MEMORANDUM

TO: Don Crowley, Faculty Secretary  
F. Marty Ytreberg, Faculty Senate Chair 2014-15  
Randall Teal, Faculty Senate Chair 2015-16

FROM: Chuck Staben, President

DATE: June 4, 2015

SUBJECT: Response to select items from University Faculty Meeting of May 5, 2015

In response to your memo of May 6, 2015 and pursuant to Faculty-Staff Handbook (FSH) sections 3360, 3710, 3780 and 2700, I hereby address the items listed below (attached to your memo of May 6, 2015). Please note the remaining items submitted by the Faculty Secretary will be addressed in a later memo.

- **FS-15-062**: FSH 3360 – Probation, Promotion, Demotion, Reassignment and Transfer of Non-Faculty Exempt and Classified Employees
  - I disapprove this change. Proposed Sections D-1 through D-5 should remain in the APM and any changes should be proposed for the APM. I note the Faculty Senate’s decision of April 21 to create an ad hoc committee to be formed by Staff Affairs as a tool for continued dialogue with HR on improvements to the classification system.

- **FS-15-051**: FSH 3710 – Leave Policies for All Employees
  - FS-15-051 contains numerous changes to the language of FSH 3710 the bulk of which address changes to the University’s policy on parenting leave. I will address the proposed changes to the parenting leave policy in general terms and then ask that the Faculty Secretary, Human Resources and Office of General Counsel collaborate on the appropriate final language changes to FSH 3710 (and any related sections of the APM) to incorporate the approved changes and remove language for those changes not approved as follows:
    - New Subsection E-1 increases the leave available for parenting from 12 weeks to 16 weeks. I disapprove this change. In discussions with my cabinet officers the consensus was that expansion of parenting leave by an additional 7 weeks would create too much of a burden on the University workforce which must fill in for the absent parent.
- **New Subsection E-2** allows both parents the full 12 weeks of parenting leave when both parents are employees of the University of Idaho. This is an expansion over the minimum requirements of the federal Family Medical Leave Act which calls for dual-employee parents to share the 12 weeks of leave allocated to parenting. I approve this change.

- **New Subsection E-3** creates two changes to University policy on the application of paid leave to parenting leave. Current University policy limits application of sick leave to 10 days for parenting leave and requires the parent to then apply and exhaust any available annual leave or compensatory time balances before taking unpaid leave (unless the unpaid leave is separately approved as Personal Leave Without Pay).
  - The first proposed policy change under E-3 incorporates use of sick leave for parenting leave for the full amount of parenting leave taken, up to the full balance of sick leave the parent has accrued. This change requires use of accrued sick leave first before application of any other paid leave and before unpaid leave is taken. I approve this change.
  - The second proposed policy change under E-3 allows the parent to choose between unpaid leave or application of annual leave or compensatory time balances once accrued sick leave balances are exhausted. I disapprove this change as a significant departure from the University’s general policy that for all absences available paid leave is to be exhausted before unpaid leave is taken.

- **New Subsection E-4** proposes to allow transfer of annual leave from one parent to the other parent to be applied to parenting leave when the transferee parent has exhausted all other accrued paid leave balances. This applies only when both parents are employed by the University. I disapprove this change as a significant departure from the University’s policy on shared leave, which limits use of shared leave and the shared leave pool to employees dealing with significant medical matters for themselves or immediate family members.

- **New Subsection E-5** makes no substantive change to University policy requiring approval, rather it simply encourages employees to know their rights under the federal family medical leave laws and notes that the University policy on parenting leave must, at a minimum, comply with the federal law. I approve this language.

- **New Subsection E-5** remains under review. This language is simply a relocation of current policy language which will remain unless University counsel determines that it does not comply with the federal family medical leave laws.

- **New Subsections E-6 and E-7** do not contain any policy changes requiring Presidential approval, rather they simply refer to the locations for existing University policies.
Other proposed language changes spread throughout FSH 3710 address various aspects of the changes set out in New Subsection E discussed above. Language changes that implement the policy changes approved above are themselves approved, and correspondingly, language changes that support or implement the policy changes disapproved above are disapproved. As noted above, I ask the Faculty Secretary to work with Human Resources and General Counsel to make the final adjustments to the language of FSH 3710 based on these approvals.

Other substantive policy changes proposed in FSH 3710 will be addressed at a later time.

- **FS-15-060**: FSH 3780 — Dependent Tuition
  
  This proposed change would reduce the Dependent Tuition at the University to $0 (currently it is 50% of the in-state tuition) and expand the availability of the benefit to include all eligible dependents including multiple dependents at the same time. I **disapprove** this change based on anticipated cost of the benefit and the limited number of employees benefited.

- **FS-15-024**: FSH 2700 — Student Evaluations
  
  This proposed change removes a number of items of student input from the student evaluations form which provide useful feedback to the faculty teaching these courses and that may be important in the evaluation of faculty and courses. The proposed revisions may lessen the utility of this as an evaluation tool. I encourage consideration of changes in the student evaluation in light of research on the utility and practice of such evaluations and with input from Institutional Research and Assessment. I **disapprove** this change.