

In addition, the group identified what it determined to be a much more substantial issue regarding the ORP. The group recommended that faculty and staff seek to end the continuing subsidy of PERSI by ORP participants. This subsidy has continued for over 25 years and is scheduled to continue until 2025. Moreover, other faculty and staff at Idaho's 2-year institutions were only required to subsidize PERSI for 14 years. Finally, the group recommended that faculty and staff seek to tie the institutional ORP contribution rate to the institutional contribution rate to PERSI. Currently, the ORP contribution rate is established by statute and cannot be adjusted for inflation without a statutory amendment. In contrast, the PERSI contribution rate is set in regulations which are frequently updated to reflect inflation. When the PERSI subsidy by faculty at 2-year institutions was ended, the legislature also provided that their ORP contribution rate had to be the same as the PERSI contribution rate. There was no such adjustment made for the 4-year institutes.

The day after senate leadership shared the memorandum containing our groups recommendations with leaders at our sister institutions inviting them to participate in a meeting to discuss the issues, our Executive Director of Human Resources Wes Matthews was contacted by the director of human resources at BSU and asked to discuss possible scenarios for re-integrating faculty and staff in PERSI and eliminating the ORP. Moreover, personnel at the SBOE contacted VP Foisy to ask about the “UI Memo”. As a result of these contacts, and our continuing communications with Foisy and Matthews, UI senate leadership was concerned that a proposal making PERSI the only retirement option for faculty and staff, and to thereby eliminate the ORP, might be in the works.

A senator commented that his experience is that PERSI may not be compatible with the new system of standard pay for faculty. PERSI does not credit faculty with months of service over the summer. Under the new system, employees must make a higher contribution per month. PERSI has been unable to provide information regarding whether the increased contribution makes up for the loss of service months. Foisy, who was in attendance at the meeting agreed that this was essentially accurate. PERSI has been unwilling to put any analysis of the situation mentioned by the senator in writing. The net effect of the higher contributions over fewer pay periods is not clear.

Another senator indicated that he believes it is viable to implement a system in which employees have a choice between PERSI and the ORP. He believed it would be better to offer both plans. Another senator commented that the treatment of the retirement investment for estate planning when the employee passes away, is different. Funds in the ORP may be inherited by family members, while there may be no inheritable interest under PERSI. He opposed a change that would force all employees into PERSI. Another senator commented that most employers are moving away from defined benefit plans such as PERSI, because they are not affordable. He believes its counter intuitive to move toward such a plan. He asked whether the SBOE had been consulted. Brandt indicated that Foisy had shared the memorandum from the UI group with the Chief Financial Officer at the SBOE. At present, the SBOE seems to be taking a “wait and see” attitude. It is too late to move a legislative proposal forward this year. Senators expressed the desire to communicate their concerns before the proposals to move to a PERSI-only option for retirement gained too much momentum.
Brandt offered that, as a result of the appearance of a momentum and in preparation for the HR meeting, she had prepared the following resolution for senate’s consideration:

**Title:** Resolution on PERSI Participation and ORP Subsidy  
**Author:** University of Idaho Faculty Senate

WHEREAS University of Idaho employees currently participate in the Optional Retirement Plan (ORP) and have a choice of investing in TIAA or in VALIC;  
WHEREAS the ORP options, TIAA and VALIC, are defined contribution plans that have contracts with many other higher education institutions around the country so these plans are very portable for those considering joining the University of Idaho and for University of Idaho employees who leave for other institutions;  
WHEREAS many faculty believe that TIAA and VALIC offer individual control and the opportunity for higher returns on retirement investments;  
WHEREAS the retirement system known as PERSI and the ORP are two separate retirement systems of the state of Idaho;  
WHEREAS since 1990 the legislature of Idaho has directed that a portion of the funds set aside for the retirement of members of the ORP be paid to PERSI even though the ORP participants are not beneficiaries of the PERSI system in their roles as ORP participants;  
WHEREAS this subsidy by faculty and exempt staff at Idaho four year institutions of higher education has been required for 28 years and is scheduled to continue until 2025;  
WHEREAS similar institutions in Idaho (two year colleges and technical education institutions) were only required to subsidize PERSI for 14 years;  
WHEREAS the 4-year institutions in Idaho are not required to contribute as much to the ORP as they are required to contribute to PERSI;  
WHEREAS the 2-year institutions and technical education institutions in Idaho are required to contribute equal amounts to PERSI and the ORP on behalf of their employees;  
WHEREAS the ORP participants at the 4-year institutions are, in effect, subsidizing PERSI to their direct detriment, and have been required to do so over an extended and unfair length of time;  
WHEREAS the required ORP participant subsidy to PERSI results in unfair and unequal treatment of ORP participants;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO FACULTY SENATE RECOMMENDS  
   a. that the ORP continue to be offered as a retirement plan at University of Idaho;  
   b. that if PERSI is offered to University of Idaho employees, it must be offered as an optional plan alongside the ORP;  
   c. that any change in the retirement plan options must be revenue neutral to the institution;  
   and  
   d. that any change in the retirement plan options must not impose new or additional costs, or other disadvantages, on the ORP, or its participants.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT THE UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO FACULTY SENATE FURTHER RECOMMENDS that the leadership of the Faculty Senate work with University of Idaho Staff Council and with the university administration, State Board of Education and sympathetic leaders at other Idaho higher education institutions to seek an immediate legislative change ending the required subsidy of PERSI by University of Idaho employees.

After some further discussion it was moved (Foster/Panttaja) that the resolution be adopted. The resolution passed with one abstention.
Non-Tenure Track Faculty Task Force. Chair Hrdlicka reported that senate leadership, together with the Faculty Affairs Committee, and the Provost’s Office, is creating a joint task force to look at a number of issues affecting non-tenure track faculty. The taskforce will be chaired by Prof. Dan Eveleth of the College of Business and Economics. The description of the taskforce’s responsibilities is as follows:

The desired outcomes of the task force’s work are to help the university community:
- Develop a shared understanding of (and commitment to) the roles and expectations of non-tenure track faculty.
- Increase fairness and consistency with respect to practices associated with recruiting, selecting, developing, rewarding, including, and managing non-tenure track faculty.

To achieve these goals the task force is charged with:
- Identifying the current, potentially disparate, beliefs about the roles and expectations of non-tenure-track faculty across the university.
- Developing a comprehensive understanding of the issues and concerns associated with the current state of affairs.
- Identifying sentiment about a future, aspirational state of affairs, and coalescing around a single view of the future that honors the identified sentiment.
- Making policy and practice-related recommendations to Faculty Affairs, Faculty Senate Leadership and the Provost that are designed to achieve the desired outcomes.

The chair explained that the taskforce was formed because of the need to have broader representation across colleges and to include non-tenure track faculty that was not possible on the Faculty Affairs Committee. In addition, he noted the broad scope of the assignment and thanked Dan Eveleth for taking on this challenging, but important topic. He solicited recommendations for taskforce members from senators.

The business of the meeting having been completed, a motion to adjourn (DeAngelis/Ellison) passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 4:57.

Respectfully Submitted,

Liz Brandt, Faculty Secretary &
Secretary to the Faculty Senate
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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.

The current FSH lists the Institutional Review Board (IRB) as a standing subcommittee of the Research Council and we would like to remove this statement. The IRB has not been involved with Research Council and we feel that this relationship is not accurate. Research activities on campus include a wide range of disciplines outside the scope of human subjects.

II. Fiscal Impact: What fiscal impact, if any, will this addition, revision, or deletion have?
No impact.

III. Related Policies/Procedures: Describe other policies or procedures existing that are related or similar to this proposed change.
None

IV. Effective Date: This policy shall be effective on July 1, or January 1, whichever arrives first after final approval (see FSH 1460 D) unless otherwise specified in the policy.

July 1

If not a minor amendment forward to: __________________________________________

Policy Coordinator
Appr. & Date: ____________________
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Appr. ______________ FC __________ GFM __________ Pres./Prov. __________
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(Office Use Only)
1640.72
RESEARCH COUNCIL

A. FUNCTION. The Research Council is the faculty’s standing committee that oversees the implementation of discovery, creativity, and research policies [see 5100 and 5200] and resolves disagreements about the interpretation or implementation of those policies. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) is a standing subcommittee of the Research Council. For information on its function, structure, and membership, call the Research Office. [See also 5200.D and E] [rev. 1-06, 1-09]

B. STRUCTURE. One faculty member from each of the colleges, four members appointed by the president to ensure adequate representation from faculty constituencies that are most active in discovery, creativity, and research policies while ensuring that faculty engaged in multidisciplinary activities are represented, and (w/o vote) vice president for research and dean of library services (or the latter's designee). The representatives from the colleges are designated in accordance with procedures determined by their respective faculties. The vice president for research and economic development serves as chair of the Research Council. [ed. 7-97, 9-10 rev. 1-06]
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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.

FAC approved March 22, 2018. The changes to the position description (PD) policy and form are to: (i) Eliminate the annual process. The PD will be initially created by the unit administrator(s) when a faculty member is hired (or once policy goes into effect for current faculty) and modified only if substantial changes occur. (ii) Make the PD form electronic. There will no longer be paper forms. (iii) Clean up, clarify and simplify language.

The changes to the Annual Evaluation (AE) policy adds the word “and goals” to FSH 3320 A-1. to encourage a discussion.

II. Fiscal Impact: What fiscal impact, if any, will this addition, revision, or deletion have?
None

III. Related Policies/Procedures: Describe other policies or procedures existing that are related or similar to this proposed change.
None

IV. Effective Date: This policy shall be effective on July 1, or January 1, whichever arrives first after final approval (see FSH 1460 D) unless otherwise specified in the policy.
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(Office Use Only)
Faculty Position Description (*link to FSH 3050)

Date: (*autodate - retain all versions, effective date) ________________

Faculty Name: _________________________________________________________  Employee V#: _______________

Rank: ____________________________________ Administrative Title (if applicable): __________________________

Unit(s):  ___________________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________________

Responsibility Areas (*link to FSH 1565 C)  PD% (*autofill into pie chart)

| Teaching and Advising     |          |
| Scholarship and Creative Activities |          |
| Outreach and Extension    |          |
| University Service and Leadership |          |
| Total                     | 100%     |

Brief* description of expectations** that must be consistent with the unit(s) context statement and that encompasses the range of expected activities.

*limit box to 250 characters, or consult with FAC

**propose on form a checkbox used for instance when faculty go on full leave for extenuating circumstances, when box checked of no responsibility to equal 0% responsibility for specified time.

Include several checkboxes (replace following signatures on current form): Faculty Member signature box, confirm button that also assigns date, same for unit administrator, include UAs for those on joint appointments, interdisciplinary/center activities, and college dean.

Note to include or weave into online form:

• Position descriptions are one component of the independent process for promotion and tenure. See FSH 3520 and 3560 for details on the promotion and tenure process.

• Instructors will provide syllabi to their unit offices at the beginning of each term for courses for which they are responsible. Each syllabus should include expected learning outcomes for the course and should describe an example of how at least one learning outcome is assessed. Note: Is this still needed for NWCCU? Check with Dale Pietrzak, if so where best to include other than PD form, and what language is needed.

• ***If the joint appt/interdisciplinary box is checked, the unit administrator is responsible to solicit comments from, and discuss with, the interdisciplinary/center administrators listed whether the interdisciplinary/center activities as stated are accurate. All solicited comments are to be attached to this form. (FSH 3050 B-2, 3520 E-1, G-3, G-4 c, 3560 C, and E-2d, and 3320 A-1 d).
## FACULTY POSITION DESCRIPTION

**ENTER CALENDAR YEAR** for review period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Name:</th>
<th>V Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title/Rank:</td>
<td>Administrative Title:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit(s):</td>
<td>(if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FTE:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall description of responsibilities and goals by category:

**Faculty Member:** I agree that this is a reasonable description of my responsibilities to the University of Idaho for the forthcoming calendar year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Advising</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship and Creative Activities</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach and Extension</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Service and Leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit Administrator(s):** I agree that this position description is a reasonable reflection of the stated expectations for progress towards tenure, promotion and/or continued satisfactory performance.

**College Dean:** I agree that this position description is a reasonable reflection of the stated expectations for progress towards tenure, promotion and/or continued satisfactory performance.

---

1. FSH 3050
2. See FSH 1565 for faculty responsibilities. Also, instructors will provide syllabi to their unit offices at the beginning of each term for courses for which they are responsible. Each syllabus should include expected learning outcomes for the course and should describe an example of how at least one learning outcome is assessed.
3. If the above box is checked, the unit administrator is responsible to solicit comments from, and discuss with, the interdisciplinary/center administrators listed whether the interdisciplinary/center activities as stated are accurate. All solicited comments are to be attached to this form. (FSH 3050 B-2, 3520 E-1, G-3, G-4 c, 3560 C, and E-2d, and 3320 A-1 d).
PREAMBLE: This section describes the creation and use of position descriptions that define responsibilities for faculty. This section was original to the 1979 Handbook; it has been editorially revised at intervals. In July 1998 the year covered by a position description was changed from an academic year to a calendar year. In July 2001 section B underwent some clarifying changes while the form itself underwent extensive revisions. In July 2007 the form underwent substantial revisions to address enforcement and accountability issues in the UI promotion and tenure process as well as to align the form with the Strategic Action Plan. In 2009 the form was revised to better integrate faculty interdisciplinary activities (including ensuring communication among all parties and eliminating the need to obtain multiple signatures) and FSH 3140 was incorporated into this policy. In January 2015 assessment language was added to the form. In 2016 a pilot form was introduced that reduced the amount of detail requested from faculty, streamlining the process and ratified in January 2017 with minor edits. Further information may be obtained from the Provost's Office (208-885-6448). [rev. 7-98, 7-01, 7-07, 7-09, 1-15, 1-17ed. 12-06]

A. GENERAL. The position description establishes the expectations for each faculty member's specific responsibilities in the four major responsibility areas identified in FSH 1565 C, Teaching and Advising, Scholarship and Creative Activities, Outreach and Extension, and University Service and Leadership. Expectations must be consistent with the unit(s) context statement. Faculty should ensure that the description fully encompasses the range of their expected activities be careful when preparing their position description to ensure they describe their goals and expectations in all responsibility areas. The position description serves as a reference for a faculty member's a variety of important functions; in particular, it constitutes the essential frame of reference in annual performance evaluation of faculty members [see 3320], and consideration of faculty members—is one component of the independent process for tenure and promotion [see 3520 and 3560]. [rev. 7-98, 1-17, ed. 7-00, 7-02, 7-09, 1-12]

B. PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS. Expectations designated for individual faculty members to achieve tenure or promotion in rank or satisfactory performance evaluation must be compatible with the criteria of the department or other unit concerned. Each faculty member is to be advised of these expectations in writing by the departmental or unit administrator at the time of appointment. [7-09—original text from 3140 A]

B-1. Expectations are specified in the current faculty position description and are the basis for the annual performance evaluation. Expectations must not be greater than those that can be reasonably supported in the department or unit by providing sufficient time and resources. [rev. 7-09—partial text from 3140 B-1, 1 & 5]

B-2. Except by written agreement between the faculty member and the appropriate administrator, expectations for individual faculty members are in effect for a period of one calendar year. [7-09—original text from 3140 B-2]

B.C. PROCEDURE.

B.C.1. The calendar year A position description shall be provided to each faculty member by the unit administrator within a reasonable period of time after the faculty member begins employment. The faculty member, and the unit administrator(s), and/or center director, must approve the position description, is recorded on the form appended to this section with a due date established by the provost. [rev. 7-98, 1-08, 7-09, ed. 7-01]

B.C.2. The form should be filled out in collaboration with the unit administrator. Faculty members involved in interdisciplinary activities should check the box on the position description form and attach a narrative explaining their activities and listing units and members involved. For faculty involved in interdisciplinary activities or with centers, the unit administrator is to solicit comments regarding the position description and discuss it with all interdisciplinary/administrator(s) listed on the faculty member's narrative attached to the form. The form is then to be signed by the faculty member, approved by the unit administrator, and—dean, and sent to the Provost's Office. [rev. 7-01, 7-02, 1-08, 7-09]

B.C.32. The position description shall remain in effect unless revised to reflect substantial changes in expectations. Such a change may include the assumption of administrative responsibilities, a change in teaching
load, an increase in research responsibilities, leave or sabbatical, etc. The faculty member and the unit administrator(s), and/or center director, must approve the revised position description. Any change in duties or responsibilities that represents a significant departure from the position description is permitted only with the written consent of the faculty member and administrator involved. A revised position description should be filed in this event.

C-4. When the personnel activity report form (PAR) (see APM 45.09) is completed, the unit administrator should compare the data obtained for each faculty member with the corresponding position description. Perfect agreement between the position description and the record of actual performance is not necessarily expected, but it is desirable that any discrepancy between them be as small as is feasible.

(Form follows on the next pages.)
UI FACULTY-STAFF HANDBOOK
CHAPTER THREE:
EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION CONCERNING FACULTY AND STAFF

3050
POSITION DESCRIPTIONS

PREAMBLE: This section describes the creation and use of position descriptions that define responsibilities for faculty. This section was original to the 1979 Handbook; it has been editorially revised at intervals. In July 1998 the year covered by a position description was changed from an academic year to a calendar year. In July 2001 section B underwent some clarifying changes while the form itself underwent extensive revisions. In July 2007 the form underwent substantial revisions to address enforcement and accountability issues in the UI promotion and tenure process as well as to align the form with the Strategic Action Plan. In 2009 the form was revised to better integrate faculty interdisciplinary activities (including ensuring communication among all parties and eliminating the need to obtain multiple signatures) and FSH 3140 was incorporated into this policy. In January 2015 assessment language was added to the form. In 2016 a pilot form was introduced that reduced the amount of detail requested from faculty, streamlining the process and ratified in January 2017 with minor edits. Further information may be obtained from the Provost's Office (208-885-6448).

[rev. 7-98, 7-01, 7-07, 7-09, 1-15, 1-17ed. 12-06]

A. GENERAL. The position description establishes the expectations for each faculty member in the major responsibility areas identified in FSH 1565 C, Teaching and Advising, Scholarship and Creative Activities, Outreach and Extension, and University Service and Leadership. Expectations must be consistent with the unit(s) context statement. Faculty should ensure that the description fully encompasses the range of their expected activities. The position description serves as a reference for a faculty member’s annual performance evaluation [see 3320], and is one component of the independent process for tenure and promotion [see 3520 and 3560]. [rev. 7-98, 1-17, ed. 7-00, 7-02, 7-09, 1-12]

B. PROCEDURE.

B-1. A position description shall be provided to each faculty member by the unit administrator within a reasonable period of time after the faculty member begins employment. The faculty member, and the unit administrator(s), and/or center director, must approve the position description. [rev. 7-98, 1-08, 7-09, ed. 7-01]

B-2. The position description shall remain in effect unless revised to reflect substantial changes in expectations. Such a change may include the assumption of administrative responsibilities, a change in teaching load, an increase in research responsibilities, leave or sabbatical, etc. The faculty member and the unit administrator(s), and/or center director, must approve the revised position description.

(Form follows on the next pages.)
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS

AND

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS

PREAMBLE: This section contains those policies and their attendant procedures for those periodic reviews of performance that affect faculty members and academic administrators. Policies concerning performance evaluation were part of the original 1979 Handbook, but were completely rewritten in July 2002 and further refined in 2003. In July 2007 Form 1 underwent substantial revisions to address enforcement and accountability issues in the UI promotion and tenure process as well as align the form with the Strategic Action Plan. In January 2008 Form 1 was again revised to include a Disclosure of Conflicts statement to comply with FSH 6240. In 2009 this section was again revised to reflect recent changes to the faculty position description and evaluation forms to better integrate faculty interdisciplinary activities. In July 2010 B was added and FSH 1420 E-6 was incorporated into D to consolidate the evaluation process into one policy. In July 2014 changes were incorporated to ensure all faculty go through a review by their peers. In January 2017 a temporary fix to this policy was put in place to allow for a pilot narrative evaluation process for 2016 and ensure that existing policy would apply. In November 2017 an emergency revision (rewrite of the faculty section, not the administrator section) to this policy was put in place to address the new narrative evaluation process so as to be effective before the next evaluation process. Further information may be obtained from the Provost’s Office (208-885-6448). [ed. 7-03, rev. 7-07, 1-08, 7-09, 7-10, 7-14, 1-17]

CONTENTS:

A. Annual Performance Evaluation for Faculty Members
B. Faculty Performance that does not Meet Expectations
C. Performance Evaluation of Academic Administrators
D. Sequence of Evaluation of Faculty Members and Administrators.

A. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FOR FACULTY MEMBERS.

A-1. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION. Annual evaluation of the performance of each member of the faculty is primarily the responsibility of the faculty member and unit administrator. The provost is responsible for preparing supplementary instructions each year, including the schedule for completion of the annual performance evaluation. Personnel on international assignment see FSH 3380 C. [rev. 7-03, 7-09, 7-14, ed. 7-10, 1-17]

a. Forms. The Annual Performance Evaluation Form is available below. The form may not be altered without following the appropriate governance process (see FSH 1460). The unit administrator is responsible for ensuring that each faculty member uses the proper form together with the supplementary instructions as provided by the Provost Office. [rev. 7-01, 1-17]

b. Performance expectations are described below. The narrative in the evaluation form shall provide evidence to support the evaluation. [ed. 7-10]

i. Performance that Meets or Exceeds Expectations is at least satisfactory performance during the review period of a faculty member relative to the position description.

ii. Performance that does not Meet Expectations denotes performance during the review period that is less than expected of a faculty member relative to the position description and means improvement is necessary. An evaluation of not meeting expectations in one or more responsibility areas triggers procedures outlined in FSH 3320 B below.

c. Annual Report of Efforts and Accomplishments by Faculty Member. Each faculty member shall provide his or her unit administrator with the following materials in preparation for the annual performance evaluation:

(1) Current Curriculum Vitae
(2) UI Faculty Position Description for Annual Performance Review
(3) Written detailed summary report of faculty activity for the period of the annual performance review that compares accomplishments to expectations in the Position Description for the review period. This report may be in the form of a self-evaluation using the annual evaluation form included in this policy. [rev. 7-09]
(4) Other materials necessary to document efforts and accomplishments for the review period. [add. 7-01, ed. 7-10]

d. Evaluation of Faculty by Unit Administrators. Unit administrators evaluate the faculty members in their unit. The performance of each faculty member during the review period is judged on the basis of the position description(s) in effect during that period. In the case of a faculty member holding joint appointments and/or involved in interdisciplinary activities, as described in the position description, in two or more academic or administrative units, it is the responsibility of the administrator in the faculty member’s primary academic discipline to solicit and consider relevant information on job performance from other administrators with responsibility for the faculty member’s work. [See also 3080 E-3.] [rev. 7-09, ed. 7-10]

Whether a faculty member’s performance meets expectations is determined by comparing the faculty member’s performance to the position description for the review period. For each area of responsibility, the unit administrator shall describe the basis for her/his evaluation of the faculty member’s performance in the narrative on the form. After the unit administrator has completed the narrative evaluation for all faculty for the review period, the unit administrator shall provide the following items to each reviewed individual as they become available: [rev. 7-03, 7-09]

1. a copy of the individual’s annual evaluation form [rev. 7-09]
2. if requested, comparative information to help assess performance evaluation

The unit administrator shall also include comments and recommendations for the faculty member’s progress toward tenure, promotion or continued satisfactory performance in the appropriate place on the annual evaluation form.

e. Conference. It is strongly recommended that the unit administrator meet with each faculty member. The unit administrator shall provide each faculty member with the opportunity to meet to discuss the unit administrator’s evaluation. (Suitable alternate arrangements shall be made for off-campus personnel.) The purpose of this meeting is to review and discuss the administrator’s evaluation and the faculty member’s detailed report of activities. The unit administrator should explain the narrative providing a formative assessment on progress towards tenure, promotion, and/or continued satisfactory performance. The faculty member and the unit administrator should work to identify strategies and goals to help the faculty member improve performance. The evaluation may be modified as a result of the discussion. At the conclusion of the review process, each faculty member shall sign the evaluation form indicating that she/he has had the opportunity to read the evaluation report and to discuss it with the unit administrator. If the faculty member wishes to respond to the contents of the review, he/she shall be permitted to append a response to the unit administrator’s evaluation. A copy of the administrator’s final evaluation shall be given to the faculty member. [ren. and rev. 7-01, rev. 7-09, ed. 7-10]

f. College-Level Action. Copies of the performance evaluation materials forwarded by the unit administrator to the appropriate dean(s), for evaluation at the college(s) level, shall include: [rev. 7-09]

1. the evaluation form with the complete narrative and the comments and recommendations on progress towards tenure, promotion, and/or continued satisfactory performance, and [rev. 7-09]
2. any comments provided by interdisciplinary/center administrators or from those administrators of faculty holding joint appointments provided pursuant to subsection A-1. d., above. [rev. 7-09]

g. If the unit administrator fails to include the required narrative and comments/recommendations the college shall return the materials to the unit administrator. [add. 7-09, rev. 7-10]
**h.** If the faculty member has attached a response to the evaluation, the response shall be provided to the dean with the annual evaluation form. The dean shall arrange a meeting with the unit administrator and the faculty member to attempt to resolve the relevant issues.

**i.** If the college dean disagrees with the unit administrator’s evaluation, the dean shall attach a narrative stating the reasons for the disagreement. A copy of the dean’s narrative shall be provided to the faculty member. The faculty member may respond to the dean’s evaluation before the evaluation is forwarded to the provost. The faculty member, unit administrator, and dean are encouraged to resolve the disagreement before forwarding the evaluation to the provost. If the matter remains unresolved at the college level, the provost shall be notified of the disagreement.

**j.** The college shall forward all evaluation material at the unit and college level, including the dean’s narrative and faculty responses, if any, to the provost for permanent filing.  

A-2. **Relationship to Promotion and Tenure Process.** The faculty annual performance evaluation is an administrative review. Annual evaluations are one component of the independent promotion and tenure process. See FSH 3520 and FSH 3560 for details on the promotion and tenure process.

**B. FACULTY PERFORMANCE THAT DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS.**  

B-1. If the unit administrator determines that a faculty member is not meeting expectations, the unit administrator should consider the reasons for and explanations of the performance. (see FSH 3190).  

The unit administrator, in consultation with the faculty member, should address the possible causes of the problem, should suggest appropriate resources and encourage the employee to seek such help. Faculty members and unit administrators may obtain referral information and advice from the Ombuds, Human Resources, or the Provost’s Office.  

B-2. **PROVOST INVOLVEMENT.** In the event of an overall evaluation of “does not meet expectations” where the faculty member’s performance is so far below expectations that it is not acceptable in relation to the position description, the provost may, in consultation with the dean and unit administrator, determine that further review of the faculty member’s performance is required pursuant to FSH 3320 B-5 below.  

B-3. **FIRST OCCURRENCE.** In the event that a faculty member has not met expectations overall or within one or more areas of responsibility, the unit administrator shall offer to meet with the faculty member. At this meeting, the faculty member and the unit administrator shall review the faculty member’s Position Description and examine strategies that would permit the faculty member to improve performance. A mentoring committee shall be formed upon the request of either the faculty member or the unit administrator. The committee shall be composed of two or more faculty members agreed upon by the unit administrator and faculty member.  

B-4. **TWO OCCURENCES WITHIN THREE YEARS.** In the event of two annual evaluations within three years concluding that the faculty member has not met expectations overall or within one or more areas of responsibility the unit administrator shall arrange a meeting of the faculty member, the unit administrator and the college dean.  

The intent of the meeting is to review:

a. the current position description and revise it if necessary to address the issues identified during the discussion.  

b. the strategies implemented in the previous year(s) and to identify why the strategies did not result in the faculty member meeting expectations. The parties should re-examine strategies that would support improved performance by the faculty member.
B-5. THREE OCCURRENCES WITHIN FIVE YEARS. In the event of three annual evaluations of “does not meet expectations” within a five-year period, either overall or within one or more areas of responsibility, the dean shall initiate a formal peer review. [rev. 7-09, ren. 7-10]

a. Composition of the Review Committee. The Review Committee shall consist of at least four (4) members, appointed as follows:

(1) The faculty member may submit to the unit administrator a list of the names of three faculty members from within the unit and at least one faculty member from outside of the unit. If the faculty member is tenured or on the tenure track, faculty on the committee should be tenured faculty unless no tenured faculty are available. The unit administrator shall appoint the committee, including at least two names from the faculty member’s list.
(2) The committee members shall select a chair.

b. Report and Timing. The committee report includes the review and possible recommendation(s), and shall be completed within sixty days of the annual evaluation.

c. The Review. The purpose of the review is to assess the level of performance of the faculty member, the reasonableness of the previous evaluations, and the appropriateness of the strategies put in place to assist the faculty member.

The faculty member and the unit administrator shall provide the following materials for the review period to the committee:

(1) Updated Curriculum Vitae of the faculty member,
(2) Position Descriptions,
(3) Annual evaluation materials submitted by the faculty member,
(4) Annual Evaluations of the faculty member by the unit administrator and the dean,
(5) Student and peer evaluations (if any) of teaching,
(6) A summary of the strategies put in place to assist the faculty member,
(7) A self-assessment summary of each area of the faculty member’s responsibility and what the faculty member has learned and achieved during the review period, including contributions to the department, university, state, nation, and field (about 2 pages).

The faculty member may submit any additional information he or she desires, and the committee may request additional materials as it deems necessary.

d. Responses to Committee Report. The committee chair shall submit the report to the faculty member, unit administrator, and dean. Each recipient shall have fifteen days from the report’s date to submit written responses to the review committee. The committee chair shall send the report and all responses to the provost.

e. Provost. The provost shall be responsible for determining the appropriate resolution, which may include:

[rev. 7-09]

(1) continuing the status quo;
(2) mentoring to address area(s) of concern;
(3) termination for cause;
(4) consideration of other recommended resolution(s). [1-4 add. 7-09]

B-6. Non-Tenured Faculty. Pursuant to Regent’s policy, non-tenured faculty do not have an expectation of contract renewal beyond that stated in FSH 3900 B-2, absent a specific written multi-year contract. The process set forth in FSH 3320 B does not require the University to renew a non-tenured faculty contract. The process set forth in FSH 3320 B shall not be required for a non-tenured faculty member who has been given notice of non-renewal.

C. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS. [ed. 7-09, ren. 7-10]
C-1. EVALUATION BY FACULTY MEMBERS. Opportunity is provided for an annual performance evaluation of college deans, assistant and associate deans, and administrators of academic departments and other intracollege units by the faculty members of the respective units. The provost sends each faculty member an appropriate number of copies of the form, “Annual Faculty Evaluation of Academic Administrators” [form 2 appended to this section] to be used for evaluation of the unit or center administrator, one to be used for evaluation of the dean, and one to be used for evaluation of each assistant or associate dean in the college. [ren. & ed. 7-10, 10-10]

C-2. EVALUATION OF UNIT AND CENTER ADMINISTRATORS AND ASSISTANT AND ASSOCIATE DEANS. The review and evaluation of unit and center administrators, and assistant and associate deans, require consideration of their responsibilities as faculty members and as administrators as defined by percentage allocations in the Annual Position Description. All administrators are entitled to a review and evaluation of their performance as faculty members. Further, all administrators are entitled to a review of their performance as administrators. (Forms to be used in the evaluation of administrators are found in Form 1 and 2. [rev. 7-99, ed. 3-07, rev. & ren. 7-10 (incorporated 1420 E-6 into this entire section C-2 through C-4)]

1. Evaluation as a Faculty Member.

   a. Annual Evaluation. The annual evaluation of an administrator’s performance as a faculty member shall be conducted by the dean of the college in accordance with the provisions of FSH 3320 A above.

   b. Third Year Review. If the administrator is untenured, there shall be a third-year review in accordance with the procedures outlined in FSH 3520 G-4.

2. Evaluation as an Administrator.

   a. Annual Evaluation. The dean shall conduct an annual evaluation of each administrator’s performance in accordance with the responsibilities specified in FSH 1420 E-1 and in the Annual Position Description. The dean and administrator will negotiate the administrator’s Annual Position Description on the basis of the unit’s needs, and make it available to the faculty for annual evaluation purposes. The administrator will present his or her annual goals for the unit at the beginning of the review year and report on his/her effectiveness in meeting last year’s goals. Annual goals should be based on the unit action plan, needs of the unit, and discussion with the dean. The dean will make a conscientious effort to solicit input from unit faculty through evaluation form 2. [rev. 7-99, ed. 6-09, 10-10]

   Unit faculty must send completed copies of form 2 directly to the dean. The dean furnishes the administrator a summary of the faculty evaluations in such a way that the confidentiality of individual evaluations is preserved. The dean may arrange a conference with the administrator to discuss the summary. After these steps have been completed, the dean shall destroy the individual faculty members’ evaluations and shall file the written summary in the dean’s office. The dean then submits a summary of conclusions and recommendations resulting from the review to the provost, who in turn makes his or her review and forwards recommendations to the president. The dean will then provide feedback to faculty who have submitted form 2, as appropriate. [ed. 10-10]

C-3. EVALUATION OF DEANS. The provost shall conduct an annual evaluation of each dean's performance in accordance with the dean’s responsibilities specified in FSH 1420 D-2 and in the Annual Position Description. The provost and dean will negotiate the Annual Position Description for the dean on the basis of the college’s needs and make it available to the faculty for annual evaluation purposes. The dean will present his or her annual goals for the college at the beginning of the review year and report on his or her effectiveness in meeting last year’s goals. Annual goals should be based on the college’s action plan, needs of the college, and discussion with the provost. The provost will make a conscientious effort to solicit input from college faculty through evaluation form 2. [ed. 10-10]
College faculty will send completed copies of form 2 directly to the provost. The provost will summarize the faculty responses and share that summary with the dean. In preparing and conveying that summary, the provost has the responsibility to ensure that faculty comments are confidential. This includes, but is not limited to, avoiding the use of any phrases that can identify the faculty member making the comments. The provost may arrange a conference with the dean to discuss the summary. After these steps have been completed, the provost shall destroy individual faculty members’ evaluations and file the written summary in the Office of Academic Affairs. The provost must then submit a summary of conclusions and recommendations resulting from the review to the president. The provost will then provide feedback to faculty who have submitted form 2, as appropriate. [ed. 10-10]

C-4. PERIODIC REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATORS. Each administrator is formally reviewed at least six months before the end of each appointment term, or, if there is not a fixed appointment term, at least every five years. The Provost appoints an ad hoc review committee to include faculty, department chairs, and experienced administrators of other units. The periodic review will be conducted at the request of the Provost and Executive Vice President and in accordance with the mechanisms of formal review, which must provide for the following:

1. Opportunity for the dean, center administrator, or unit administrator to prepare a report/portfolio summarizing his or her administrative achievements for the period, including annual reviews; [rev. and ren. 7-99]

2. Opportunity for all faculty and staff of the college/unit to participate in the review;

3. Solicitation of input by the committee from appropriate constituencies of the college/unit. Confidentiality of all individual evaluations will be ensured; [add. 7-99]

4. Preparation by the review committee of a written report summarizing the findings and recommendations of the review, which will be forwarded to the Provost and the dean/center or unit administrator; [ed. and ren. 7-99]

5. The provost will submit the written report along with any additional comments and recommendations to the president and provide appropriate feedback to the administrator. [rev. and ren. 7-99]

a. Additional Review. The provost and/or college dean may initiate a review at any time he or she determines a review is needed. The dean shall submit to the provost a summary of conclusions and recommendations resulting from this additional review. If the review is conducted by the provost, he or she shall submit a summary of conclusions and recommendations to the president.

The faculty of the unit may also initiate, by majority vote, a formal review (as outlined above) of the unit administrator. The tenured faculty of a college may also initiate, by majority vote, a formal review (as outlined above) of the college dean.

D. SEQUENCE OF EVALUATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS AND ADMINISTRATORS. The provost prepares the schedule for completion of steps in the performance evaluation and salary determination process each year. The schedule will ensure that faculty members’ evaluations of unit or center administrators and assistant and associate deans have been received by the dean before the administrators’ recommendations on salary, promotion, and tenure are made known to the faculty and, similarly, that faculty members’ evaluations of deans have been received by the provost before the deans’ recommendations on salary, promotion, and tenure are made known to the faculty. Likewise, the summaries of faculty evaluations of unit or center administrators, assistant and associate deans, and deans will be communicated to the persons evaluated after their recommendations on faculty salary, promotion, and tenure have been transmitted to the provost. [ren. & rev. 7-10]

(Forms on next few pages)
4 IMPORTANT TAKEAWAYS

1. Severity of mental health issues is increasing at the University of Idaho
2. Self-harming, suicidal ideation and suicide attempts have also shown increases
3. Counseling Center clients have consistently higher acuity of mental health symptoms
4. Demand for clinical services at the CTC has been steadily increasing in the past decade
NATIONAL COLLEGE HEALTH ASSESSMENT
FALL 2017

University of Idaho
N= 982
Response Rate=28.1%
AREAS SURVEYED

1. General Health of College Students
2. Disease and Injury Prevention
3. Academic Impacts
4. Violence, Abusive Relationships and Personal Safety
5. Tobacco, Alcohol and Marijuana Use
6. Sexual Behavior
7. Nutrition and Exercise
8. Mental Health
9. Sleep
10. Demographics and Student Characteristics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disorder</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panic Attacks</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHD</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insomnia</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sleep Disorders</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bipolar Disorder</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mental Health</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCD</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse or addiction</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulimia</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anorexia</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Stress Level

- UI More than Average
- National More than Average

Year:
- 2011
- 2013
- 2015
- 2017

Values:
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49

Trend:
- UI More than Average has remained relatively stable from 2011 to 2015, slightly increasing in 2017.
- National More than Average has shown a steady increase from 2011 to 2017.
Felt overwhelmed by all you had to do
Felt so depressed that it was difficult to function.
Felt overwhelming anxiety

---

UI Last 12 Months
National Last 12 Months
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Felt very lonely

![Graph showing the trend of feeling very lonely from 2011 to 2017 for UI Last 12 Months (red dotted line) and National Last 12 Months (purple dotted line). The graph indicates an increasing trend over the years.]

- UI Last 12 Months
- National Last 12 Months
Felt overwhelming anger

![Graph showing the trend of feeling overwhelming anger over years for different regions and time periods.](Image)
Felt things were hopeless

- UI Never
- UI Last 12 Months
- National Never
- National Last 12 Months
Intentionally cut, burned, bruised, or otherwise injured yourself
Seriously considered suicide

- UI Last 12 Months
- National Last 12 Months
Prescription Drug Use

UI Pain Killer
UI Sedative
National Pain Killer
National Sedative

2011 2013 2015 2017
Prescription Drugs Use

- UI Stimulants
- UI 1+ Drugs
- National Stimulants
- National 1+ drugs

Years: 2011, 2013, 2015, 2017
Number of Unique Clients Seen at CTC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>1077</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>1256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage of Clients Reporting Academic Distress

- Some Distress
- Major Distress


Percentage Range: 0.00% to 100.00%
Percentage of Clients Reporting Staying in School as a concern

- Some Concern
- Major Concern
Clinically Significant Depression & Anxiety at CTC

- Dep
- Anx
Percentage of Clients Reporting Significant Social Anxiety and Overall Distress
Clinically Significant Suicidal Thoughts at CTC

![Graph showing the percentage of clinically significant suicidal thoughts from 2010-11 to 2016-17. The graph includes two lines: one for CCAPS and one for List of Concerns. The percentage ranges from 6.00% to 15.00%. The line for CCAPS is represented by a blue dashed line, and the line for List of Concerns is represented by an orange line. The graph shows an increase in the percentage of clinically significant suicidal thoughts over the years.]
The 21 U.S. states that saw their well-being drop in 2017 shattered the previous record set in 2009 amidst the Great Recession, when 15 states had lower well-being than the year before. The large
THANK YOU …
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**Chapter & Title:** APM 50.16 Criminal Background Checks

*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):** Brandi Terwilliger

Name: Brandi Terwilliger
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885-3008 brandit@uidaho.edu
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885-6174 brianfoisy@uidaho.edu

Reviewed by General Counsel
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**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.

Requesting a CBC be completed for all employees that have contact with minors. Currently some of the larger units on campus already complete a CBC for all employees hired regardless of employment type. Further recommending changes to allow for a break in service of one year that would not require a CBC be re-completed as long as a CBC is on-file with appropriate results for the position the employee is considered for. This is anticipated to reduce the number of background checks currently requested under the 13 month rule. Further clarification regarding disqualifications based on convictions has been made to meet concerns of general counsel. Highlighted summary of changes is attached, although this is a substantial rewrite that is not redlined, the intent of the changes are in the summary.

**Fiscal Impact:**

What fiscal impact, if any, will this addition, revision, or deletion have?

We anticipate a fairly stable number of background checks to be completed in comparison with the current numbers even in light of the proposed changes. It is possible that the removal of the 13 month requirement will actually reduce the amount of background checks necessary even with the language inclusion for every employee who has contact with minors. This is due to the current department requirements and recommendations that CBCs be completed for those employees.

**Related Policies/Procedures:**

Describe other policies or procedures existing that are related or similar to this proposed change.

**Effective Date:**

This policy shall be effective on July 1, or January 1, whichever arrives first after final approval (see FSH 1460 D) unless otherwise specified in the policy.

If not a minor amendment forward to:

**Policy Coordinator**

[Office Use Only]

**FSH**

Appr. ____________

FC ____________

GFM ____________

Pres./Prov. ____________

[Office Use Only]

**Track #**

Date Rec.: ____________

Posted: t-sheet ____________

h/c ____________

web ____________

Register: ____________

(Office Use Only)

---

Policy Coordinator

Appr. & Date: ____________

[Office Use Only]

APM

F&A Appr. ____________

[Office Use Only]
50.16 - Criminal Background Check Procedures
Updated: February 20, 2018

A. General. Criminal background checks confirm an individual’s fitness relative to the requirements of their employment or volunteer service at the University of Idaho (UI).

UI requires criminal background checks for all non-student positions, graduate student appointees, postdoctoral scholars, and temporary help positions (T1, T4, etc.). UI also requires criminal background checks for student positions (ST/SF/SI), interns, and volunteers if the work will involve contact with minors or the hiring authority determines the work to be security-sensitive. This list is not intended to be exhaustive. Questions on background check requirements should be directed to Human Resources (HR). [rev. 3-18]

The requirements of this procedure also apply to existing employees being considered for changes in position, transfers, and promotions. However, if an existing employee has a previous background check on file with UI, and that background check is applicable to the change in position, transfer, or promotion, a new background check will not be required. A background check is not required for general faculty promotions in rank pursuant to FSH 3560 where the faculty promotion does not involve an internal or external search. [rev. 11-12, 12-14, 3-18]

Non-compliance with this procedure will be communicated to the Office of General Counsel and the appropriate vice president.

B. Procedures for Criminal Background Checks. The UI will conduct criminal background checks on the recommended candidate(s) for all positions listed in Section A. Hiring authorities must request criminal background checks for student positions (ST/SF/SI), interns, and volunteers if the work will involve contact with minors or the hiring authority determines the work to be security-sensitive. Security-sensitive work may involve access to restricted facilities, resources, finances, data, confidential information, or research (as determined by the hiring authority). [rev. 3-18]

B-1. Required Notification of Criminal Background Checks. All advertisements, notices, and postings for positions listed in Section A must state: “This position is subject to the successful completion of a criminal background check.” No candidate for a position listed in Section A shall commence employment until a satisfactory criminal background check has been received by HR. Any offers associated with
these positions must be made contingent on a satisfactory criminal background check. [rev. 3-18]

For student (ST/SF/SI), intern, and volunteer positions for which a search was not necessary or was waived, the hiring authority will provide the candidate/volunteer with written notice of the criminal background check requirement prior to offering the position. The candidate/volunteer can only be offered the position contingent on a satisfactory criminal background check. The candidate/volunteer must not begin work or begin the new responsibilities until a satisfactory criminal background check has been received by HR. [add. 10-07, ed. 11-12, rev. 3-18]

B-2. Required Authorization for Criminal Background Check. If a search runs through the UI online recruitment system, the criminal background check is initiated during the hiring proposal process. For hires outside the online recruitment system, the hiring unit must submit a Department Request for Criminal Background Check via the on-line request for background check. The request shall include the following information: candidate name and email address, position title/action number, budget number, and unit. The candidate will receive an email to initiate the background check. The candidate must submit the required personal information at a secure website and electronically sign the Disclosure and Authorization forms. The candidate will then receive a summary of rights under the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA), and the background check will begin. The third party consumer reporting agency will provide the background check results to HR. HR will review the background check’ results to determine whether the candidate meets the criteria for the position. HR will notify the hiring authority of the results of the background check. Costs associated with criminal background checks will be charged to the hiring unit. [rev. 11-12, 12-14, 3-18]

B-3. Contingent Offer of Employment. If circumstances require that a job offer be made prior to the completion of the background check, the hiring unit must use the approved contingent offer letter template found on the HR website, which includes the following language: “This offer is contingent upon the completion of a satisfactory criminal background investigation and other pre-employment requirements.” Although a contingent offer may be made, the employee may not begin work in any capacity, including attending orientations for the unit or University, without a completed satisfactory background investigation and other pre-employment paperwork. [rev. 3-18]
B-4. **Prior Criminal Background Check Qualifies.** If a candidate is being rehired or reappointed into the same position, has previously met the background check requirement for that position, and the break in service is less than one year, the background check requirement may be waived at the discretion of the senior HR executive, or designee. [rev. 10-07, 11-12, 3-18]

B-5. **Day Care Centers Must Comply with I.C. § 39-1105.** This procedure does not apply to employees or volunteers at day care centers who have direct contact with children. These individuals are subject to the criminal history check procedures set forth in I.C. § 39-1105, which are conducted by the day care centers in conjunction with the appropriate state agencies. [ed. 3-18]

B-6. **UI College of Agricultural and Life Sciences Unique Requirements.** The University’s College of Agricultural and Life Sciences (CALS) has implemented additional criminal background check procedures for volunteers who have significant contact with minors. Students and volunteers of CALS may be subject to additional screening requirements pursuant to those procedures. [rev. 10-07, 3-18 ed. 11-12]

B-7. **J-1 Scholars and Exceptions.** J-1 scholars are visiting temporary workers here by invitation to perform specialized work. The Department of Homeland Security performs background checks on all J-1 scholars. Therefore, these temporary workers are exempt from the requirements of this procedure. Senior HR executive, or designee, may provide exemptions for other employees in similar situations. [add. 3-18]

C. **Procedures for Criminal Background Checks for Security Purposes.** If senior HR executive, or designee has reasonable grounds to believe that an employee or volunteer represents an immediate threat to the safety and security of the UI community, HR may conduct a criminal background check through the Idaho State Police or other appropriate agency. The written authorization of the employee to conduct this check will be obtained in most cases. However, in certain circumstances, it may not be possible or feasible to obtain written authorization. In those cases, a limited background check may be performed through the Idaho State Police or other appropriate agency. Any information obtained through this process will be used solely for the purpose of maintaining the safety and security of the UI community, and will be shared strictly on a “need to know” basis. [ed. 11-12, rev. 3-18]
D. Results of Criminal Background Checks.

Applicants New to UI: If the criminal background check identifies convictions, with the exception of D-1 below, determinations of fitness for employment will be made by Human Resources in consultation with appropriate hiring authority when applicable based on the nature and details of the conviction, date of the conviction, how the crime relates to the job in question, evidence of rehabilitation, and other relevant factors. \[rev. 3-18\]

Current Employees: When a current employee with convictions is considered for changes in position, transfers, or promotions, the senior HR executive, or designee, in consultation with the appropriate hiring authority, will determine whether to exclude the candidate. \[rev. 3-18\]

If, pursuant to this procedure, a criminal background check is conducted on a current employee and an event is uncovered that was not previously considered, UI may initiate personnel action against the employee. In these cases, the senior HR executive, or designee, in consultation with the Risk Management Officer and other applicable personnel, will determine what action, if any, should be taken. The senior HR executive, or designee may ask the employee for a written explanation of the offense(s).\[rev. 11-12, 3-18\]

D-1. Disqualifying Employment Convictions. A record of any of the following convictions will generally result in automatic exclusion of the candidate or termination of a current employee:\[rev. 3-18\]

i) Conviction of any crime against a child or vulnerable adult (including but not limited to child abuse, abandonment, neglect, and statutory rape);

ii) Conviction of any crime of violence;

iii) Conviction of any crime of a sexual nature, including but not limited to lewd conduct, sexual battery, sexual exploitation, rape, and statutory rape;

iv) Conviction of any crime involving unlawful use or possession of a weapon or firearm. \[ed. 11-12\]

D-2. “Conviction” Defined. For purposes of this procedure, the term “conviction” will be interpreted broadly and will include pleas of no contest, deferred adjudications, and similar dispositions. If a criminal history report indicates pending criminal charges that, if a conviction
resulted, would result in exclusion from employment, the candidate will be excluded from employment until final disposition of the charges.\[ed. 3-18\]

E. Communication of Results and Employee Rights

E-1. Consumer Reporting Agency. Procedures when the report has been provided by a consumer reporting agency (e.g., Verified Credentials).\[ed. 12-14, 3-18\]

i) If a determination has been made that a candidate should be excluded, or that adverse action should be taken against a current employee, based on an unsatisfactory criminal background check, HR shall, prior to taking any adverse action against the individual, provide a Pre-Adverse Action Disclosure that (1) notifies the individual in writing of the unsatisfactory result, (2) provides the candidate or employee with a copy of the report, and (3) provides the candidate or employee with a written description of his or her rights under the Fair Credit Reporting Act.

ii) After the adverse action has been taken, HR will provide the candidate with an Adverse Action Notice, which includes (1) the name, address, and phone number of the consumer reporting agency that supplied the report, (2) a statement that the consumer reporting agency that supplied the report did not make the decision regarding the adverse action and cannot provide the reasons for the adverse action, and (3) a notice of the individual’s right to dispute the accuracy or completeness of any information the agency has furnished, and his or her right to an additional free consumer report from the agency upon request within 60 days.

iii) A candidate or employee who has received an initial unsatisfactory result and who has sought correction of his or her report under the Fair Credit Reporting Act is not eligible for a listed position until the senior HR executive, or designee has confirmed the correction and determined that the result is satisfactory. The UI has no obligation to hold a position open to allow a candidate or employee to correct his or her report. \[ed. 11-12, 3-18\]
E-2. **Government Reporting Agency.** Procedures when the report has been provided by a governmental agency (e.g., Idaho State Police).

i) If a decision has been made to exclude a candidate, or initiate action against a current employee, based on an unsatisfactory background check, HR shall (1) notify the individual in writing of the unsatisfactory result, and (2) provide the candidate or employee with a copy of the report.

F. **Record Keeping.** Criminal history information collected under this procedure shall be kept electronically with the third party vendor or in accordance with record retention requirements (see APM Chapter 65). The information will be used solely for the purpose of maintaining the safety and security of the UI community and will be disclosed only as permitted or required by law. [rev. 10-07, 11-12, 3-18]
50.16 - Criminal Background Check Procedures

**December 2014**

Updated: February 20, 2018

**A. General.** Criminal background checks confirm an individual’s suitability/fitness relative to the requirements of their employment or volunteer service at the University of Idaho (UI).

UI requires criminal background checks on the successful candidate(s) for each faculty (including temporary faculty) and staff position recruitment, internal or external. Criminal background checks are also required prior to hiring a all non-student positions, graduate student appointees, assistant, teaching assistant or research assistant, postdoctoral scholars, and temporary help positions (T1, T4, etc.). UI also requires criminal background checks for non-student hourly employees (temporaries), student workers, positions (ST/SF/SI), interns, and volunteers if their the work will involve significant contact with minors and also recommends checks for individuals considered for positions where the hiring authority determines the work to be security-sensitive. UI will conduct criminal. This list is not intended to be exhaustive. Questions on background check requirements should be directed to Human Resources (HR). [rev. 3-18]

The requirements of this procedure also apply to existing employees being considered for changes in position, transfers, and promotions. However, if an existing employee has a previous background check on file with UI, and that background check is applicable to the change in position, transfer, or promotion, a new background check will not be required. A background check is not required for reclassifications and promotions (this does not apply to general faculty promotions in rank pursuant to FSH 3560 where the faculty promotion does not involve an internal or external search). Non-compliance of this policy will be communicated to the Office of General Counsel and the related Vice-President. [rev. 11-12, 12-14]

Non-compliance with this procedure will be communicated to the Office of General Counsel and the appropriate vice president.

**B. Procedures for Criminal Background Checks.** The University will conduct criminal background checks on the recommended candidate(s) for all positions listed in Section A. Hiring authorities must request criminal background checks for student positions (ST/SF/SI), interns, and volunteers if the work will involve contact with minors or the hiring authority determines the work to be security-sensitive. Security-sensitive work may
involves access to restricted facilities, resources, finances, data, confidential information, or research (as determined by the hiring authority). [rev. 3-18]

B-1. Required Notification of Criminal Background Checks. All advertisements, notices, and postings for positions listed as requiring a background check will in Section A must state: “This position is subject to the successful completion of a criminal background check.” Successful candidates for these positions will be offered the position contingent on a satisfactory criminal background check. No candidate for a position requiring a background check listed in Section A shall commence employment until a satisfactory criminal background check has been received by HR. Any offers associated with these positions must be made contingent on a satisfactory criminal background check. [rev. 3-18]

For student (ST/SF/SI), intern, and volunteer positions and other positions for which a search was not necessary or was waived, the hiring authority will notify the individual in writing provide the candidate/volunteer with written notice of the criminal history background check requirement prior to offering the position. The candidate/volunteer can only be offered the position contingent on a satisfactory criminal background check. The candidate/volunteer must not begin work or begin the new responsibilities until a satisfactory results are received criminal background check has been received by Human Resources-HR. [add. 10-07, ed. 11-12, rev. 3-18]

B-2. Required Authorization for Criminal Background Check. If a search is run through PeopleAdmin the UI online recruitment system, the criminal background check is initiated during the hiring proposal process. For hires outside of PeopleAdmin, contact HR by email at crimcheck@uidaho.edu to the online recruitment system, the hiring unit must submit a Department Request for Criminal Background Check via the online request for a background check on. The request shall include the following information: candidate(s) name, and email address, position title/position action number, budget number, and job vacancy announcement number. HireRight will contact the candidate(s) via unit. The candidate will receive an email to initiate the background check. The candidate must submit the required personal information at a secure website and electronically sign the Disclosure to Consent form and Authorization forms. The candidate will then receive a summary of rights under the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA). Once the candidate has submitted his or her personal information and electronically signs the Disclosure, and Consent form,
the background check will begin. The third party consumer reporting agency will provide the background check results to HR. Upon receipt of the information pertaining to the candidate meets the criteria for the position, and. HR will notify the hiring authority of the results of the background check. Costs associated with criminal background checks will be charged to the hiring unit. 

B-3. Contingent Offer of Employment. If circumstances require that a job offer be made quickly to a candidate, prior to the completion of the background check, the hiring unit must use the approved contingent offer must be in writing and include letter template found on the HR website, which includes the following statement language: “This offer is contingent upon the completion of a satisfactory criminal background investigation and other pre-employment requirements.” Although the contingent offer may be made, the employee may not begin work in any capacity, including attending New Employee Orientation or University without a completed satisfactory background investigation and other pre-employment paperwork.

B-4. Prior Criminal Background Check Qualifies. If the candidate is being rehired or reappointed into the same position, has had a criminal background investigation completed by the UI within the last 13 months previously, the background check requirement for that position, and the results are satisfactory for the position for which s/he is applying, a subsequent investigation less than one year, the background check requirement may be waived at the discretion of the senior Executive Director for Human Resources or designee.

B-5. Day Care Centers Must Comply with I.C. § 39-1105. This policy does not apply to employees or volunteers at day care centers who have direct contact with children. These individuals are subject to the criminal history check procedures set forth in I.C. § 39-1105, which are conducted by the day care centers in conjunction with the appropriate state agencies.

B-6. UI College of Agricultural and Life Sciences Unique Requirements. The University’s College of Agricultural and Life Sciences (CALS) has implemented its own additional criminal background check procedures for volunteers who have significant contact with minors. Students and volunteers of CALS may be subject
to additional screening requirements pursuant to those procedures that policy [rev. 10-07, 3-18 ed. 11-12]

B-7. J-1 Scholars and Exceptions. J-1 scholars are visiting temporary workers here by invitation to perform specialized work. The Department of Homeland Security performs background checks on all J-1 scholars. Therefore, these temporary workers are exempt from the requirements of this procedure. Senior HR executive, or designee, may provide exemptions for other employees in similar situations. [add. 3-18]

C. Procedures for Criminal Background Checks for Security Purposes. If senior HR executive, or designee the Executive Director for Human Resources has reasonable grounds to believe that an employee or volunteer may represent an immediate threat to the safety and security of the UI University community or to the public, s/he or designee, HR may conduct a criminal background check through the Idaho State Police or other appropriate agency. The written authorization of the employee to conduct this check will be obtained in most cases; however, in certain circumstances, it may exist in which obtaining a written authorization is not be possible or feasible, in which case to obtain written authorization. In those cases, a limited background check may be performed through the Idaho State Police or other appropriate agency. Any information obtained through this process will be used solely for the purpose of maintaining the safety and security of the UI community and will be shared strictly on a “need to know” basis. [ed. 11-12, rev. 3-18]

D. Results of Criminal Background Checks.

Applicants New to UI: If the criminal background check identifies convictions, with the exception of D-1 below, determinations of suitability for employment will be made by Human Resources in consultation with appropriate hiring authority when applicable based on factors that include the nature and details of the conviction, the length of time that has passed since the conviction, how the crime relates to the job in question, evidence of rehabilitation, and other relevant factors. [rev. 3-18]

Current Employees: When a current employees with convictions are considered for new positions or potentially reclassified or promoted into a security-sensitive position, transfers, or promotions, the Senior Executive Director for HR executive, or designee, in consultation with the appropriate hiring authority, will determine whether to exclude the candidate. [rev. 3-18]
If, pursuant to this procedure, a criminal background check is conducted on a current employee and an event is uncovered that was not previously considered, UI may initiate potential personnel action against the employee. In these cases, the Executive Director for senior HR executive, Human Resources or designee, in consultation with the Risk Management Officer and Unit Manager other applicable personnel, will determine what personnel action, if any, should be taken. The senior Executive Director for HR executive, or designee Human Resources may ask the employee for a written explanation of the offense(s). [rev. 11-12, 3-18]

D-1. Disqualifying Employment Convictions. For positions involving significant contact with minors, a record of any of the following convictions will generally result in automatic exclusion of the candidate or termination of a current employee: [rev. 3-18]

i) Conviction of any crime against a child or vulnerable adult (including but not limited to child abuse, abandonment, neglect, and statutory rape);

ii) Conviction of any crime of violence;

iii) Conviction of any crime of a sexual nature, including but not limited to lewd conduct, sexual battery, sexual exploitation, rape, and statutory rape;

iv) Conviction of any crime involving unlawful use or possession of a weapon or firearm. [ed. 11-12]

D-2. “Convictions” Defined. For purposes of this policy procedure, the term “conviction” will be interpreted broadly and will include pleas of no contest, deferred adjudications, and similar dispositions. If a criminal history report indicates pending criminal charges that, if a conviction resulted, would result in exclusion from employment, the candidate will be excluded from employment until final disposition of the charges. [ed. 3-18]

E. Communication of Results and Employee Rights

E-1. Consumer Reporting Agency. Procedures when the report has been provided by a consumer reporting agency (e.g., Verified Credentials, HireRight). [ed. 12-14, 3-18]
i) If a determination has been made that a candidate should be excluded, or that adverse action should be taken against a current employee, based on an unsatisfactory criminal background check, HR shall, prior to taking any adverse action against the individual, provide a Pre-Adverse Action Disclosure that (1) notifies the individual in writing of the unsatisfactory result, (2) provides the candidate or employee with a copy of the report, and (3) provides the candidate or employee with a written description of his or her rights under the Fair Credit Reporting Act.

ii) After the adverse action has been taken, HR will provide the candidate with an Adverse Action Notice, which includes (1) the name, address, and phone number of the consumer reporting agency that supplied the report; (2) a statement that the consumer reporting agency that supplied the report did not make the decision regarding the adverse action and cannot provide the reasons for the adverse action; and (3) a notice of the individual’s right to dispute the accuracy or completeness of any information the agency has furnished, and his or her right to an additional free consumer report from the agency upon request within 60 days.

iii) A candidate or employee who has received an initial unsatisfactory result and who has sought correction of his or her report under the Fair Credit Reporting Act is not eligible for a listed position until the senior Executive Director for Human Resources or designee has confirmed the correction and determined that the result is satisfactory. The University has no obligation to hold a position open to allow a candidate or employee to correct his or her report. [ed. 11-12, 3-18]

E-2. Government Reporting Agency. Procedures when the report has been provided by a governmental agency (e.g., Idaho State Police) are as follows:

i) If a decision has been made to exclude a candidate, or initiate action against a current employee, based on an unsatisfactory background check, HR shall (1) notify the individual in writing of the unsatisfactory result, and (2) provide the candidate or employee with a copy of the report.
F. Record Keeping. Criminal history information collected under this policy shall be kept electronically with the third party vendor or in accordance with record retention requirements (see APM Chapter 65). The information will be used solely for the purpose of maintaining the safety and security of the University of Idaho community and will be disclosed only as permitted or required by law. \[rev. 10-07, 11-12, 3-18\]
Summary of Changes for Criminal Background Check Procedures – APM 50.16 – March 6, 2018

The policy has been substantially re-written and does not show a redlined version. Below is a summary of changes we are trying to accomplish, although the proposed policy has been reorganized and rewritten to be easier to understand.

A. General:

- Requesting a criminal background check (CBC) be completed for all employees including temporary help; student employees (ST, SF) and volunteers if their work involves contact with minors or safety-sensitive functions. Questions regarding specific positions could be asked of HR to remove the need to specifically list every position in the APM. Requiring a CBC for all employees is the “norm” amongst Idaho Universities and recommended throughout HR profession. Recommending student and volunteer positions get a CBC if contact with minors or safety sensitive functions. The term “significant” is very confusing to departments and HR has been asked to provide clear guidance on what it means to have significant contact. Removing that terminology.
  - Note: Some departments currently require background checks for all employees. Those departments currently include: Facilities, Auxiliary Services, College of Natural Resources, University Research.
  - Due to the security safety sensitive nature of the ITS positions, the large majority of the ITS positions also receive a CBC.

- Adjusted language to remove need for an employee who is changing positions due to a transfer, promotion, etc. (exception of general faculty) if the employee has previously had one completed with the UI.

B-2. Required Authorization for Criminal Background Check:

- Updated language that referenced specific vendor names. Keeping the information less specific will reduce the need for future updates due to change in vendors.

B.4. Prior Criminal Background Check Qualifies

- Requesting to update the requirements for ongoing employees who may have a break in service that would be no longer than one semester time period. This would generally apply to the temporary faculty that are appointed for specific terms and reappointed each year, which currently triggers a CBC based on the 13 month rule resulting in a large number of CBC requests. The change in the language would still require a CBC if there is a qualified break in service, but would eliminate the need for unnecessary CBC requests and meet the requests of the departments on this particular item.

B.7. J-1 Scholars and Exceptions

- This section was added to document the current process in regard to J-1 Scholars. Due to the background check process with Department of Homeland Security, a UI background check policy is waived. This may also be true of other international employees.

D. Results of Criminal Background Checks:

- Updated language to reflect the process and potential participants in the review if results of a CBC require further discussion and input prior to a final decision.

D-1. Disqualifying Employment Convictions:

- Language changed as a result of concerns from General Counsel surrounding automatic exclusions. The proposed language more accurately reflects the review and assessment process in connection with the conviction, time period and job applied for.