University of Idaho
2017-2018 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #6

3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, September 26, 2017
Brink Hall Faculty-Staff Lounge & Zoom

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2017-18 Faculty Senate Meeting #5, September 19, 2017 (vote)

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.
   • Vice Provost for Faculty (Stevenson)
   • Benefits (Terwilliger)

VI. Committee Reports.

   Student Code Task Force (Craig/Eckles/Brandt)
   • FS-18-003: FSH 2400 – Disciplinary Process for Violations of Student Code of Conduct (initial presentation – overview)
   • FS-18-004: FSH 1640.83 – Student Conduct Board

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Patrick Hrdlicka, Chair 2017-2018, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2017-2018 FS Meeting #5
Handouts
FS-18-003 & FS-18-004
Call to Order and Minutes: The chair called the meeting to order at 3:31. A motion to approve the minutes was approved with one no vote and three abstentions.

Chair's Report:

- The University Faculty Meeting will be held on September 20\textsuperscript{th} at 3:00. Provost Wiencek will be presiding for President Staben. He will introduce new faculty members, acknowledge faculty promotions and make remarks to the faculty.
- Early warning grades are due on Tuesday, September 19\textsuperscript{th}. These grades help with retention of at-risk students.
- Faculty members should be sure to complete the survey on Classification of Instructional Program Codes (CIP Codes). Each faculty member received the survey in an email from Provost Wiencek on September 14\textsuperscript{th}. CIP Codes will be used as part of the determination of market compensation. The survey provides the opportunity for individual faculty members to provide feedback on which CIP code best describes them. The survey must be completed by September 25\textsuperscript{th}.
- Vice President of Finance Brian Foisy and Executive Director of Human Resources Wes Matthews will be hosting a meeting on the staff market compensation process on October 6\textsuperscript{th}.
- The Faculty Compensation Taskforce is reconvening on Friday, September 22\textsuperscript{nd}. Provost Wiencek will present his feedback on the faculty market compensation approach. The taskforce will discuss how to fine-tune the approach and how to implement the model for faculty.

A senator asked whether faculty can and/or should attend the staff compensation meeting on October 6\textsuperscript{th}. The chair and the provost indicated that the web interface for staff will be presented and explained at the meeting. Some of the conversation may focus on the process for assigning Standard Occupational Codes (SOC Codes) to individual staff positions and whether staff voices were heard in that process. In addition, the provost indicated that there are also some alignment issues that may be discussed. For example, how will the university handle market compensation for positions that are similar from college to college, but currently make different amounts in each college? Faculty attendance at the meeting is a way of showing support to our staff colleagues, although issues at the meeting will not directly affect faculty.

Provost's Report: The provost called senators’ attention to the memo about the Great Colleges Survey that went out on Tuesday, September 19\textsuperscript{th}. The results have been available for a while and have been shared to some extent previously. Because of the need to move forward on program prioritization and on market compensation, the share link had not been broadly communicated to the entire university community until Tuesday. The results are not much different than last year. One of the areas of concern is the teaching environment on campus. The university is working on how to support good teaching. The new Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning is part of that effort.
The provost is also working on a memo about how to implement the current program prioritization reallocation among academic units. He encouraged emails from senators who would like to have input on this reallocation process.

A senator asked whether clinical faculty colleagues will be left out of the market compensation process. The provost responded that no faculty member will be “left out.” Every faculty member will be assigned a CIP code. The source of the confusion is that a sample compensation spreadsheet was circulated that did not include any clinical faculty. Chair Hrdlicka, who co-chairs the Faculty Compensation Taskforce, explained that the taskforce is aware of the confusion. During its deliberations, it had to limit the scope of the data it examined and, as a result, focused on non-clinical faculty. The national databases that will be used to determine each faculty members’ market include data for clinical faculty. The taskforce is expanding the scope of its analysis. The provost thanked the senator for raising this issue so that we can improve our communication to include all faculty.

Another senator asked several questions about CIP Codes:
1) How was the approved list of CIP Codes determined;
2) Can a faculty member use CIP Codes from college or departments other than their own, if those codes better describe the faculty member’s work; and
3) Because the CIP Codes appear to be tied to majors and not directly to programs – how is research reflected in the CIP Code choice process?

The provost responded that the university reports what our faculty actually do to both the State Board of Education (SBOE) and to the National Center for Education Statistics. If a department is hiring a faculty member it relies on the CIP Codes which are closely aligned with what an institution would pay faculty in a particular program. Thus, faculty members are limited to the CIP Codes associated with the majors in the faculty member’s department. The provost hopes that what most faculty do is highly correlated to the department in which they work. The senator followed up by commenting that faculty do more than deliver majors. An individual faculty member’s research may not be directly related to the majors within their home department. The Provost responded that deans and chairs will have flexibility to set salaries within a range. Our current process is focused on setting the median for each range. But, we have to accord chairs the latitude to recognize the work of each faculty member. The dean and chair recommendations will be reviewed by the provost. He plans to have conversations at different levels of the salary process. The provost also indicated that while faculty may select specific six digit CIP codes to describe themselves as part of the Qualtrics survey (discussed by Chair Hrdlicka earlier in the meeting), the university is likely to use four digit CIP Codes for our market compensation process. He explained further that the salary information for many of the six digit codes is not statistically significant. The provost pointed out that all of our faculty are “off market.” The university needs to move forward with market compensation to begin addressing our low salaries and start making decisions. The discussion about how to implement market compensation is going to continue beyond this first mid-year salary adjustment, and we can evolve as we go along. The chair elaborated on Provost Wiencek’s comments. He pointed out that if a faculty member was to leave the university, consideration must be given to how the university would fill the open position. If a biology professor leaves, in all likelihood the department will need a biologist even though the new faculty member might teach or do research as part of WWAMI. The provost commented that from his experience the merit based raises more than compensated for where his discipline was categorized. He stressed that we must take a small step and make progress. If momentum is achieved, we can consider significant revisions to the process such as re-evaluating whether to use a peer group consisting of R1 institutions rather than the currently suggested peer group of R1, R2 & R3 institutions.

1 Please note, readers of these minutes may obtain a fuller understanding of CIP Codes here:
Another senator commented that our instructional programs have evolved over the years and some of the assigned CIP Codes could be outdated. She asked whether there is a way that we can update CIP Codes. The provost will follow up to see what is required to do such updates.

A senator followed up on the Great Colleges Survey by asking whether the university planned to release the report on the 2016 survey results prepared by the President’s Council on Diversity and Inclusion (Council). The provost indicated that originally the university intended to release a memo combining the Council’s report and the results of the 2017 survey establishing a specific cascaded strategic plan to address the report and new results. Outside interest in the results of the 2017 survey led the university to release those results without the accompanying report and cascaded strategic plan. The Provost will work with Yolanda Bisbee, Executive Director of the Office of Equity and Diversity to get the Council’s report out and announce cascaded planning processes. He will be looking to a small group to develop the cascaded plan. Issues are likely to be salaries, teaching environment, and creating a respectful culture. He also pointed out that one of the president’s upcoming leadership breakfasts will focus on how to address micro-aggression in the workplace.

Green Dot/Office of Violence Against Women Campus Grant Program. Lysa Salsbury and Beckah MillerMcPhee made a presentation to Senate regarding implementation of a large grant received by the Women’s Center to address violence on campus. They are approaching the end of year one of the grant - the planning year; and, are moving into year two - the implementation year. Their goals are to:

1) engage the entire campus in violence prevention efforts,
2) reduce sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence and stalking on campus, and
3) provide effective and timely intervention.

The grant will focus specifically on ensuring that their services are accessible to multi-cultural students, LGBTQ students and international students. As indicated, they have just finished the strategic plan for the grant implementation. As part of that process, they created a team of 45 representatives from across campus, including faculty representatives Liz Brandt and Erin Chapman.

One part of the grant implementation is to develop an effective bystander intervention program that is evidence based. In response, the Green Dot program has been implemented on campus. This year the Women’s Center is developing an overview of Green Dot training specifically for faculty and staff. They are also focusing on implementing Green Dot at the university’s educational centers outside Moscow. Regarding implementation at locations off the Moscow campus, they are working on both online training and travelling to the centers to provide face-to-face training and support.

They need faculty help. Faculty are encouraged to attend a Green Dot overview or ask for a Green Dot overview at their unit’s faculty meeting. Green Dot trainers will work around schedules and tailor the overview to the needs of the unit. The overview includes information about the training students are receiving as part of the program, but also covers how faculty can respond to situations involving the possibility of violence.

In addition to the information sessions, there are other opportunities to support the program. Faculty are invited to participate in the full Green Dot training. Faculty can also help support a culture on campus that is focused on ending interpersonal violence by including a statement such as the following in their syllabi or on their course pages:

“I support Green Dot and violence prevention efforts across campus. My classroom and office are safe places. Please know you will be supported and heard if you have experienced any form of violence. Also, know you are not alone:
Any communication can go a long way to getting the message out and providing access to services.

A senator pointed out that participating in Green Dot training can trigger difficult reactions in people who have experienced sexual assault. Such individuals cannot opt out of the mandatory ASUI Green Dot training without revealing they have been victimized. He asked whether changes can be made in the training to address this issue. MillerMcPhee pointed out that the training is evidence-based and, therefore, cannot be changed. She stated that they recommend that Green Dot training be voluntary to avoid this issue. She also pointed out that the training is more effective if individuals participate voluntarily.

A senator also asked if the Green Dot trainers have reached out to Intra-fraternity Council (IFC) and Pan-Hellenic about training. MillerMcPhee responded that they have reached out and that Greek houses are responding and organizing training. The senator followed up by asking whether an incentive could be developed to increase participation. MillerMcPhee responded that she would follow up on this with the senator.

A senator asked if students had been considered for the grant committees. MillerMcPhee responded that they welcome student participation and have reached out through ASUI. In response to another question, MillerMcPhee indicated that the grant organizers were collaborating with the International Programs Office to offer Green Dot training to international students. The chair asked whether we are a particularly violent campus. MillerMcPhee responded that the level of violence at our campus is typical of peer institutions. Another senator commented that she was uncomfortable about including the recommended language in her syllabus because she is not an expert at responding to interpersonal violence issues. MillerMcPhee encouraged faculty to adapt the suggested language to fit individual approaches. Letting students know where they can access safe places is crucial. MillerMcPhee also advocated that faculty let students know that we must report information that comes to us regarding interpersonal violence. The chair emphasized the importance of faculty making statements on these issues, recently communicated at the President’s retreat indicates that faculty support and availability is crucial to student success.

Center for Teaching and Learning: Introduction of Brian Smentkowski – the inaugural director of the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL). Director Smentkowski presented his goals for CETL:

- Collaborate with faculty to design transformative educational experiences that improve the lives and learning of our students through innovative and often collaborative teaching and research.
- Offer expert consultation and programming on diverse teaching and learning strategies customizable to all instructional modalities, learning environments, fields of study, and UI campus locations. Smentkowski stressed that whether online, in the classroom, the field, or abroad, CETL have the expertise and resources to help faculty create significant learning experiences.
- Provide specialized training and leadership in course and curriculum design, learning assessment techniques, peer observation of instruction, mentoring, educational development research, and the scholarship of teaching, learning, and engagement.
- Support robust BBLearn usage, with a focus on how technology can be used to enhance learning in all classes. In addition to BBLearn, CETL will provide further support collaborative inquiry and innovation in teaching and learning through the use of new, emerging, and existing technologies.
- Strive for diversity, inclusion, responsiveness, and transparency in all aspects of our programming.
Smentkowski invited faculty to help the center identify and support what faculty need to succeed as teachers and scholars and to collaborate on shaping the mission of CETL.

A senator asked if CETL might consider offering a workshop on teaching diverse students. Director Smentkowski answered that this type of workshop is what CETL aspires to offer. He is working on becoming more familiar with the university’s needs and culture as part of developing such programming.

A senator asked whether CETL will be working to support TAs to make them effective teachers. Smentkowski has met with Dean McMurry about how CETL can provide support for TAs. He will also be working with Vice Provost Hendricks regarding how to best support TAs.

In response to a question regarding how CETL will foster the development of an “e-campus”, Director Smentkowski indicated that he will be working with new staff in the enrollment management unit on these issues. He believes his role will be to support the learning process through such programs. Provost Wienecek agreed with the senator and Director Smentkowski that the university must do a better marketing e-campus strategy. His vision is that this strategy would include not only traditional marketing, but also identifying appropriate opportunities for expanding online programs to ensure students in such programs are well supported. Another avenue for expanding our footprint in offering high quality programs online is to partner with for-profit firms. The university currently has an RFP out seeking such partners. These for-profit programs tend to focus on certain types of fields and the university must work on both its internal strategies and external partnerships.

A senator commented that he appreciated the breadth of the vision for CETL and appreciated that CETL would work with faculty in individual departments to facilitate engagement in teaching.

A senator asked whether the CETL workshops will be available at a distance and how to sign up for them. Director Smentkowski indicated that the announcements and registration information for the CETL workshops are sent to all faculty. Many of the workshops are available through Zoom. He has begun working with the centers on how to deliver workshops on the distant campuses in person, including the possibility of designating specific days for workshops, and leveraging technology in creative ways.

A senator indicated that CETL should consider sending workshop info to staff who also teach and for whom the workshops would be valuable. Director Smentkowski noted that he uses the term faculty to include anyone who gets in front of a room of students. He would also include faculty members who are not directly instructional. A senator asked if Director Smentkowski anticipates getting involved in discussions about teaching and learning spaces and environments on campus. He is looking forward to such involvement as the space and environment for teaching impacts learning.

The presentation from Vice Provost Jeanne Stevenson will be rescheduled for a future meeting.

A motion to adjourn (Morrison/Kern) was made and the meeting was adjourned at 4:53 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Liz Brandt, Faculty Secretary & Secretary to the Faculty Senate
Vice Provost for Faculty

(Includes excerpts from the position description)

Purpose: The Vice Provost for Faculty provides leadership for the recruitment, development, and retention of a high quality faculty engaged in teaching, research and scholarly activity, outreach and engagement, and leadership and service. Working in partnership with deans, department administrators, and faculty, the Vice Provost sustains and builds upon current faculty support programs to assure the University of Idaho's continued commitment to faculty excellence in support of the university mission and strategic plan.

Responsibilities include:

- Facilitate and support faculty hiring process and personnel matters.

- Facilitate and provide faculty development and support functions (e.g., New Faculty Orientation, mentoring through promotion and tenure, leadership development, department chair orientation/seminar series, and other targeted mentoring programs).

- Oversee faculty processes such as sabbatical leaves, distinguished professor rank, and periodic review of administrators.

- Establish metrics and review and continuously improve processes and procedures (e.g., hiring processes, performance review, conflict resolution, and so forth) to recruit and retain high performing faculty members.

- Provide leadership and oversight of the university Leadership Academy.

- Serve as the provost's liaison with Faculty Senate and represent the provost as needed.

- Serve on university committees as assigned and/or invited (e.g., Committee on Committees, Native American Advisory Board, President's Athletic Advisory Committee, and Sabbatical Leave Committee).

- Engage with principal partners in the design, implementation, and assessment and continuous improvement of processes, programs, and services in support of faculty.
Anticipate Your 2018 Benefits

University of Idaho
2018 Key Benefit Plan Changes

- H.S.A. Employee Contribution Limit Increase

- PPO Plan Prescription Drug Cost-Share Maximum Limit Increase ($200/$400)

- Employee Medical Plan Contribution Increases Between $0.38 - $3.30 depending on Benefit Plan and Coverage Level Elected
Updated Benefit Enrollment Site

- Continued Single-Sign-On Via Vandalweb
- Four Easy Enrollment Steps
- Contains Side-By-Side Plan Comparison
- Ability to Personalize Your Enrollment Experience
How to Enroll

It's easy to enroll with our new enrollment website. Here's what you need to do.

1. Log in to VandalWeb: click/tap the Employee Menu tab.


3. On the landing page, you can see a summary of your current elections. Click/tap View all for details. Click/tap Quick actions for a list of short cuts. Click/tap View My Elections for your elections history. Or Click/tap the checkbox at the top for Annual Enrollment.

Initiate
4. From MyElections, click/tap Annual Enrollment, then click Start in the pop-up box that appears.

5. From Personalize your benefits plan, review your dependents under Family. You can add, remove, or edit your dependents from this page. If you do not want to make changes, click/tap Next.
6. Under Health Benefits, review your current selections. You can also see who is covered, the University's contributions, and your costs. To keep your selections, click/tap Next. To see your other options, click/tap the arrow next to your current selection or a drop-down menu. To change your selections, click/tap the plans you want, then click Next.
7. Continue with the same process for the remaining benefits, then click/tap Next.

8. Under Beneficiaries, you can add, remove, or edit your beneficiaries. If you do not want to make changes, click/tap Next.

9. Under Finalize, review your information carefully. If you want to make changes, go back to the appropriate step.
10. If you are satisfied with your selections, at the bottom of the Edit page, click/tap the box under "By selecting NEXT," then click/tap Next.

11. This screen indicates that your selections have been successfully submitted and gives you the option to print your confirmation statement. Click/tap Done when you are finished.

12. Review your confirmation statement. If any information is incorrect, call the University of Idaho Benefits Center immediately: 1-208-885-3697 or 1-800-614-6174. The confirmation statement is your verification of enrollment after the enrollment period.

13. Complete an evidence of insurability form, if applicable (see page 27).
**HDHP WITH HSA** | **STANDARD PPO WITH FSA**  
| IN-OUT-OF-NETWORK | IN-NETWORK | OUT-OF-NETWORK |

| **ANNUAL DEDUCTIBLE:** Amount you pay before the plan begins to pay. For the PPO Plan, office visit copays do not count toward the medical deductible, and there are separate medical and prescription drug deductibles. |
|---|---|---|
| Single | $1,500 | $400 | $600 per individual |
| Family | $3,000 | $800 |  |

| **ANNUAL MEDICAL COST-SHARE MAXIMUM:** After you meet this amount, plus pay the deductible, the plan pays 100% of covered services for the rest of the plan year. (Works like percentage cost-share.) The cost-share maximum includes what you pay in both dollar and percentage copays and for covered services. Medical and/or prescription drug deductibles do not count toward the cost-share maximum. For the PPO Plan, there are separate medical and prescription drug cost-share maximums. |
|---|---|---|
| Single | $3,100 | $3,600 | $5,200 per individual |
| Family | $6,200 | $7,200 |  |

For the HDHP, if one family member's covered services meets the $3,100 individual cost-share maximum, the plan pays 100 percent of covered services for that person for the rest of the plan year. When any combination of family members' covered services meets the $6,200 family cost-share maximum, the plan pays 100 percent of covered services for all family members for the rest of the plan year.

| **ANNUAL PRESCRIPTION DRUG DEDUCTIBLE** |
|---|---|---|
| Single | N/A | $125 |  |
| Family | $250 |  |  |

| **ANNUAL PRESCRIPTION DRUG COST-SHARE MAXIMUM:** After you meet this amount, plus pay your annual prescription drug deductible (if applicable), the plan pays 100% of covered prescriptions for the rest of the plan year. |
|---|---|---|
| Single | N/A | $3,225 |  |
| Family | $6,450 |  |  |

| **COMBINED MEDICAL AND PRESCRIPTION DRUG OUT-OF-POCKET MAXIMUM:** The most you'll pay in a plan year (annual medical and prescription drug deductibles plus annual medical and prescription drug cost-share maximums). |
|---|---|---|---|
| Single | $4,600 | $7,350 | $9,150 |
| Family | $9,200 per family; $6,100 per individual | $14,700 | $5,800 per individual for medical; $6,700 for family for prescription drugs |

| **MEDICAL BENEFITS** |
|---|---|---|
| Preventive care | You pay $0 | You pay $0 | You pay full cost |
| Office visit | 30% of maximum allowance after deductible | $25 copay, not subject to or applied to deductible | 35% of maximum allowance after deductible |
| Lab work, Imaging (MRI, CT Scan, PET), etc. | 30% of maximum allowance after deductible | 20% of maximum allowance after deductible | 35% of maximum allowance after deductible |

1. Single reflects Employees Only coverage level.  
2. Family includes the following coverage levels: Employee + Spouse or Other Eligible Adult; Employee + Child, Employee + Children, Employee + Family (spouse or other eligible adult + children).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral Health</th>
<th>HDHP WITH HSA</th>
<th>STANDARD PPO WITH FSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN-/OUT-OF-NETWORK</td>
<td>IN-NETWORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inpatient services</strong></td>
<td>30% of maximum allowance after deductible</td>
<td>20% of maximum allowance after deductible and $100 per-day copay up to $300 maximum copay per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outpatient psychotherapy</strong></td>
<td>30% of maximum allowance after deductible</td>
<td>$25 copay per visit, not subject to or applied to deductible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hospital Benefits</th>
<th>HDHP WITH HSA</th>
<th>STANDARD PPO WITH FSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN-/OUT-OF-NETWORK</td>
<td>IN-NETWORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency services</strong></td>
<td>30% of maximum allowance after deductible</td>
<td>20% of maximum allowance after deductible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inpatient</strong></td>
<td>30% of maximum allowance after deductible</td>
<td>20% of maximum allowance after deductible and $100 per-day copay up to $300 maximum copay per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outpatient</strong></td>
<td>30% of maximum allowance after deductible</td>
<td>20% of maximum allowance after deductible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maternity Services</th>
<th>HDHP WITH HSA</th>
<th>STANDARD PPO WITH FSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN-/OUT-OF-NETWORK</td>
<td>IN-NETWORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physician</strong></td>
<td>30% of maximum allowance after deductible</td>
<td>$250 copay (not subject to deductible or cost-share) then plan pays 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hospital</strong></td>
<td>30% of maximum allowance after deductible</td>
<td>20% of maximum allowance after deductible and $100 per-day copay up to $300 maximum copay per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prescription Drug Benefit</th>
<th>HDHP WITH HSA</th>
<th>STANDARD PPO WITH FSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail Pharmacy</td>
<td>Mail Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generic</strong></td>
<td>100% of drug cost until you meet the deductible; then 30% of maximum allowance</td>
<td>25% ($12 min., $25 max.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preferred brand name</strong></td>
<td>25% ($25 min., $75 max.)</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-preferred brand name</strong></td>
<td>25% ($40 min., $100 max.)</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that under both plans, bariatric surgery requires pre-authorization and has a separate $1,500 deductible that does not count toward the medical or prescription drug deductibles. Services must be provided by a Centers of Excellence provider and/or facility. Under the PPO, you pay 20% of the maximum allowance after the deductible. Under the HDHP, you pay 30% of the maximum allowance after the deductible. Under both plans, the cost-share amounts do not count toward the cost-share maximum.

3 If you buy a brand name drug instead of an available generic drug, you pay the applicable brand copay plus 100 percent of the cost difference between the brand name and generic.
## Active Employee Medical Rates - PPO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coverage Level</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Only</td>
<td>$60.67</td>
<td>$61.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee &amp; Spouse</td>
<td>$127.39</td>
<td>$129.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee &amp; Child</td>
<td>$84.94</td>
<td>$86.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee &amp; Children</td>
<td>$128.61</td>
<td>$131.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee &amp; Family</td>
<td>$171.08</td>
<td>$174.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage Level</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Only</td>
<td>$25.34</td>
<td>$25.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee &amp; Spouse</td>
<td>$53.21</td>
<td>$54.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee &amp; Child</td>
<td>$35.48</td>
<td>$36.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee &amp; Children</td>
<td>$53.72</td>
<td>$54.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee &amp; Family</td>
<td>$71.46</td>
<td>$72.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Dental Plans At-a-Glance

The chart below summarizes what you will pay for in-network dental care. If you elect Delta Dental Standard or Delta Dental Plus and receive services from non-network dentists, the plan pays your full requested reimbursement or Delta Dental’s non-network dentist fee, whichever is less. Willamette Dental does not pay benefits if you see non-network providers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delta Dental Standard</th>
<th>Delta Dental Plus</th>
<th>Willamette Dental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Deductible</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class I Benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventive care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-rays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan pays 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20 copay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class II Benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral surgery</td>
<td>25% of maximum allowance after deductible</td>
<td>20% of maximum allowance after deductible</td>
<td>$75 - $150 copay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endodontic care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodontic care, including perio cleaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor restorative services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class III Benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major restorative services</td>
<td>55% of maximum allowance after deductible</td>
<td>45% of maximum allowance after deductible</td>
<td>$200 - $250 copay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosthodontics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class IV Benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult, child orthodontia (covered services only include those started when coverage under the plan begins)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50% up to lifetime maximum benefit of $1,500 per person</td>
<td>Pre-orthodontia treatment: $150 copay; Comprehensive treatment: $1,500 copay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual maximum benefit per person, excluding orthodontia</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>No annual maximum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2018 Full-time Employees' Per Pay Contributions for Dental Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coverage Level</th>
<th>Delta Dental Standard</th>
<th>Delta Dental Plus</th>
<th>Willamette Dental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee only</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$3.72</td>
<td>$1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee + spouse or other eligible adult</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$8.31</td>
<td>$1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee + child</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$7.43</td>
<td>$2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee + children</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$14.12</td>
<td>$4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee + family (spouse or other eligible adult + children)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$15.01</td>
<td>$4.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Vision Plan At-a-Glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>VSP PROVIDER (IN-NETWORK)</th>
<th>NON-VSP PROVIDER (OUT-OF-NETWORK)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eye Exam—annual</td>
<td>$10 deductible: Plan pays 100%</td>
<td>$10 deductible: Plan reimburses up to $52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyeglass lenses (once every 12 months)</td>
<td>$25 deductible¹: Plan pays 100%</td>
<td>$25 deductible²: Plan reimburses up to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Single vision</td>
<td>$25 deductible¹: Plan pays 100%</td>
<td>$55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bifocal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Trifocal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lenticular</td>
<td></td>
<td>$125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>$60 - $119 deductible: Plan pays 100%</td>
<td>Not covered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyeglass frames (once every 2 years)</td>
<td>$25 deductible¹: Plan pays up to $120</td>
<td>$25 deductible²: Plan reimburses up to $45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact lenses (once every 12 months)</td>
<td>Plan pays up to $120 for contacts and fitting exam</td>
<td>Plan reimburses up to $105 for contacts and fitting exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Deductible applies to a complete pair of glasses or frames, whichever you choose.

### 2018 Employees’ Per-Pay Contributions for Vision Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COVERAGE LEVEL</th>
<th>VSP VISION SERVICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee only</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee + spouse or other eligible adult</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee + child</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee + children</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee + family (spouse or other eligible adult + children)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2018 Annual Enrollment
October 16th—November 7th

MEETINGS & EVENTS:

BENEFITS VENDOR FORUM
Monday, October 2, 2017
8:30am - 4:30pm
Pitman Center, International Ballroom (2nd Floor)

Designated vendors have been invited to participate as panel experts in the following forums:

- Taking Charge of and Understanding Your Medical and RX Plans
- Planning for Your Future
- Understanding Vision and Dental Plans
- Advantages of Pre-Tax Health Savings

Thursday, October 12 (Moscow - Pacific Time)
Borah Theatre - Pitman Center 10:00 - 11:00 am
ZOOM: https://uidaho.zoom.us/j/804318424
Telephone - 408-638-0968
Meeting ID: 804 318 424

Thursday, October 12 (Moscow - Pacific Time)
Borah Theatre - Pitman Center 2:00–3:00 pm
ZOOM: https://uidaho.zoom.us/j/310316250
Telephone - 408-638-0968
Meeting ID: 310 316 250

Thursday, November 2 (Moscow - Pacific Time)
Whitewater Room — Commons 9:00–10:00 am
ZOOM: https://uidaho.zoom.us/j/373140710
Telephone - 408-638-0968
Meeting ID: 373 140 710

Thursday, November 2 (Moscow - Pacific Time)
Whitewater Room — Commons 1:30–2:30 pm
ZOOM: https://uidaho.zoom.us/j/935263242
Telephone - 408-638-0968
Meeting ID: 935 263 242
STUDENT CODE OF CONDUCT

WHERE HAVE WE COME FROM?
STUDENT CODE OF CONDUCT

Where have we come from?
PRIOR TO SPRING 2014

Student Code of Conduct and Statement of Student Rights adopted in the early 1970s.

Very confrontational – envisioned a hearing that resembled a court trial

Students had “rights” of confrontation, to remain silent, etc.

The hearing process was

- Stressful for students (hearings took a long time, cross-ex by lawyers was common, delays were frequent)
- Interfered with UI’s duty to provide a safe environment (hard to take action against students who refused to participate)
SPRING 2014 REVISION PROCESS

DOS proposed a revision based on the “investigative model”

- Meetings not hearings; no “right to remain silent,” no appeal outside DOS
- The proposal was VERY different than the ’70s Code. Faculty and students pushed back against the proposal
- Faculty Senate authorized the UJC (earlier version of the SDRB) to work with DOS and make changes

The current code was passed by Senate in spring 2014

- Combination of the DOS investigative proposal and the old 1970’s system
2014 CODE ISSUES

Too many layers of review mean that cases take a long time to resolve

- Original 2014 Code = DOS, then SDRB, then Senate Leadership screening, then Senate Subcommittee Appeal, then President.
- Revisions in 2016 eliminated Senate Leadership Screening, formed a Student Appeal Committee and allowed hearings before panels of 3 SDRB members. This helped.
- Still VERY difficult to get panels convened for hearings at busy times of year
- Appeal Boards don’t always understand their role or how the hearing works
Hearings take too long and can re-traumatize Title IX Complainants

- Often witnesses are not helpful
- Title IX Complainants have to keep re-telling their experience before different people (DOS, then SDRB, in front of respondent, etc.)

Puts the DOS in the position of acting as a pseudo prosecutor, instead of being able to help students (both respondents and complainants)

Difficult for non-lawyer faculty members to control hearings when lawyers try to treat the case like a court hearing

- Leads to increased involvement by General Counsel
CONSIDERATIONS FOR A NEW PROCESS

A Respondent’s due process rights

A Complainant’s ability to navigate and participate in the process with dignity and autonomy

Title IX Requirements

Clery Act Requirements

The ability to administratively handle the workload
Collaborative development process that involved DOS, OGC, faculty, and students

Enhances the investigation process by providing for extensive exchange of information prior to a decision or hearing

- Everyone is informed before a decision and hearing and has chance to respond in non-confrontational environment
- Hopefully cases will resolve without a hearing

Combines hearing board and appeal board into one group from which sub-panels may be formed

- Experience at both hearings and appeals
- Larger board will help schedule hearings
- Easier to provide training
Limits who can talk at the hearing – generally only the complainant, respondent and investigator

- Hearing does not “re-do” the investigator’s report
- But still give complainant and respondent chance to “tell their story” and have their credibility evaluated in person
- Limited hearing = easier for non-lawyer committee chair to manage

Provides for trained, professional Hearing Officer in some cases

- Better able to handle complex situations

One Appeal
QUESTIONS?

Jim Craig  
Deputy General Counsel  
jimcraig@uidaho.edu  
208-885-6125

Dr. Blaine Eckles  
Dean of Students  
beckles@uidaho.edu  
208-885-6757

Elizabeth Brandt  
Faculty Secretary  
ebrandt@uidaho.edu  
208-885-7808
Investigation

- All parties are given opportunity to meet with investigator
- All parties are given opportunity to provide information to investigator
- All parties are given opportunity to review and respond to draft report
- May be resolved at this level if all parties agree
- Investigator drafts report and sends report to Student Conduct Administrator (SCA)

Student Conduct Administrator

- Final Report goes to the SCA
- All parties can provide a written response to the Final Report to the SCA
- SCA may meet with parties
- SCA makes decision in minor cases, in cases where there is no violation of the Code, and in cases where no party requests a hearing before the Student Conduct Board (SCB)
- SCA refers matter to SCB in Title IX cases and major cases where either party requests an SCB hearing

Student Conduct Board

- Hearing Panel of 3 – 5 members
- Parties may provide written responses to the Final Report
- Only the respondent, complainant (in Title IX Cases), and investigator appear at the hearing (only the chair may decide to call additional witnesses)
- Only information presented is information that was given to the investigator, unless information not previously available
- Only the chair may ask questions during the hearing
- Board should generally defer to findings contained in the report, but can issue different findings if warranted. Board is not required to defer to conclusion as to whether the respondent violated the Code.
- UI may use a hearing officer instead of a hearing panel

Appeal

- Any party may appeal the SCA’s or the Hearing Panel’s decision
- All appeals heard by a 3 – 5 member panel of the SCB
- Appeal is a paper appeal only, no in-person hearings
- This is the Final Institutional Decision
University Disciplinary Process for Alleged Violations of Student Code of Conduct

A. Introduction
1. The purpose of the Student Code of Conduct (Code) is to help protect the safety of the University community and educate students about appropriate and responsible behavior, and to do so in a manner designed to educate students about their civic and social responsibilities as members of the University community, while complying with applicable state and federal laws and institutional policy. The primary focus of the disciplinary process is on educational and corrective outcomes; however, sanctions including suspension or expulsion from the University may be necessary to uphold community standards and to protect the campus community. University discipline is not in the nature of punishment for a crime, and the University’s discipline process is not equivalent to state or federal criminal prosecutions. University disciplinary proceedings for any and all matters encompassed within the Code [FSH 2300] and the Statement of Student Rights [FSH 2200] are addressed under the following rules and regulations.

B. Definitions
1. Advisor: a person of the student’s choosing who has agreed to advise the student during the University disciplinary process and attend scheduled meetings with the student. The Advisor’s role is simply to advise the student, and the Advisor is not permitted to speak during hearings, conferences, or interviews unless allowed by the University official conducting the interview.
2. Chief Student Affairs Officer (CSA Officer): the Dean of Students, unless the President appoints a different official to serve as the CSA Officer.
3. Code: the Student Code of Conduct, which is currently found in FSH 2300 and FSH 2400.
4. Complainant: the person(s) reportedly harmed by the Respondent’s alleged violation of the Code.
5. Days: days that the University is open for business, not including Saturdays, Sundays, Fall Recess, Winter Recess, Spring Recess, or University holidays.
6. Student Conduct Administrator (Administrator): the official at the University of Idaho who has been designated by the CSA Officer to serve in this role. It shall also include the Administrator’s designee.
7. DOS: the Office of the Dean of Students at the University of Idaho.
8. Hearing Officer: a person appointed by the Administrator to serve as the person presiding over a hearing in accordance with Section G.
9. Parties: the Respondent and, in Title IX cases only, the Complainant.
10. Respondent: the student who is alleged to have violated the Code.
11. Student: includes, but is not limited to, all persons admitted to the University, either full-time or part-time, to pursue undergraduate, graduate, or professional studies, and includes non-degree seeking students. The following persons are also considered students:
   a. Persons who withdraw after allegedly violating the Student Code of Conduct;
   b. Persons who are eligible to enroll for classes without submitting an application for re-admission;
   c. Individuals participating in the American Language and Culture Program, Independent Study of Idaho sponsored by the University of Idaho, the University of
Idaho International Student Success Program (UI-ISSP), or any other similar educational program of the University.

12. Student Conduct Board (SCB): the body which reviews student disciplinary matters, as set forth in sections D.2 and E and FSH 1640.83.

13. Title IX case: any disciplinary case, investigation, charge, or allegation involving alleged dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, sexual harassment, or stalking. The Title IX Coordinator may also designate any other case as a Title IX case.

14. University: the University of Idaho, in all of its campus locations, education, outreach and research programs, including extension programs and distance education programs, and at all locations where any of these programs are offered or administered.

C. Investigation

1. Any member of the University community having knowledge of a potential violation of the Code may report the violation to either DOS or, in Title IX cases, to the Title IX Coordinator. A report should be in writing, but may be reported orally to the appropriate University official. A report should be submitted as soon as possible after the event takes place.

2. The University may conduct an investigation into any report of a violation of the Code. The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether a violation may have occurred and to gather relevant information concerning each allegation of a Code violation.

3. The investigator may conduct a preliminary review to determine whether there is sufficient information to engage in a formal investigation. The preliminary review may include interviewing the Complainant, Respondent, and other witnesses. If, after the conclusion of the preliminary review, the investigator decides to engage in a formal investigation, the investigator must notify the Respondent of the allegation.
   a. The notice must be in writing and may be delivered either in person to the Respondent, or by email to the student’s official University email account. If the notice cannot be delivered either in person or to the student’s official University email account, the notice shall be delivered by any means reasonably likely to reach the student.
   b. The notice shall inform the Respondent of the specific provision(s) of the Code the Respondent is alleged to have violated and include a short description of the basis of the alleged violation.

4. The investigator must give the Respondent an opportunity to meet with the investigator in person within a reasonable time after the notice of allegation is delivered to the Respondent in order to give the Respondent an opportunity to respond to the notice, present information in his or her defense, present any information the Respondent would like the investigator to consider, and provide the names of any witnesses the Respondent would like the investigator to contact.

5. At any time during the investigation, either the Complainant or the Respondent may, but is not required to, provide information to the investigator for the investigator to consider. Such information may include documentary information, the names of witnesses, witness statements, suggested questions to ask the other Party or other witnesses, etc. Only information that is presented to the investigator may be used in a hearing under section D.

6. Preliminary Report of Investigation
   a. At the conclusion of the investigation, the investigator shall draft a Preliminary Report of Investigation (Preliminary Report) setting forth the steps taken during the
investigation; a list of witnesses contacted; a detailed summary of any witness interviews; a detailed summary of any interviews of the Respondent and/or Complainant; a detailed summary of any other information considered as part of the investigation; and complete copies of any relevant documentary evidence gathered during the investigation, including copies of documentary information provided by the Respondent and/or the Complainant.

b. The Preliminary Report shall not include any conclusions, findings, or credibility analysis.

c. The parties shall be provided an opportunity to review the Preliminary Report and may provide a written response to the Preliminary Report within five days of the review of the report. A party shall be deemed to have waived the right to review the report if the party does not make arrangements with the investigator to review the report within five days of being notified that the report is available to be reviewed. The written response may include requests for additional investigation, additional witnesses to interview, or additional questions to ask any witness.

d. After the time for submitting a written response to the Preliminary Report has passed, the investigator shall review any responses received and determine whether additional investigation is needed. If additional investigation is deemed appropriate, the investigator shall draft a revised Preliminary Report and shall give the parties an opportunity to review the report, as set forth in section C.6.c, above.

e. After reviewing any written responses received within the time period allowed for submitting written responses, the investigator shall either continue the investigation or draft a Final Report of Investigation. The investigator has sole discretion of determining whether sufficient information has been obtained in order to end the investigation process.

7. Final Report of Investigation

a. The Final Report of Investigation (Final Report) shall contain everything included in the Preliminary Report plus complete copies of any written responses received within the time period allowed for submitting written responses, a credibility analysis, recommended findings, and recommended conclusion as to whether the Respondent violated the Code.

(1) Credibility Analysis. The Final Report should include an analysis of the statements provided by each party and interviewee, as necessary, to determine whether the statements provided by that person are credible. The analysis may include a description of the person’s demeanor during the interview(s), a comparison of statements made to known facts or statements from other witnesses, the person’s ability to observe the event described, the person’s bias, whether the person was under the influence of a controlled substance or alcohol, and any other information that a reasonable person would use in his or her everyday affairs to determine a person’s credibility. Not every case will require a detailed credibility analysis of each interviewee, and the credibility analysis may be part of the particular finding. However, in cases where the credibility of the interviewee is material to the conclusion, there should generally be a separate credibility analysis.

(2) Recommended Findings. The investigator’s recommended findings regarding factual issues shall include a description of the basis for each finding. Each
finding shall be based on a more likely than not standard and should include information from the interviews, documentary information obtained during the investigation, and, if relevant to that finding, information regarding the credibility of the Respondent, Complainant and/or witnesses.

(3) Recommended Conclusion. In making a recommended conclusion, the investigator must apply the Code to the findings to reach a determination of whether the findings as found by a more likely than not standard constitute a violation of the Code.

b. Sanctions. If the Final Report includes a recommended finding that the Respondent violated the Code, the Final Report shall not include recommended sanctions.

c. The Final Report shall be provided to the Administrator. The Administrator shall provide the Final Report simultaneously to the parties.

D. Hearing Process

1. Student Conduct Administrator’s Review:
   a. After the Final Report is submitted to the Administrator, the parties may each submit a written response to the Final Report. This response must be provided to the Administrator no later than five days after the Final Report is provided to the parties. The Administrator may meet with the parties, separately, to discuss the Final Report.
   b. A party may request that the matter be referred to the SCB for a hearing. The request must be in writing and must be submitted to the Administrator no later than five days after the Final Report is provided to the parties. If a party timely submits a request for the matter to be referred to the SCB:
      (1) In non-Title IX cases, the Administrator shall refer matters to the SCB for a hearing if:
         (i) The Administrator determines that there is sufficient information in the Final Report such that a finding could be made that the Respondent violated the Code; and
         (ii) The Administrator determines that the appropriate sanction could include suspension, expulsion, or the withholding or revoking of a degree.
      (2) In Title IX cases, the Administrator shall refer matters to the SCB for a hearing in matters in which the Administrator determines that there is sufficient information in the Final Report such that a finding could be made that the Respondent violated the Code.
      (3) In all other cases, the Administrator shall decide whether the Respondent violated the Code.
   c. If a matter is not referred to the SCB for a hearing:
      (1) The Administrator shall decide whether the Respondent violated the Code. The Administrator shall make the decision based on the information contained in the Final Report, the written responses to the report, if any, submitted to the Administrator by the parties, and, if the Administrator chooses to meet with the parties, the information provided at the meeting to the Administrator by the parties.
      (2) The Administrator should adopt the findings and credibility analysis contained in the Final Report, unless the Administrator finds that the findings or credibility analysis are not more likely than not to be true. Any additional or different
findings issued by the Administrator must be based on a more likely than not standard.

3. The Administrator is not required to defer to the recommendation contained in the Final Report as to whether the Respondent violated the Code, but is entitled to freely apply the Code to the findings in order to determine whether the Respondent violated the Code.

4. If the Administrator determines that the Respondent violated the Code, the Administrator shall determine the appropriate sanction.

5. The Administrator’s decision shall be in writing and include the basis for the decision. The written decision shall be simultaneously provided to the parties.

6. The Administrator’s decision may be appealed in accordance with section E.

d. At any time before the matter is submitted to the SCB, DOS may refer a charge of a violation of the Code to mediation or other forms of appropriate conflict resolution. All parties must agree to participate with DOS in the conflict resolution process. Complaints of physical sexual misconduct or violence shall not be referred for alternative resolution under this paragraph, except in unique circumstances approved by the Title IX Coordinator after consultation with the Office of General Counsel and the CSA Officer.

2. Student Conduct Board Hearing
   a. In matters referred to the SCB, the Administrator (or designee) must send written notice to the SCB and the parties.
      (1) The notice shall be in writing and may be delivered either in person to the parties, or by email to the student’s official University email account. If the notice cannot be delivered either in person or to the student’s official University account, the notice may be delivered by any means reasonably likely to reach the student.
      (2) The notice must inform the Respondent of the specific provision(s) of the Code the Respondent is accused of violating, and include a short description of the basis of the alleged violation, the date and time for the hearing, and the deadline for submitting written materials to the Administrator.
      (3) The written notice shall also include the Final Report and any responses to the Final Report which were timely submitted to the Administrator.
   b. Except in cases referred to a Hearing Officer under Section G, the chair of the SCB shall appoint three to five members of the SCB to serve as a Hearing Panel to review each matter.
      (1) The chair of the SCB shall appoint one of the Hearing Panel members to serve as chair of the panel. A student may not serve as chair of a Hearing Panel.
      (2) The Administrator (or designee) shall serve as a non-voting, ex-officio member of every Hearing Panel and may be present and available as a resource during all deliberations. The Administrator is responsible for informing the panel of any previous conduct violations or other relevant disciplinary actions involving the Respondent.
   c. In every case submitted to a Hearing Panel, the parties may submit written materials for the panel to review as part of its decision. To be considered by the Hearing Panel, all written materials must be submitted to the Administrator prior to the deadline set forth in the notice. The Administrator shall ensure that any materials timely
submitted are distributed to the parties and the Hearing Panel prior to the hearing. The written materials may only consist of the following:

(1) Suggested questions for the panel to ask the Respondent or the Complainant;
(2) Written discussion or argument addressing the information contained in the Final Report;
(3) Information (as opposed to a discussion of the information contained in the report) that was not considered by the investigators in the Final Report only if the information was not available prior to the completion of the Final Report or if the information was provided to the investigator prior to the completion of the investigation but the information was not included in the Final Report.

d. Hearing procedures:

(1) The hearing shall be held at the time and place listed in the notice. The hearing shall be held no less than five days after the notice is provided to the parties.
(2) All hearings are closed to the public. The only people allowed to be present during the hearing are the parties, each individual party’s Advisor, the investigator(s), the Administrator, the Title IX Coordinator (or designee) in Title IX cases, one or more attorneys from the Office of General Counsel, and the members of the Hearing Panel. The panel chair may give permission for others to attend the hearing in the panel chair’s discretion, after consultation with the Administrator.
(3) The only witnesses at the hearing shall be the investigator(s), the Complainant, and the Respondent. In non-Title IX cases, the Complainant may only be present during the portion of the hearing where the Hearing Panel questions the Complainant, unless the chair determines in appropriate cases that the Complainant may remain for the entire hearing. In extraordinary circumstances, if the investigator is unable to be present at the hearing, the DOS may designate a representative to be there in the place of the investigator. Neither the Complainant nor the Respondent are required to say anything at the hearing.
(i) The panel chair, in consultation with the Administrator, may call additional witnesses if the panel chair determines that the additional witnesses are necessary for the Hearing Panel to properly resolve the case. This discretion should be used sparingly. The intention of the Code is that the Final Report, in the vast majority of cases, should provide a sufficient basis for the Hearing Panel’s decision, recognizing that the parties may speak in person to the Hearing Panel and to respond to the Final Report.
(4) It is each party’s responsibility to inform the panel chair and the Administrator of scheduling conflicts no less than three days prior to the scheduled hearing. The Administrator shall have the sole discretion as to whether to reschedule the hearing. Except in cases of grave or unforeseen circumstances, if either party fails to appear, the hearing will proceed as scheduled.
(5) If a report of a violation of the Code involves more than one Respondent, the Hearing Panel shall conduct a joint hearing with all Respondents. However, the panel chair may permit the hearing pertinent to each Respondent to be conducted separately. In joint hearings, separate determinations of responsibility shall be made for each Respondent.
(6) Only the chair of the Hearing Panel may ask questions during the hearing, and doing so is at the sole discretion of the chair. However, the chair may seek input from panel members on areas for questioning. The parties may submit suggested questions in writing as long as the questions are received prior to the deadline for submitting written materials contained in the notice. Questions based on information that arises during the hearing may be submitted in writing during the hearing at the discretion of the panel chair.

(7) For complaints involving sexual misconduct, discrimination, or other complaints of a sensitive nature, the panel chair, in consultation with the Title IX Coordinator and the Administrator, may allow the Complainant to attend the hearing, answer questions, and make a statement from behind a partition or from another room or location through audio/video technology.

(8) The panel chair has discretion as to how to conduct the hearing. Generally, however, the hearing should be conducted as follows:

(i) Opening statement by the Respondent addressing the Final Report and the allegations that the Respondent violated the Code;

(ii) In Title IX cases, opening statement by the Complainant addressing the Final Report and the allegations that the Respondent violated the Code;

(iii) Questions, if any, by the panel chair of the investigator(s), Respondent, and/or Complainant;

(iv) Final statements by the Respondent and, in Title IX cases, the Complainant.

(9) In making its decision, the Hearing Panel shall consider all relevant information from the following sources:

(i) the Final Report, including the findings and conclusions contained in the report;

(ii) any written information provided by the parties as provided above; and

(iii) the information received at the hearing.

(10) In Title IX cases involving allegations of sexual misconduct, the past sexual history or sexual character of either party shall not be considered by the Hearing Panel except in extremely unusual cases where the panel chair determines that the information is critical to a proper understanding of the specific facts of the case at hand. Demonstration of pattern, repeated, and/or predatory behavior, in the form of previous findings in any legal or campus proceeding, or in the form of good faith allegations, may be considered in making the findings and, if a violation of the Code is found, the sanction.

(11) There shall be a single record, such as an audio recording, for all hearings. Deliberations shall not be recorded. Failure to record the hearing for any reason is not to be considered a procedural error that substantially impacts the decision and will not be grounds for appeal or reversal of the Hearing Panel’s decision.

e. Hearing Panel Decision

(1) The Hearing Panel shall issue a written decision, which should be issued within ten days after completing deliberations. The chair shall provide the written decision to the Administrator, who shall then simultaneously provide the decision to the parties.
The Hearing Panel should adopt the findings and credibility analysis contained in the Final Report, unless the Hearing Panel finds that the information presented at the hearing warrants a different finding or the Hearing Panel finds that the findings or credibility analysis are not more likely than not to be true. Any findings issued by the Hearing Panel must be based on a more likely than not standard.

The Hearing Panel is not required to defer to the recommendation contained in the Final Report as to whether the Respondent violated the Code, but is entitled to freely apply the Code to the findings in order to determine whether the Respondent violated the Code.

Unless the panel chair is a Hearing Officer appointed to serve as chair without a vote, the panel chair shall participate in all votes, and all Hearing Panel decisions shall be made by a majority vote.

If the Hearing Panel determines that the Respondent violated the Code, the Hearing Panel shall determine the appropriate sanction(s). The Administrator shall serve as a resource to the Hearing Panel to help ensure that sanctions are reasonably consistent among similar cases.

The Hearing Panel may return the matter for additional investigation if the Hearing Panel determines that:
  (i) The investigator failed to properly investigate the allegation and the failure was both substantial and to the student’s detriment; or
  (ii) There is new information that could substantially affect the outcome and the new information could not have been discovered before the issuance of the Final Report.

Either party may appeal a Hearing Panel’s decision.

Sanctions imposed by the Hearing Panel shall generally not go into effect until either the time period for an appeal has expired and no appeal has been filed or until the decision is upheld on appeal. However, the CSA Officer may impose any sanction imposed by the Hearing Panel as an interim action pending the appeal.

E. Appeals

1. Any party may appeal the Administrator’s or Hearing Panel’s final decision. Appeals must be submitted in writing to the Administrator and must set forth the grounds for the appeal. The appeal must be filed no later than five days after the decision is delivered to the parties. The Administrator shall ensure that the parties receive a copy of the appeal.

2. Appeals are limited to the following grounds:
   a. A procedural error occurred in the investigation process that significantly impacted the outcome of the hearing;
   b. New information, unavailable during the investigation or hearing, that could substantially impact the original finding or sanction has been presented in the appeal documents;
   c. The sanctions imposed are substantially disproportionate to the severity of the violation (the imposition of an administrative fee is not a sanction, and therefore cannot be appealed); or
   d. The decision is not based on substantial information. A decision is based on substantial information if there are facts in the case that, if believed by the fact finder, are sufficient to establish that a violation of the Code occurred.
3. An appeal shall be limited to a review of the decision, the Final Report, any written material considered in the decision, the recording of the hearing held before the Hearing Panel, and any written materials submitted with the appeal. Where an appeal is based on the discovery of new information, the new information may be considered only to determine whether the information was unavailable at the time of the decision and whether the new information could substantially impact the original finding or sanction.

4. Appeal Panel Procedures:
   a. The chair of the SCB shall appoint three to five members of the Student Conduct Board to serve on the Appeal Panel, and shall designate one member to serve as chair of the Appeal Panel. Any member who served on a Hearing Panel shall not serve on the Appeal Panel on the same case. A student may not serve as chair of an Appeal Panel.
   b. In Title IX cases, the non-appealing party may file a response to the appeal within five days of the filing of the appeal.
   c. The Appeal Panel shall issue a written decision. The decision should be issued within fifteen days of receiving the appeal. The chair of the Appeal Panel shall provide the written decision to the Administrator, who will then simultaneously provide the decision to the parties.

5. The Appeal Panel may:
   a. Uphold the Administrator’s or Hearing Panel’s decision;
   b. Uphold the finding that the Respondent violated the Code, but revise the sanctions;
   c. Return the matter for reconsideration; or
   d. Return the matter for additional investigation.

6. Unless the case is returned for reconsideration or to the investigator for additional investigation, the decision of the Appeal Panel is the final institutional decision. If the decision upholds the finding that the Respondent violated the Code, the sanctions imposed shall go into effect immediately.

F. Student Conduct Board
   1. The description and make-up of the SCB can be found in FHS 1640.83.
   2. A member of the SCB shall not serve on any Hearing Panel or Appeal Panel in any case where the member has a conflict of interest or bias for or against either party.
   3. If procedures call for the appointment of three or more members to serve on a Hearing Panel or Appeal Panel, the chair of the SCB should endeavor to appoint at least one student to the Hearing Panel or Appeal Panel. A student may not serve as chair of the Hearing Panel or Appeal Panel. In disciplinary cases involving allegations of academic misconduct, a majority of the Hearing Panel or Appeal Panel should ordinarily be faculty members.
   4. All members of the SCB must receive annual training as determined by DOS, the Title IX Coordinator, and/or the Office of General Counsel. A member cannot serve on either a Hearing Panel or Appeal Panel until the member has completed this training.

G. Use of a Hearing Officer
   1. In any case requiring a hearing before a panel of the SCB, the University may use a Hearing Officer to conduct that hearing.
   2. The decision as to whether to appoint a Hearing Officer shall be made by the Administrator. The decision as to whether to appoint a Hearing Officer may not be appealed and may not be challenged on appeal as a procedural error.
3. The Hearing Officer may be appointed to serve as follows:
   a. As a non-voting chair of the Hearing Panel whose duties are to run the hearing and ensure all proper procedures are followed;
   b. As a voting chair of the Hearing Panel whose duties are to run the hearing, ensure that all proper procedures are followed, and to have a vote on the decision; or
   c. As the chair and only member of the Hearing Panel whose duties are to run the hearing, ensure that all proper procedures are followed, and to issue the decision. When the Hearing Officer serves as the sole decision-maker, the Hearing Officer’s decision shall be treated for all purposes the same as the decision of a Hearing Panel under the Code.
   d. In cases involving allegations of academic dishonesty, a Hearing Officer may only be appointed as a non-voting chair of the Hearing Panel, but may not be appointed as a voting member of the Hearing Panel or as the chair and only member of the Hearing Panel.

4. The Administrator shall appoint the Hearing Officer from a list of Hearing Officers approved by the Office of General Counsel. The Hearing Officer must not have a conflict of interest or bias for or against either party.

5. The Office of General Counsel shall determine the appropriate qualifications for a person to serve as a Hearing Officer and shall make a list of approved Hearing Officers available to the Administrator.

H. Interim Action
1. At any time before a final institutional decision, the CSA Officer, or designee, may impose restrictions on a student and/or separate the student from the University community pending the final institutional decision. If circumstances allow, the CSA Officer (or designee) should meet with the student prior to imposing the interim action.
2. Other than issuance of no contact orders, an interim action issued prior to a hearing before the Hearing Panel may only be imposed when the CSA Officer determines that the student represents a threat of serious harm to any person; the student is facing allegations of serious criminal activity; the action is necessary to preserve the integrity of the investigation; the action is necessary to preserve University property; and/or the action is necessary to prevent disruption of, or interference with, the normal operations of the University. After the Hearing Panel’s decision, pending an appeal of the decision, the CSA Officer may impose a sanction issued by a Hearing Panel as an interim action at the discretion of the CSA Officer.
3. In any Title IX case, the investigator, in consultation with DOS, may issue a no contact order prohibiting the Respondent and/or the Complainant from contacting the other. A no contact order should be routinely issued in Title IX cases and there need not be a specific determination made as provided above.
4. Interim actions may include, but are not limited to, the following:
   a. Suspension from the University pending a final institutional decision;
   b. Issuance of a no contact order;
   c. Exclusion from University property;
   d. Removal from the residence halls;
   e. Removal from extracurricular activities, including participation on athletics teams;
   f. Withholding the award of a degree pending the conclusion of the investigation and hearing process; or
g. Any other action deemed necessary and appropriate by the CSA Officer to maintain orderly and appropriate University operations.

5. Where a student is suspended from the University, or directed to not attend certain classes, alternative coursework options may be pursued, with the approval of the CSA Officer and the appropriate college dean, to ensure as minimal an impact as possible on the responding student.

6. An interim action must be made in writing and is effective when the CSA Officer delivers the Notice of Interim Action to the responding student either in person or by email sent to the student’s official University of Idaho email account.

7. The Respondent may appeal the imposition of any interim action by filing an appeal with the CSA Officer. There are no formal procedures for this appeal, and the interim sanctions remain in effect unless overturned by the CSA Officer.

8. A violation of the provisions of an interim action shall be considered a violation of the Code.

I. Sanctions

1. The following sanctions may be imposed upon any student determined to have violated the Code:
   a. Warning: a written notice to the student.
   b. Probation: a written reprimand accompanied by a probationary period during which the student must not violate the Code in order to avoid more severe disciplinary sanctions.
   c. Loss of Privileges: denial of specified privileges for a designated period of time.
   d. Restitution: compensation for loss, damage, or injury. This may take the form of appropriate service and/or monetary or material replacement.
   e. Educational Sanctions: completion of work assignments, essays, service to the University, community service, workshops, or other related educational assignments.
   f. Housing Suspension: separation of the student from University Housing for a definite period of time, after which the student is eligible to return. Conditions for return may be specified.
   g. Housing Expulsion: permanent separation of the student from University Housing.
   h. University Suspension: separation of the student from the University for a definite period of time, after which the student is eligible to return. Conditions for return may be specified.
   i. University Expulsion: permanent separation of the student from the University.
   j. Revocation of Admission and/or Degree: admission to or a degree awarded from the University may be revoked for fraud, misrepresentation, or other violation of University standards in obtaining the degree, or for other serious violations committed by a student prior to graduation.
   k. Withholding Degree: the University may withhold awarding a degree otherwise earned until the completion of all sanctions imposed.

2. More than one of the sanctions listed above may be imposed for any single violation.

3. A student who fails to comply with the sanction(s) imposed shall have a disciplinary hold placed on his/her record until the student complies with all sanctions imposed.

4. Disciplinary sanctions other than suspension, expulsion or revocation or withholding of a degree shall not be made part of the student’s permanent academic record, but shall
become part of the student’s disciplinary record. Such sanctions shall be expunged from
the student’s disciplinary record seven (7) years after final disposition of the case.

5. The student shall be responsible for administrative and educational costs of any and all
sanctions imposed for alcohol related violations.

J. Miscellaneous

1. At any point during the disciplinary process prior to a final institutional decision, the
Administrator and the parties may agree to an appropriate resolution without further
investigation, hearing, or appeal. The agreed upon resolution may include the use of
appropriate alternative dispute resolution methods.

2. Role of an Advisor: In accordance with the educational purpose of the Code, all students,
including Respondents and Complainants, are expected to speak for themselves at all
stages of proceedings under the Code, including, but not limited to, during the
investigation, hearing, and any appeal. Any student may have an Advisor present at any
time during any interview, meeting, or proceeding under the Code, but the Advisor’s role
is to advise the student, not to speak for the student or make any presentation on behalf of
the student. The student may, at any time and for a reasonable period of time, confer
with the Advisor. If the University official conducting the proceeding determines at any
time that the Advisor is acting outside of these parameters, the Advisor may be required
to leave the proceeding at the official’s discretion. In appropriate circumstances, at the
sole discretion of the University official conducting the proceeding, the University
official may allow the Advisor to speak on behalf of the student and/or make a
presentation on behalf of the student.

3. Any time a student is found to have violated the Code, DOS may charge the student an
administrative fee of $150. This is not considered a sanction and may not be appealed.

4. The University may notify parents of students under the age of 21 when a student has
been found to have committed a drug or alcohol-related violation. This is not considered
a sanction, and the decision as to whether to notify the parents or not rests entirely within
the discretion of DOS.

5. Training: All members of the SCB, the Administrator, the Title IX Coordinator, and the
investigators shall receive annual training in accordance with the requirements of the
policies of the Board of Regents of the University of Idaho and the Idaho State Board of
Education (said policy is currently found at Section I, Subsection T), the Clery Act and
implementing regulations (see, e.g., 34 C.F.R. § 668.46(k)(2)(ii)), and Title IX.

6. With the exception of the deadlines for filing an appeal (see section E) or for requesting a
hearing before the SCB (see section D.1.b), all other timeframes contained in the Code
are suggested timeframes. While the timeframes should be followed absent exceptional
circumstances, the failure to conduct any action within a designated time frame is not
grounds for appeal or reversal of any decision.

7. Any question of interpretation regarding the Code or these procedures will be referred to
the CSA Officer or his/her designee for final determination.

8. The University will, upon written request, disclose to the alleged victim of any crime of
violence (as that term is defined in section 16 of title 18, United States Code), or a non-
forcible sex offense, the report on the results of any disciplinary proceeding conducted by
the University against a student who is the alleged perpetrator of such crime or offense
with respect to such crime or offense. If the alleged victim of such crime or offense is
deceased as a result of such crime or offense, the next of kin of such victim shall be treated as the alleged victim for purposes of this paragraph.

9. Any decision or action taken under the Code may be reviewed by the President at the President’s discretion.

10. Appeals of a final institutional decision to the Board of Regents must be made in accordance with Idaho State Board of Education Governing Policies and Procedures Section III.P.18.
STUDENT CONDUCT BOARD (SCB)

[This section was removed from FSH 2400 and placed here in July 2008. In 2014 University Judicial Council was renamed Student Disciplinary Review Board following a complete review of the Student Code of Conduct. In 2017 this board was created by collapsing the Student Appeals Committee with the Student Disciplinary Review Board to reflect a major rewrite of the code disciplinary process in FSH 2400]

A. FUNCTION. UI's process for reviewing alleged violations of the Student Code of Conduct (FSH 2300) is set forth in FSH 2400. The SCB is the reviewing body involved in the conduct process set out in FSH 2400. [rev. 7-14, 7-16]

B. STRUCTURE AND MEMBERSHIP. The SCB is broadly representative of the UI community and is composed of 21 voting members: seven faculty, seven staff, and seven students. The student members should include at least one graduate student and at least one law student. Hearing panels will be drawn from these committee members. Given the nature of responsibility of the Chair of SCB, Committee on Committees shall first consider a tenured faculty member. Pursuant to FSH 2400 the chair will appoint the three person panels. [rev. 7-14, 7-16]

C. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION. Each committee member shall be required to participate in Title IX training and other training as needed. Members of the SCB should be aware that federal regulations governing the handling of disciplinary matters recommend a specific hearing time schedule. Therefore, SCB members may need to be available on short notice and during the summer months. Outgoing committee members should be aware that their appointment will continue until their replacement is confirmed and has received the required Title IX training (typically by early fall). [add. 1-14, rev. 7-14, rev. & ren. 7-16, rev. 1-17]
FSH 1640.83

STUDENT APPEALS COMMITTEE
[created July 2016]

A. Function. To conduct a review at the request of a student who wishes to appeal a decision of any Student Disciplinary Review Board panel in matters that include a sanction of suspension, expulsion, or withholding or revoking a degree. A subcommittee (see B-1 below) of the Student Appeals Committee, will make a determination as to whether the student’s appeal meets the qualifications as stated in FSH 2400 C-6.

B. Structure and Membership. The committee shall be composed of eleven members to include six faculty (at least two will be from the current year’s Faculty Senate), two staff, and three students (at least one undergraduate and one graduate student) who will be eligible to serve on a subcommittee as noted in B-1 below. The term of membership is three years, with initial terms staggered to form a rotation pattern.

B-1. Subcommittee. For each appeal, the Chair of the Student Appeals Committee shall appoint a three member subcommittee and designate a chair. In selecting a chair, a tenured faculty member will receive priority. Each subcommittee will consist of at least one faculty member and, if possible, at least one student. A student may not chair any subcommittee. Persons appointed must have no interest in or involvement with the parties to or the subject matter of the situation under review. [rev. 7-17]

C. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION. Each committee member will be required to participate in Title IX training and other training as needed. Members serving on the Student Appeals Committee should be aware that federal regulations governing the handling of disciplinary matters recommend a specific hearing time schedule. Therefore, Student Appeals Committee members may need to be available for approximately two to four hours within as little as five days of a student being notified of a decision of an SDRB panel review.

Outgoing committee members should be aware that their appointment will continue until their replacement is confirmed and has received the required Title IX training (typically by early fall). [add. 1-17]

1640.93

STUDENT DISCIPLINARY REVIEW CONDUCT BOARD (SDRBSCB)
[This section was removed from FSH 2400 and placed here in July 2008. In 2014 University Judicial Council was renamed Student Disciplinary Review Board following a complete review of the Student Code of Conduct. In 2017 this board was created by collapsing the Student Appeals Committee with the Student Disciplinary Review Board to reflect a major rewrite of the code disciplinary process in FSH 2400]

A. FUNCTION. UI’s disciplinary review process for reviewing alleged violations of the Student Code of Conduct (FSH 2300) is established and maintained for the handling of disciplinary matters concerning UI students (“student” is defined in FSH 2300 I.A-6 and 2400 A-1.) set forth in FSH 2300 and 2400. The SCB SDRB is one of the reviewing bodies involved in the review conduct process set out in FSH 2400 which covers any and all matters that are related to and consistent with the Student Code of Conduct [FSH 2300] and the Statement of Student Rights [FSH 2200]. [rev. 7-14, 7-16]

B. STRUCTURE AND MEMBERSHIP. The SDRB SCB is broadly representative of the academic UI community and is composed of. The SDRB SCB consists of 21 thirteen twenty-one voting members; seven members faculty, seven staff, and seven shall be students. The student members should include at least one graduate student and at least one law student. Seven members shall be staff. The remaining members shall be faculty: five faculty members, two staff, five undergraduate students, and one graduate student. The chair is responsible for forming a panel (see B-1 below) and designating the chair. Hearing panels will be drawn from these committee members. Given the nature of responsibility of the Chair of SDRBSCB, Committee on Committees will shall first consider a tenured faculty member. Pursuant to FSH 2400 the chair will appoint the three person panels. [rev. 7-14, 7-16]

B-1. Panel. The chair of the SDRB shall appoint a three person panel from the committee to hear matters presented to the SDRB pursuant to FSH 2400. Each panel will consist of at least one faculty member and, if possible, at least one student. A student may not chair any panel. In selecting a chair, a tenured faculty member will receive priority. Persons appointed must have no interest in or involvement with the parties to or the subject matter of the situation under review. [add. 7-16, rev. 7-17]
C. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION. Each committee member **will** be required to participate in Title IX training and other training as needed. Members serving on the **SDRB SCB** should be aware that federal regulations governing the handling of disciplinary matters recommend a specific hearing time schedule. Therefore, **SDRB SCB** members may need to be available **for approximately two to four hours within as little as five days of a student being notified of the alleged violation of the Student Code of Conduct on short notice and during the summer months.** [add. 1-14, rev. 7-14, rev. & ren. 7-16]

Outgoing committee members should be aware that their appointment will continue until their replacement is confirmed and has received the required Title IX training (typically by early fall). [add. 1-17]