University of Idaho
2017-2018 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #24

3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, April 10, 2018
Brink Hall Faculty-Staff Lounge & Zoom

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2017-18 Faculty Senate Meeting #23, April 3, 2018 (vote)

III. Consent Agenda.
   • Spring 2018 Graduates (vote)

IV. Chair’s Report.

V. Provost’s Report.

VI. Other Announcements and Communications.

VII. Committee Reports.

   Faculty Affairs (vote)
   • FS-18-050: FSH 3050 - Position Description Policy & Form and FSH 3320 - Annual Evaluation Policy (Ytreberg)

   Faculty Appeals Hearing Board (vote)
   • FS-18-054: FSH 3840 Procedures for Faculty Appeals & 1640.43 Faculty Appeals Hearing Board (Sammarruca)

   Safety & Loss (vote)
   • FS-18-055: FSH 1640.76 Safety & Loss Committee (Seamon)

   Staff-Compensation Task Force (vote)
   • FS-18-056: FSH 1640.XX – University Staff Compensation Committee (Miller)

VIII. Special Orders.

IX. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

X. New Business.

XI. Adjournment.

Professor Patrick Hrdlicka, Chair 2017-2018, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2017-2018 FS Meeting #23
Handouts
University of Idaho  
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
2017-2018 Meeting #23, Tuesday, April 3, 2018  

Present: Anderson (Mike), Anderson (Miranda), Arowojolu, Baird, Brandt (w/o vote), Brown, Cannon (Boise), Caplan, De Angelis, Ellison, Grieb, Howard, Hrdlicka, Jeffrey, Johnson, Kern (Coeur d’Alene), Morgan, Morrison, Nicotra, Panttaja, Schwarzlaender, Seamon, Stevenson (for Wiencek, w/o vote), Vella, Watson, Zhao (Idaho Falls). Absent: Foster, Leonor, Mahoney, Tibbals, Wiencek. Guests: 6

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

Chair’s Report:

- On March 6th, President Staben released the initial notice regarding the university’s FY2019 Student Fees and Tuition request to the student groups and others including the chair of Faculty Senate. The university proposes an 8% increase in the resident tuition rate ($600 increase for undergraduates; proposed new tuition $8,088/yr). Students and other University of Idaho community members will have the opportunity to comment on these proposed changes at an open forum on April 5th at 3:30 in the Commons Horizon/Aurora Rooms and comments can also be submitted via email to studentfees@uidaho.edu. This proposal will be presented to the SBOE at the April 19th meeting.
- A memo was distributed on March 20th to the UI community from Provost Wiencek and Yolanda Bisbee, who is the chair of the "Great Colleges to Work For" task force. The task force has analyzed survey responses from 2016 and 2017, and recommendations from the Campus Culture and Climate subcommittee of the President’s Council on Diversity and Inclusion, to draft an action plan how to address some of the workplace environment challenges that we are facing. Members of the university community are invited to read and provide improvements to the report via email to provost@uidaho.edu by April 4, 2018.
- The deadline for Faculty and Staff to participate in the 2018 Great Colleges to Work for survey is April 6. Senators are encouraged to remind their constituents to participate in this anonymous survey which is our primary instrument for evaluation of our workplace environment.
- The names of Newly Elected senators are due to the Faculty Secretary by April 15, 2019.

A senator commented that due to the timing of the ASUI elections, the names of the new ASUI Senators would not be available on the 15th.

The Chair deferred to Senator Katie Brown who announced that the Margaret Ritchie Distinguished Speaker will be alumna and Olympic Gold Medalist Kristin Armstrong. Armstrong’s speech will be Wednesday, April 11th at 6:00 pm in the Ag Sciences Auditorium.

Provost’s Report: Jeanne Stevenson did not have any items to report for the Provost.

Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) Report: FS-18-050: FSH 3050 - Position Description Policy & Form and FSH 3320 - Annual Evaluation Policy. Professor Marty Ytreberg, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, was present to discuss the committee’s report. Revisions to the position description (PD) policy and form and to the policy on annual evaluations (AE) by faculty were initially presented at the senate meeting on March 27, 2018.

A senator began the discussion by conveying that several colleagues in the School of Music commented that their responsibilities change frequently. They did not think the new form contained sufficient narrative to
explain these changes and that the process did not accommodate their need to change responsibilities regularly. Ytreberg explained that the new process will allow a faculty member to change the PD as often as needed. He also explained that the vision of the committee was that the new PD would be a higher-level document that would not necessarily reflect small changes in responsibilities. The details of what each of us do change often – we get new grants, teach new classes, and work on new projects. The sense of the committee was that usually these changes in detail do not change the general nature of our position expectations. A senator commented that many faculty appreciated the simplification of the form and the elimination of the annual PD meeting. Department chairs in her college expressed the concern that the 250-word limit on the PD narrative was not sufficient to capture enough detail to support annual evaluations and promotion and tenure. She asked whether the character limit could be increased? Ytreberg responded that the committee would be open to increasing the characters. Their goal was to set a character limit that would support the purpose of the form, but discourage too much detail. The committee recognized that more information might well be needed. It was moved (Grieb/Morgan) that the character limit on the PD form be increased to 500. The motion passed with one abstention and one negative vote.

Another senator asked whether the pie chart on the form could be changed to a bar chart. Ytreberg commented that there will be no chart on the new form because the system on which the new electronic form will reside does not accommodate charts.

A senator asked for clarification on whether syllabi with learning assessments will be required with the new PD. Dale Pietrzak, Director of Institutional Assessment and Accreditation, who was attending the meeting as a guest, responded that the university needs to collect and archive this information for accreditation. Ytreberg responded that this information did not need to be collected as part of the PD process and could be done in some other manner.

A senator asked what FAC intended in proposing that the PD be amended in the case of a substantial change in responsibilities. Other senators asked whether FAC might provide guidelines on what constituted a substantial change. Ytreberg responded that the committee didn’t want to be prescriptive and dictate what constituted a substantial change. It discussed several scenarios. For example, a position would not necessarily need to be changed if a faculty member is asked to teach a different course, even a course that is a new prep. Likewise, the committee did not think taking on a temporary teaching overload necessitated a change in the PD. On the other hand, where the faculty member assumes a long-term increase in teaching expectations, or assumes major administrative responsibilities, the PD should likely be updated. Secretary Brandt, who is an ex officio member of FAC, added that the committee also thought that a change might be substantial for a faculty member in the tenure process, while the same change might not warrant a revision of the PD for a more senior faculty member. Ytreberg stressed that the committee believes the decision to change the PD should rest with the faculty member, with the approval of the unit administrator and dean.

A senator noted that the changes that were made during the fall 2017 semester are related to the proposed changes in the PD. She asked how FAC envisions that the PD and AE will work in the future. Ytreberg stressed again that the PD is intended as a high-level view of a faculty member’s responsibilities; FAC assumes that most faculty will not have to make frequent changes in the PD. The committee envisions that faculty would have a single evaluation meeting with unit administrator. This meeting would be both reflective and forward thinking. He pointed out that the new AE form has a space specifically for forward-looking comments labeled “Commentary/recommendations on progress toward tenure, promotion, and/or continued satisfactory performance.” The committee also hopes that the AE discussion will include goal setting.

A senator encouraged in-depth training for unit administrators to support the new system. He expressed concern that without such training, the revisions might lead to a very uneven and possibly unstructured and unhelpful evaluation process. Ytreberg expressed his confidence that the Vice Provost for Faculty has begun and will continue a detailed process of supporting unit administrators in carrying out the AE process.
A senator asked where the detail that was formerly in the PD would be recorded. Ytreberg responded that departments would be free to develop procedures to capture the data if this was deemed necessary.

Based on the concern expressed by several senators regarding the short time for gathering input from colleagues, it was moved (De Angelis/Morgan) to postpone the vote on the proposed policy changes to April 10, 2018. After the initial vote on this matter, a Senator raised a point of order requesting clarification on whether passage of the motion requires a majority of those attending the meeting or a majority of those voting. The faculty secretary consulted the Senate Bylaws and Roberts Rules of Order. She clarified that passage of the motion requires a majority of those voting. She also stated that she may have earlier miscounted the votes and suggested that the vote be repeated. On repeating the vote, the motion to postpone passed with 14 votes in favor and 6 against.

**Library Affairs Report. FS-18-053: FSH 6920 – University Library.** Professor Robert Perret, Chair of the Library Affairs Committee, presented the committee’s report. The committee’s proposal streamlines and updates the language of the library policy. A senator commented in his view that the introductory language in the proposed policy was a statement of purpose and not truly policy. Perret responded that the committee believed it was important to set forth a broad statement of the library’s role in the university. The dean of the University Library, Lynn Baird (a member of senate) commented that the proposed language is taken directly from the library’s mission statement. Another senator asked about the enforcement of the fees for books that were checked out for so long that they are declared lost. Her concern was that the fees were not enforced. Another senator questioned why faculty should be exempt from overdue charges. Dean Baird responded that borrowing library materials for extended periods of time is a longstanding privilege of faculty. However, the library has experienced problems when faculty have attempted to assert the extended loan privilege as to interlibrary loans and other materials to which extended periods of time does not apply. The proposed language provides more enforcement than does the present policy. Finally, a senator commented that, in his opinion, certain descriptive provisions could be removed from the proposed policy. Perret responded that the committee intended the policy to be comprehensive. Regarding one of the provisions, Perret also pointed out that the language creates a faculty privilege to request library materials. The proposed revisions passed 22-0.

**Strategic Plan Update.** Director of Institutional Assessment and Accreditation, Dale Pietrzak updated senate on the status of the university’s strategic plan in preparation for the mid-cycle visit by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU). Director Pietrzak reminded senate that President Staben first presented the updated strategic plan at his State of the University Address last fall. As the university’s processes were reviewed in preparation for the visit, it was determined that a presentation of the update to Faculty Senate also would be appropriate. Pietrzak noted that while the university is behind on meeting several of its aspirational goals, it has made progress in implementing its plan. He also pointed out that since the president’s update last fall, some of the metrics in the plan have been further updated as data has become available. The primary concern of the NWCCU reviewers is that the university is assessing its operations and that the assessment activities (such as the University Budget and Finance Committee process and Program Prioritization) are tied to our strategic plan.

A senator asked whether there was any data faculty should be particularly aware of? Pietrzak explained that NWCCU wants to know whether the university is regularly collecting information and updating the evaluation of our strategic plan. They are focused on whether we are doing what we said we would do. The upcoming visit is a mid-cycle visit that focuses on student and program learning outcomes and on the ad hoc report issued at the NWCCU’s last mid-cycle visit 18 months ago. NWCCU is sending only two reviewers instead of three or four – these reviewers will review both areas of focus. The NWCCU has given them latitude on how to proceed in order to accommodate the paucity of reviewers. Pietrzak also elaborated on the reason for this particular mid-cycle review. The NWCCU reviewers who visited the university in the fall of 2017 liked what the university was doing on strategic planning and wanted to see that we are consistently doing what we say we were going to do over time. A senator commented on several metrics in the update – we have had a decrease in terminal
degrees, we haven’t met our enrollment goals and we have experienced an understandable dip in International enrollment.

**Update on Parking and Transportation (PTS).** Director of Parking and Transportation Services Rebecca Couch. Couch indicated that PTS is introducing parking changes and permit price increases. She stated that the PTS’ vision is to keep UI moving and to focus on good customer service. The PTS Strategic Plan is on the PTS website and was provided to senators. Couch stated that while the university has available parking spaces to meet our current needs, the open spaces are not in desired areas. This is beginning to place increasing pressure on the parking system. In preparation for the strategic plan, PTS conducted a campus-wide survey. They received almost 2000 responses including significant responses from faculty, staff and students. As a result, they were able to segment the responses to different groups, so they could compare priorities. The survey asked participants to rank sixteen different priorities based on four criteria -- availability, affordability, sustainability and fairness. Most participants believed that parking policy should emphasize availability and affordability. Sustainability and fairness were lesser considerations for most participants. As a result of the information obtained from the survey, PTS has renewed its focus on reducing the number of vehicles brought to campus. Reducing vehicles is the most cost-effective way to provide affordable parking access. The plan is particularly focused on reducing the need of students to bring personal vehicles to campus. PTS plans to enhance existing alternative transportation options and to add some new options. She particularly mentioned improved shuttle service from parking lots in peripheral areas. Another plan is to increase the convenience of public transportation options by bringing them into the core of campus. PTS plans to start a bike share program. Such programs are booming across the country. Users do not have to worry about purchasing a bike or getting one to campus. Another idea is to provide incentives to people who don’t buy a parking permit. The ultimate plan is to focus the parking system on those who need to drive to campus. PTS also hopes to improve availability, enhanced technology, improve lot conditions and better maintain lots.

For FY19 PTS is creating a new permit tier – orange. Orange permits will be priced between gold and red permits. Many of the current high demand, red lots close to the campus core will be reclassified as orange lots. In addition, the prices for gold permits and student residential permits will increase. Gold permits will increase by 4% and premium residential permits will increase by 14%. The goal of these changes is to keep prices for each of the permit tiers about a hundred dollars apart. This provides financial options for students and employees. The increase in price for the premium student permits recognizes that these parking spaces are generally very conveniently located. Demand for these residential permits, located close to student residences, is sky-rocketing.

Late in 2019 PTS expects to begin a major capital project. This project involves paving lot 53 near the Student Health Center and changing the parking in that lot to metered parking, changing the street directions on Ash Street and Idaho Street, changing the on-street parking on these streets to gold permit parking, and adding additional permit parking south of Life Sciences where there are now meters. Finally, PTS is working with the City of Moscow to authorize more on-street parking on city streets to the east of campus. PTS expects that the direction change on Ash and Idaho Streets will make it possible for public transportation to come into the center of the campus – a bus stop will be added on Ash Street. Also, PTS has had complaints about cars driving in pedestrian-only areas. The directional change will make this more difficult. Changing the parking on Ash and Idaho Streets from long-term residential parking to day time parking will make snow removal on these streets easier. In addition, PTS plans better signage that will direct visitors to campus to the metered spots.

A senator asked whether any gold lots had changed. Couch responded that there were no changes to the locations of gold parking lots. Rather, several red lots will be re-classified to orange lots. A senator commented that it appears that the changes push students into affordable red lots further from the campus core. The senator wanted to know how many students had been involved in the process of reviewing parking policies. He stated that the proposed changes are not responsive to student input. A senator commented that the policy would push lower income employees into these more distant lots. He noted the price of the new orange permit is the equivalent of 1% of the annual compensation for some of our employees. Another senator suggested
that the parking map make clear that holders of the new orange permit can park in lots open to lower priced permits. Couch thanked the senator for pointing out this ambiguity.

A senator suggested that PTS create a more direct walk way for those who park in the blue lot on Sweet Avenue to make it more accessible to the campus core. Couch responded that PTS would follow up on this idea.

A senator asked whether parking reciprocity with WSU could be improved. Couch explained that WSU has changed their parking policies. The university plans to try to work with them for reciprocity.

A senator commented that she appreciated the need to increase revenues, but that this should not be done at the expense of employees and students. Her opinion was that while the creation of the new orange lots might be a good idea, she did not support raising permit prices. Senators also expressed frustration that spaces are constantly re-purposed in gold lots for service, delivery, Zip cars and for special uses, especially near Memorial Gym. She also did not support telling employees that they cannot park in lots during athletic events. Many senators nodded in agreement.

A senator commented that it did not appear that customer satisfaction was considered. He pointed out that there are acute shortages of parking for certain students. He suggested that PTS should decrease the price for red permits, because they will be less desirable. He also commented on the high number of parking appeals. Couch responded that PTS is proposing dropping the prices for blue permits.

**Adjournment:** Finally, a senator commented on PTS plans to reduce the number of blue lots. Couch explained that future PTS plans are to convert blue lots on Sweet Avenue to red lots. Time for meeting expired, a motion to adjourn (Morrison/Johnson) was made. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Liz Brandt, Faculty Secretary &
Secretary to the Faculty Senate
POLICY COVER SHEET
(See Faculty Staff Handbook 1460 for instructions at UI policy website: www.webs.uidaho.edu/uipolicy)

[3/09]

Faculty/Staff Handbook [FSH] □ Addition □ Revision* □ Deletion* □ Emergency

Minor Amendment

Chapter & Title: FSH 3050 – Position Description Policy & Form and FSH 3320 – Annual evaluation policy

All policies must be reviewed, approved and returned by a policy sponsor, with a cover sheet attached to apm@uidaho.edu or fsh@uidaho.edu respectively.

*Note: If revision/deletion request original document from apm@uidaho.edu or fsh@uidaho.edu, all changes must be made using “track changes.”

Originator(s): Marty Ytreberg                    March 22, 2018

(Please see FSH 1460 C)

Name Date

Telephone & Email: 208-885-6908         ytreberg@uidaho.edu

Policy Sponsor: (If different than originator.)

Policy Sponsor

Telephone & Email:

Reviewed by General Counsel  ___Yes __X__No  Name & Date: __________

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. e 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.

If not a minor amendment forward to: ____________

Track #: ____________

Date Rec.: ____________

Posted: t-sheet ____________

h/e ____________

web ____________

Register: ____________

(Faculty Senate 2017-18 - Meeting #24 - April 10, 2018 - Page 7)
*Note: This form was drafted solely for the purpose of informing the IT folks who will develop the online form, that will follow as closely as possible the substantive contents of the form. The online form is not likely to look like this form, e.g. the red text will not remain on the form.

University of Idaho
Faculty Position Description (*link to FSH 3050)

Date: (*effective date – retain all versions) _______________

Faculty Name: ___________________________ Employee V#: _______________

Rank: ___________________________ Administrative Title (if applicable): ___________________________

Unit(s): ___________________________

Responsibility Areas (*link to FSH 1565 C) PD%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching and Advising</th>
<th>PD%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship and Creative Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach and Extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Service and Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 500 characters, or consult with Faculty Affairs
** 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.

Will include several checkboxes (replaces 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: 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.
# 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:

**Teaching and Advising**

60

**Scholarship and Creative Activities**

30

**Outreach and Extension**

5

**University Service and Leadership**

5

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

---

Signature of Faculty Member  Date

☐ Interdisciplinary/Center Activities: Attach narrative.

**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.

---

Signature of Unit Administrator  Date

Signature of Additional Unit Administrator  Date

(e.g. joint appointments [if applicable])

Signature of Additional Unit Administrator  Date

(e.g. joint appointments [if applicable])

**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.

---

Signature of Dean  Date

---

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, 3660 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 2013 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).

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.

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.

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.

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.

B.C. PROCEDURE.

C.B-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.

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.

BC-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. [7-09 - original text from 3140 B-3]

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. [ed. 7-01, 7-09]

(Form follows on the next pages.)
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).

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].

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.

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. [ren. and rev. 7-01, rev. 12-06, 7-09, 7-10]

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. [add. 7-10]

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). [ed. 7-09, rev. 7-10]

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. [ed. 12-06, 7-09, 7-14, rev. 7-16]

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. [ren. and ed. 7-09, rev. 7-16]

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. [rev. 7-09, 7-10]

B-4. TWO OCCURRENCES 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 [ed. 12-06, rev. 7-10]

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. [ed. 7-09]

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. [ed. 7-09]
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]
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PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY APPEALS

PREAMBLE: This section deals with the procedures for faculty appeals. It formed a part of the 1979 Handbook and was revised in July of 1994 to add harassment on the basis of race, color, religion, gender, national origin, age or disability to the "areas of concern" and in January of 1996 so as to remove the Faculty Affairs Committee from those bodies through which an appeal had to travel before being heard. The section was substantially revised in July 1999 and again in July 2002 to clarify the committee's scope and its procedures, and was revised in 2007 to add a process for addressing retaliation complaints. In 2008 the committee composition previously in C and D was moved into FSH 1640 Committee Directory. In April 2014 changes were made to align this policy with Board policy. Further information is available from the Provost's Office (208-885-6448) or the Office of the Faculty Secretary (208-885-6151). [rev. 7-99, 7-02, 7-07, 7-08, ed. 7-00, 7-05, 4-14]

CONTENTS:
A. Areas of Concern
B. Procedures for Initiating an Appeal
C. Faculty Appeals Hearing Board
D. Hearing Procedures
E. Procedures Following the Hearing

A. AREAS OF CONCERN. The procedures provided in this policy are to be used by faculty members to appeal administrative decisions, including without limitation decisions in such matters as denial of tenure, denial of promotion, position description, performance evaluation, salary determination, and to challenge the contents of personnel files. Applicability of these procedures to some matters is subject to certain limitations and exclusions - nonrenewal of fixed-term appointments [see 3900 E and F], dismissal for cause [see 3910, in particular, 3910 D-5-c], and layoff resulting from a declaration of financial exigency [see 3970]. Allegations of sexual harassment or discrimination based on race, color, sex, national origin, religion, age, sexual orientation, or disability are not subject to this policy, but should be brought to the Director of Human Rights, Access and Inclusion. Decisions of the president concerning administrative assignments are not appealable under this policy. A faculty member alleging retaliation is required to follow the process set forth in FSH 3810 before proceeding under this policy. The time period for appeal will begin to run upon completion of the process set forth in 3810. [rev. 7-99, 7-02, 7-07, 7-12, ed. 9-06, 6-09]

B. PROCEDURES FOR INITIATING AN APPEAL.

B-1. Before, or in addition to, filing an appeal, the faculty member should seek satisfaction informally by discussing his or her complaint with the administrator who made the decision. If the issue is not resolved by this means, the faculty member should then go to the next administrative level for redress. Reference to these discussions should be included in the request for a hearing.

B-2. A faculty member who wishes to appeal an institutional decision may do so by submitting a written request for a formal hearing. Such a request must be made within 30 calendar days after he or she receives written notice of the institutional decision, except that a 20-day period is allowed in cases of nonrenewal of fixed-term appointments [see 3900 F], a 14-day period is allowed in cases of denial of tenure or promotion, and a 15-day period is allowed in cases of dismissal for cause [see 3910 D-5-a]. If the appeal concerns salary determination, the 30-day period allowed for filing begins with receipt of notice of the dollar amount of salary assigned [see 3420 B-3, B-6]; the earlier assignment to a salary-increment category [see 3420 B-3] may be appealed by the informal means described in B-1 or may be included in the appeal after the salary amount has been fixed. In the request, the faculty member must state clearly what decision is being appealed and, briefly, the grounds on which the appeal is based. If the time deadlines contained in this provision or in any rules or procedures adopted by the Faculty Appeals Hearing Board are not complied with the appeal shall be dismissed unless the Faculty Appeals Hearing Board determines that an attempt at informal resolution through the Ombuds Office or extraordinary circumstances justified the delay. [rev. 7-99, 2-07, ed. 7-01, 7-02, ed. 3-14]

B-3. The request for a hearing shall be addressed to the chair of the Faculty Appeals Hearing Board (FAHB) (see FSH 1640.43). The grounds for the FAHB review are limited to the following possible determinations:
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(1) failure to comply with prescribed procedures; (2) application of inappropriate considerations; (3) abuse of discretion; and (4) abuse of the appellant’s academic rights and privileges. The request for a hearing must be based on one, or more, of these four grounds. The FAHB chair will forward copies of the request to the provost, and other administrators concerned. The provost, or another administrator designated by the provost, will furnish the FAHB chair and the faculty member a written statement of the reasons for the administrative decision. [rev. and ren. 7-99, ed. 7-02]

B-4. A request for a hearing does not affect the effective date of the decision being appealed. [add. 7-02]

B-5. The FAHB may establish additional procedures (see C-1 below) for initiating appeals not inconsistent with this policy. The appellant should request these procedures prior to submitting an appeal.

C. FACULTY APPEALS HEARING BOARD. (see FSH 1640.43)

DC. HEARING PROCEDURES. [ren. 7-08]

DC-1. The FAHB hearing board may adopt rules of procedure from time to time. In a particular case these rules may be altered by the board in the interest of fairness. These rules shall be filed with the Faculty Secretary and shall be available on request from the chair of the FAHB board and/or the faculty secretary. [add. 7-99, ren. 7-08]

C-2. The FAHB chair organizes the formation of a panel to hear an appeal, see FSH 1640.43 B on panel formation.

C-3. In order to maintain the independence of the FAHB panel in its hearing process and deliberations, there shall be no communications between any member of the board and a party to an appeal that are not in writing and provided contemporaneously to all parties to the appeal. Parties to an appeal shall make all communications to the FAHB panel in writing and shall provide contemporaneous copies to all other parties. Likewise, communications from the FAHB panel shall be copied to all parties.

DC-4. The board panel will meet before the hearing to consider the nature of the parties’ expected presentations, to make decisions about the procedure that will be followed in the hearing, and to set mutually acceptable dates for the hearing, including the time and duration of the presentations. The board panel chair communicates the panel’s decision in writing to the parties and allows each of them five working days in which to respond. The chair of the board panel negotiates any disputed matters. [ed. and ren. 7-99, ren. 7-08]

DC-5. The chair of the board panel summons the faculty member and the officer (or a representative of the body) whose decision is under appeal. The chair also summons other UI employees or students to appear on the request of either party or of the board panel itself; the summons must set a reasonable time and place to appear and must give due notice. Persons summoned have the obligation to respond as though summoned by the president. Either party may be assisted by counsel or an advisor of its choice in an advisory capacity only. Both parties are entitled to be present during the entire hearing. [rev. and ren. 7-99, ed. 7-02, ren. 7-08, rev. 7-15]

DC-6. During the hearing, the faculty member’s case will be presented first, in whatever manner he or she desires: e.g., through the testimony of witnesses, submission of documents, or oral statements. The board panel may then question the faculty member. The administration then presents its case, followed by questions from the board panel. The faculty member is given an opportunity to respond and to summarize his or her case. [ed. 7-97; ren. 7-99, ed. 7-02]

DC-7. As a general rule, the board panel admits, rather than excludes, presentations that either party desires to make. The chair may rule against presentations that are clearly repetitive or irrelevant. [ren. 7-99]

DC-8. The faculty member and the board panel should know of the existence and substance of all materials on which the administration has relied in making the decision being appealed [see 3040]; there should be no means by which the substance of any charge, or other adverse information or allegation, can be kept secret from the faculty member. [ren. 7-99, ed. 7-02]

ED. PROCEDURES FOLLOWING THE HEARING. [ren. 7-08]
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ED-1. The findings and recommendations of the hearing board panel are reported promptly in writing to the faculty member, his or her departmental administrator and dean, the provost, and the president. [rev. 7-99, ed. 7-02, ren. 7-08]

ED-2. The president, following receipt of the report of the hearing board panel, has the responsibility of promptly responding in writing—and in any case within 45 days—to the faculty member, and the hearing board panel, and of providing a statement of the rationale for his or her decision. [rev. 7-99, ed. 7-02, ren. 7-08]

ED-3. No Appeal to the Regents. The Regents have delegated authority for personnel matters to the president (RGPIIB2b), specifically stating that employee grievances are not appealable to the Board. (RGPIIM2) [add. 7-02, ren. 7-08, rev. 4-14]

ED-4. The chair of the FAHB board shall report annually to the Faculty Senate regarding the nature of the matters considered by the all board panel(s) during the preceding year. [add. 7-99, ren. 7-02, 7-08, 6-09]
1640.43 FACULTY APPEALS HEARING BOARD

[This section was removed from FSH 3840 C & D and placed here in July 2008]

A. FUNCTION. This board will conduct a hearing at the request of a faculty member who wishes to appeal an institutional decision under FSH 3840 A. In each case referred to it, the board has the following responsibilities: [add. 4-12]

- To review all documentary evidence submitted by the parties prior to the hearing and all evidence submitted by the parties at the hearing. The board may require the parties to submit evidence deemed relevant by the board. The board will make recommendations to the president (see FSH 3840 for further details).

- To determine whether there has been any (1) failure to comply with prescribed procedures, (2) application of inappropriate considerations, (3) abuse of discretion, or (4) abuse of the appellant’s academic rights and privileges.

- To make recommendations to the president.

B. STRUCTURE AND MEMBERSHIP: Five faculty members, one of whom is a departmental administrator, are principal members. In addition, five other faculty members, two other departmental administrators, and three off-campus faculty members are appointed as alternate members of the board. In appointing members, including alternates, the Committee on Committees must ensure that the majority of the members are tenured and each of them have been employed at the UI for longer than two years. Since a case for dismissal is appealable to the Faculty Appeals Hearing Board, care should be taken in appointing members to both Faculty Appeals Hearing Board and Dismissal Hearings Committee. The term of membership is three years, with initial terms staggered to form a rotation pattern. The off-campus alternates will serve, in place of principal faculty members chosen by lot, when an appeal by an off-campus faculty member is to be heard. The other alternate members will serve, as appropriate, when a principal member is deemed to have a conflict of interest. Once the panel for an individual hearing has been determined, it will meet at the direction of the chair of the Faculty Appeals Hearing Board and elect its own panel chair. In selecting a chair, a tenured faculty member will receive priority. [rev. 7-99, 1-09, 4-11, 7-17]

- Panel Chair’s Role: Once a panel chair has been selected, he/she will request a meeting with the Faculty Secretary at their earliest opportunity to discuss and review process. The panel chair may request assistance from the Faculty Secretary, Ombuds, or General Counsel’s office throughout the hearing. [add. 7-15]

- Observers: Both parties may have an advisor or counsel at the hearing. [add. 7-15]

C. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION: Faculty members serving on the Faculty Appeals Hearing Board (FAHB) should take careful note of the following additional considerations and conditions for service: 1) appeals usually occur following tenure, promotion, and salary decisions in the middle of the Spring semester, 2) appeal hearings usually require a 2-4 hour time block which will require meeting on a weekday evening or Saturday to accommodate the schedules of all of the parties involved in a hearing, and 3) the term of office of a member of the FAHB ends when the last active case final report is submitted. Faculty members not willing to abide by these conditions should not apply for service on the Faculty Appeals Hearing Board. [add. 7-02]
Memo

To: Committee on Committees

From: Richard Seamon, Chair (2017-2018), University Safety and Loss-Control Committee (SLCC)

Re: SLCC Request to Revise Membership

Date: March 21, 2018

Dear Committee on Committees:

At its meeting on November 15, 2017, the SLCC approved a resolution to seek a change to the SLCC’s membership. The change would add four new voting members, to represent Information Technology Services, University Support Services, the University Library, and the Office of Research and Economic Development. If adopted, this change would require revising Faculty Staff Handbook 1640.76.B as follows:

B. STRUCTURE. The committee is composed of 1721 voting members and 3 ex-officio (non-voting) members, as follows: One faculty member from each college; a member from Information Technology Services; a member from University Support Services; a member from the University Library; a member from the Office of Research and Economic Development; Director of University Residences or designee; Director of Student Health Services or designee; Assistant VP of Facilities or designee; Assistant Vice-President of Human Resources or designee; Staff Affairs Representative; one undergraduate student; one graduate student; Commander, Moscow Police Department, campus subdivision (ex-officio); Occupational Safety Specialist (ex-officio); the Director, Environmental Health & Safety (ex-officio), and the University of Idaho’s Executive Director of Public Safety or designee. The Safety and Loss-Control Committee is governed by a chair and vice-chair, with the vice-chair assuming responsibilities of the chair after one-year rotation. The committee elects its own chair and vice-chair from among the voting members. Committee members representing colleges are appointed by the university’s Committee on Committees and serve a three-year period. The college representatives are ex officio members of their college unit safety committees. Student members of the committee will serve terms as recommended by the ASUI and GPSA.

The SLCC voted to approve this proposed change after a discussion of the concerns that, as we understand it, were expressed by your committee and Ann Thompson when the SLCC passed an identical resolution in March or April, 2016. Again as we understand it, the main concerns were:

1. This change would make the SLCC too big to be manageable, with regard, for example, to getting a quorum.
2. Considering the concern about size, would it be better to make any additional representatives ones who would serve without a vote?
3. How does the SLCC relate to "unit safety committees" and to the university-wide safety and loss-control infrastructure, including safety and loss control at the educational centers and research and extension centers.

Below is a summary of the SLCC’s discussion of these concerns.
1. **Will adding four members make the committee unwieldy?**

   The SLCC does not think that adding four voting members will make the committee unwieldy. For the last 18 months or so, monthly meetings have almost always had a quorum. Furthermore, almost all of these meetings have been devoted primarily to sharing information and reinforcing each other's commitment to "spreading the gospel of safety" to colleagues, rather than debating action items. The SLCC thus functions to facilitate a culture and safety by spreading awareness of issues and best practices. The SLCC voted to add four new members to broaden this effort to cultivate a culture of safety.

2. **Would it be better, if new members are added, to have them participate without a vote?**

   The SLCC does not think that it would be better to leave the new members without a vote. The consensus was that people who lack a vote will be less likely to attend than people who have a vote, and more generally, that people who lack a vote will not have the same investment in the committee's mission as people who have a vote. If the key goal of the SLCC is to promote a culture of safety through information sharing and "spreading the gospel," it would be better to add members who have "skin in the game."

3. **How Does the SLCC Relate to the University's "Safety Units," its Centers, and the Broader Safety and Loss Infrastructure?**

   a. Administrative Procedures Manual (APM) 35.32.D requires unit administrators to develop and implement a "unit safety program." One element of a "unit safety program," under APM 35.32D-1, is a "unit safety committee." For example, each academic unit -- each college, in other words -- has a unit safety committee. The unit safety committees help implement the University's Safety and Loss Control Program. Ultimate responsibility for administering this program lies with the Director of Environmental Health and Safety (EHS). The unit safety committees have no formal connection with the SLCC; they are not supervised by the SLCC. They do, however, provide information that is regularly reported to the SLCC, and members of the SLCC regularly communicate with their corresponding unit safety committee.

   b. To the extent that units operate in the centers as well as on the Moscow campus, those units' safety and loss committees implement unit safety programs at the centers as well as the main campus. For example, the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences has a unit safety committee that implements that college's unit safety program at the Moscow campus and the research and extension centers.

   c. As mentioned above, the Director of EHS heads the university's institutional Safety and Loss Control Program. Under APM 35.32A-1, the Director prescribes "[s]afety policies and procedures which are required in order to ensure compliance with local, state, or federal law or regulation." When the Director proposes safety policies that "are a combination of legal or regulatory requirements and institutional policy, those portions with institutional policy" elements are "submitted for review and approval by" the SLCC. (APM 35.32A-1.) In addition to prescribing safety policies and procedures (some of which are subject to SLCC review and approval), the Director of EHS "is responsible for administering the institutional Safety and Loss Control Program." (APM 35.32A-3.) To carry out this responsibility, among other things the Director of EHS "coordinates the efforts of all University units and employees to
create and maintain" safety. To that end, the Director of EHS and EHS Office staff work with unit safety committees to develop and implement unit safety plans.

***

Thank you for considering this request.

Attached to this memo are:

A. SLCC Minutes from meeting 2017-18 # 3 (Nov. 15, 2017)
B. Unit Safety Committees and contact personnel
C. APM 35.32
1640.76
SAFETY AND LOSS-CONTROL COMMITTEE
[created 7-00, replacing previous Safety Committee]

A. FUNCTION. The responsibilities and purposes of the committee are as follows: a. to promote policies and programs that will provide a safe and healthy working and living environment for university students, employees, and members of the public, and that will protect public property from injury or damage; b. to promote the principles and associated benefits of an effective Safety and Loss-Control Policy; c. to endorse and systematically promote university employee safety training; d. to encourage the campus community to identify, correct, and report potential hazards and/or unsafe work practices; e. to monitor and review University of Idaho accident and loss summarized reports and statistics; and; f. to report annually to Faculty Senate and the President's Executive Council on campus-wide safety initiatives and program development. [ed. 7-09]

B. STRUCTURE. The committee is composed of 212 voting members and 3 ex-officio (non-voting) members, as follows: One faculty member from each college; a member from Information Technology Services, University Support Services, University Library, Office of Research and Economic Development; , Director of University Residences, or designee; Director of Student Health Services, or designee; Assistant VP of Facilities, or designee; senior Assistant Vice-President of Human Resources executive, or designee; a Staff Affairs representative; one undergraduate student; one graduate student, and the Executive Director of Public Safety, or designee; the three ex-officio non-voting members include the Commander, Moscow Police Department, campus subdivision (ex-officio); Occupational Safety Specialist (ex-officio); the Director, Environmental Health & Safety (ex-officio), and the University of Idaho’s Executive Director of Public Safety or designee.

The Safety and Loss-Control Committee is governed by a chair and vice-chair, with the vice-chair assuming responsibilities of the chair after one-year rotation. The committee elects its own chair and vice-chair from among the voting members. Committee members representing colleges are appointed by the university's Committee on Committees and serve a three-year period. The college-faculty representatives are ex officio members of their college unit safety committees. Student members of the committee will serve terms as recommended by the ASUI and GPSA. [rev. 7-05, 7-06, 7-08, ed. 6-09, 10-13]
Attachment A
University Safety and Loss Control Committee

Meeting Minutes

Meeting 2017-18 #3

Date: November 15, 2017

Location: Idaho Commons Panorama Room

Members/Alternates Present:
Richard Seamon (CH), Benjamin Barton, Mike Sonnichsen, Rob Keefe, Member (for Raymond Dixon), James Moberly, Onesmo Balemba, Elaina McIntosh-Perry (for Mike Holthaus), Nancy Spink (for Matt Dorschel), Samir Shahat, Kelvin Daniels

Members Absent:
Monica Banyi, Brandi Terwilliger, Debbie Huffman, Nicholas Brannon, Amy Lin, Cynthia Ballesteros, Fahmid Tousif

Also in attendance:
Greg Cain, and Russell McClanahan

Handouts/Attachments:

1. USLCC Minutes for October 18, 2017
2. Meeting 2017-18 #3 Agenda
3. Annual Unit Safety Assessments

Meeting called to order at 2:05 p.m. by committee chair, Richard Seamon.

Confirmed next meeting for December 20, 2017.

Minutes for October 21st meeting approved, motioned by Ben Barton and seconded by Mike Sonnichsen.

Open issues:

1. Richard Seamon has met with Miranda Anderson of the Committee on Committees. Miranda suggests the Committee starts over and answers three questions.
   a. Who are the Unit Safety Committees, where are they located and how do they relate to the USLCC. Answer; Unit Safety Committees are a separate part of APM 35.32 to implement Loss Control. APM and list attached to minutes.
   b. How are the Branch Campuses represented? Answer; Research and Extension are represented in CALS and CNR USC.
c. Would increasing the membership from 17 to 21 make it too difficult to get a quorum?
Chair suggests submitting a written request polished with answers. Discussion followed regarding the APM 35.32 and FSH 1640. Copies will be sent out for next meeting. Motion was made by James Moberly to submit the request again to include the 4 new members, ITS, ORED, ESS and the Library. Motion was seconded by Onesmo Balemba and passed with all yea.

2. Accident report; As of November 14, 2016 there were 94 accidents with an incurred total of $604,214 with 4 claims still open and $225,808 of that incurred total is reserve. As of November 14, 2017 there are 95 accidents that have an incurred total of $648,889 with 42 open claims and $393,588 in reserves.
Discussion followed on accident report outs to USC and departments. Using near misses and accident numbers we hope to track trends to be proactive in training and preventative rather than reactive.

3. Unit Safety Committee reports:
   a. CNR hopes to meet November 29th. They have been burning on the Ex. Forest and working with EHS for communication SOP and permits. The Department is working on Lab Safety (Dora) and assisting with Fire Safety and Evacuation. The logging safety grant is on hold, through NIOSH 65,000 subscribers nationally.
   b. ESS – will have Unit Safety meeting as the first half of one of the semi-monthly staff meetings.
   c. Col of A&A has focused on completing the Fire Safety and Emergency Evacuation plans.
   d. CLASS- has no report.
   e. CALS met Nov 9 (report by Kelvin) Watch for Slips and falls. Lab audits, annual vehicle inspections and new AEDs in AgSci and AgBio.
   f. Col-Law – will be having the CPR and First Aid training as a college. They have a current issue with egress at the clinic and are installing security cameras.

4. Benjamin Barton volunteered to act as Vice-Chair

New business:

1. Staff council requested information on disussing fears about concealed carrier on campus. Active shooter response training will be conducted at the Bruce Pitman Center December 6.

2. Annual Unit Safety Committee Assessments have been distributed and are due December 11.

For the Good of the Order

None

Meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m. motion by Ben Barton, seconded by James Moberly.

Submitted by: Kelvin Daniels, Occupational Safety Specialist, Secretary.
UNIT SAFETY COMMITTEES
CONTACT PERSONNEL
Fiscal Year 2018

E mail string for all unit safety committee contacts

kknicker@uidaho.edu; dscloss@uidaho.edu; donparks@uidaho.edu; mnugen@uidaho.edu; jenniej@uidaho.edu; dstout@uidaho.edu; markn@uidaho.edu; dlahann@uidaho.edu; kbateman@uidaho.edu; thadg@uidaho.edu; jltaylor@uidaho.edu; brandit@uidaho.edu; jeannec@uidaho.edu; gcain@uidaho.edu; bborcher@uidaho.edu; samm@uidaho.edu; jpankopf@uidaho.edu; marianem@uidaho.edu; sfox@uidaho.edu; mmccuirre@uidaho.edu; msonic@uidaho.edu

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE & LIFE SCIENCES
  • Mark McGuire mmcguire@uidaho.edu

COLLEGE OF ART & ARCHITECTURE
  • Mike Sonnichsen msonic@uidaho.edu

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS & ECONOMICS
  • Ross Wulf rwulf@uidaho.edu

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
  • David Schloss dschloss@uidaho.edu

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
  • Don Parks donparks@uidaho.edu

COLLEGE OF LAW
  • Mike Nugen mnugen@uidaho.edu

COLLEGE OF LETTERS, ARTS & SOCIAL SCIENCES
  • Jennie Hall jenniej@uidaho.edu

COLLEGE OF NATURAL RESOURCES
  • Darrell Stout dstout@uidaho.edu

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE
  • Mark Neilsen markn@uidaho.edu

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND GRADUATE STUDIES AND INSTITUTES
  • Dan LaHann dlahann@uidaho.edu

IRIC
  • Russ McClanahan rmclanahan@uidaho.edu

Updated 09/18/2017
AUXILIARY SERVICES

- Nick Brannon nbrannon@uidaho.edu

EVENT & SUPPORT SERVICES

- Greg Cain gcain@uidaho.edu

FACILITIES

- Thad Gilkey thadg@uidaho.edu

HUMAN RESOURCES – moving into Executive area committee

- Shelby Hurn shelby@uidaho.edu

EXECUTIVE AREA (PRESIDENT’S / PROVOST’S OFFICE, ACADEMIC AFFAIRS)

- David Pittsley dpittsley@uidaho.edu

IDAHO COMMONS/STUDENT UNION/ACADEMIC AND STUDENT SERVICES

- Elissa Keim ekeim@uidaho.edu

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

- Brian Borchers bborcher@uidaho.edu

LIBRARY

- Samm Green samm@uidaho.edu

UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT/ALUMNI

- Judy Pankopf jpankopf@uidaho.edu

WWAMI

- Marlene Martonick marlanem@uidaho.edu

OUTREACH

UI Center – Boise
- Stephanie Fox sfox@uidaho.edu

UI Center – Idaho Falls
- Joanna Taylor jltaylor@uidaho.edu

UI Center – Coeur d’Alene
- To be determined

Updated 09/18/2017
35.32 - Safety & Loss Control Program

January 11, 2011

A. Institutional Safety and Responsibility. [ed. 1-11]

A-1. Safety Policies and Procedures. Safety policies and procedures which are required in order to ensure compliance with local, state, or federal law or regulation will be prescribed by the Director of Environmental Health and Safety. When proposed safety policies are a combination of legal or regulatory requirements and institutional policy, those portions with institutional policy will be submitted for review and approval by the University’s Safety and Loss Control Committee. [ren. & rev. 1-11]

A-2. Obligations. Administrators, managers and supervisors are responsible for developing and implementing safe work practices, promoting safety, and setting the example for others. All employees are expected to adhere to safe operating work practices and are encouraged to provide expertise and offer ideas to make safety a part of the job. All members of the University community are expected to continuously promote safety awareness, maintain property and equipment in safe operating condition, and comply with APM Chapter 35 (Environmental Health & Safety). [ren. & rev. 1-11]

A-3. Director of Environmental Health and Safety Responsibilities. The Director of Environmental Health and Safety is responsible for administering the institutional Safety and Loss Control Program. To fulfill this responsibility, the Director of Environmental Health and Safety directs the activities of the Environmental Health and Safety ("EHS") Office, monitors the work
environment and coordinates the efforts of all University units and employees to create and maintain safe conditions of study, research, and employment, to promote safe practices and to ensure compliance with applicable regulations. The Director of Environmental Health and Safety also serves as the University’s environmental compliance officer. [ed. & ren. 1-11]

A-4. Supervisor Responsibilities. Deans, directors, department heads, faculty members, staff and other supervisory personnel are responsible for providing safe environments and operations under their control (including, but not limited to, work, classroom, laboratory, and field-trip activities), and are required to ensure that all reasonable and necessary precautions are taken to prevent accidents and to preserve the life and health of the employees, instructors, students and others under their supervision. Supervisors are responsible for ensuring that employees under their supervision are adequately trained, equipped, monitored, evaluated, and guided as appropriate to ensure compliance with established safety policies, standards, and procedures. Annual performance evaluations of supervisors shall reflect performance in promoting safe work practices. [ed. & ren. 1-11]

A-5. Employee Responsibilities. All University employees are required to comply with the safety policies, procedures, and work practices established by the University. Employees must avoid any activity that creates or constitutes a serious hazard to themselves or others while working for the University. Any employee who believes that performing an assigned work task or activity may pose a serious risk to life or health is expected to immediately bring their concerns to the attention of his or her supervisor, or others as designated by department/division procedures. [ren. 1-11]

B. Safety and Loss Control Committee Function. In conformity with the State of Idaho’s Safety and Loss Control Program model, the University has established a Safety and Loss Control Committee. [See also FSH 1640.76]

B-1. Responsibilities. The responsibilities and purposes of the committee are described in FSH 1640.76. [ed. 7-10]

C. Safety and Loss Control Committee Membership/Structure.
C-1. Membership/Structure. See FSH 1640.76. [ed. 7-10]

C-2. Governance. The Safety and Loss Control Committee is governed by a chair and vice-chair, with the vice-chair assuming responsibilities of the chair after a one-year rotation. Committee members are appointed by the University’s Committee on Committees and serve a three-year period with students serving terms as recommended by the ASUI and GPSA. [ed. 1-11]

D. Unit Safety Program. Unit administrators are required to ensure that a unit safety program is developed and implemented using the template provided by EHS. [add. 1-11]

D-1. Unit Safety Program Elements. The Unit Safety Program is comprised of the following nine elements: [add. 1-11]

- Policy and Procedures
- Unit Safety Committee
- Job Hazard Assessment
- Safety Training
- Accident Reporting and Investigation
- Inspections
- Emergency Response Plans
- Vehicle Safety and Use
- Hazardous Materials Use

Further information, guidance, resources and tools to assist in the development of a unit safety program are available at the EHS website. Please click here to access the Unit Safety Program webpage. [add. 1-11]

D-2. Unit Safety Program Assessment. Unit administrators shall ensure that their safety program is reviewed annually to determine the progress made in reaching the goals described in the unit safety program template. To accomplish this, a Unit Safety Program Assessment Checklist is available.
Please click here to access the Assessment Checklist. [add. 1-11]

E. Information. For additional information and assistance, please contact the Environmental Health and Safety Office at (208) 885-6524 or Safety Office email. [add. 1-11]
**POLICY COVER SHEET**

*(See Faculty Staff Handbook 1460 for instructions at UI policy website: [www.webs.uidaho.edu/uipolicy](http://www.webs.uidaho.edu/uipolicy)*

| Faculty/Staff Handbook [FSH] | Addition X Revision* | Deletion* | Emergency
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter &amp; Title:</td>
<td>Chapter 1, University Committees 1640.XX – University Staff Compensation Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All policies must be reviewed, approved and returned by a policy sponsor, with a cover sheet attached to apm@uidaho.edu or fsh@uidaho.edu respectively.

*Note: If revision/deletion request original document from apm@uidaho.edu or fsh@uidaho.edu, all changes must be made using “track changes.”

Lisa Miller, Chair Staff Compensation Task Force 4/4/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Originator(s): (Please see FSH 1460 C)</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Miller, Chair Staff Compensation Task Force</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lisa@uidaho.edu">lisa@uidaho.edu</a></td>
<td>4-7004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Sponsor: (If different than originator.)</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian Foisy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brianfoisy@uidaho.edu">brianfoisy@uidaho.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviewed by General Counsel  
_X__Yes  x__No Name & Date:  ____Kent Nelson 4/3/18______
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*The Staff Compensation Taskforce (SCTF) was established in 2015. The taskforce is at a place where it has been determined a permanent committee will better serve the university. This proposal is to create an official university standing committee and place it within the Faculty-Staff handbook.*
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A. FUNCTION. The function of the University Staff Compensation Committee (USCC) is:

A-1. To advise the president, provost and the vice president for finance and administration on matters pertaining to staff compensation. The USCC will periodically review policy matters regarding annual change in employee compensation (CEC) allocations and annual market-based adjustment to staff salary based on College and University Professional Association (CUPA) and the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS);

A-2. To be involved strategically in the university annual CEC process. The USCC will advise on the CEC process and staff compensation goals, and participate in university hearings and meetings;

A-3. To initiate and/or respond to the study of staff compensation policies and issues; and,

A-4. To provide periodic reports to Staff Council and Faculty Senate on matters pertaining to staff compensation.

B. AGENDA. The agenda of each meeting will be set by the chair of the committee in collaboration with the senior human resources executive and/or the vice president for finance and administration, or designee. The senior human resources executive is the point of contact for the committee and is responsible for notifying the committee of relevant matters pertaining to staff salaries.

C. STRUCTURE AND MEMBERSHIP. The committee is composed of eleven members as follows: voting members will consist of nine staff. Ex officio (w/o vote) members include the vice president for finance and administration and the senior human resources executive. The committee’s chair will be selected by Staff Council. The membership is appointed by Staff Council and will consist of a broad representation of staff located university-wide with a minimum of two off-campus members.