2020 – 2021 Faculty Senate – Approved minutes at meeting #22
Meeting # 21
Tuesday, March 2, 2021, 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm
Zoom only

Present: Attinger, Brantz, Bridges, Carney, Carter, Chapman, Dezzani, Fairley, Hickman, Keim, Kirchmeier (Chair), Torrey Lawrence (w/o vote), Lee-Painter, McIntosh, McKellar, Meeuf (Vice-Chair), Paul, Quinnett, Raja, Rashed, Rinker, Rose, Sammarruca (w/o vote), Schwarzlaender, A. Smith, R. Smith Tenuto, Tibbals, Wargo, Powell (proxy for Ahmadzadeh)

Absent:

Guest Speakers/Presenters: Amber Feldman, Trina Mahoney, Lodi Price, Diane Whitney

Call to Order: Chair Kirchmeier called the meeting to order at 3:30pm.

Approval of Minutes (vote):
• Minutes of the 2020-21 Meeting #20 – Attach. #1
  The minutes of the 2020-21 Meeting #20 were approved as distributed.

Chair’s Report:
• Welcome to Patti Heath! Patti is currently supporting Faculty Senate and we thank her in advance for all her help, including managing our Zoom meetings. Let’s take a moment to greet Patti!
• Welcome to our visitors! If you have questions for any of our guests today, on any of our topics, please send your questions directly to your Senators. Senators, please update your names to include which college you are representing and keep a close eye on your emails in case questions come in for folks visiting us today. Like in any Senate meeting, we will only take questions and comments from Senators.
• Updates on visits to Faculty Senate: next week we will welcome Teresa Koeppel, the Chief Marketing Officer and Executive Director for University Communications and Marketing. Please reach out to your constituents to gather any questions they have for Teresa and send them my way.
• We are still looking for a Faculty Senate member to participate on the Vandal Star Implementation Committee. They meet every other Wednesday from 1:30-2:30pm. Please email me if you are interested. (A Senator indicated in the Zoom chat that they may be willing to volunteer.)
• Please remember to share the General Policy Report with your constituents. https://www.uidaho.edu/-/media/UIdaho-Responsive/Files/governance/faculty-senate/general-policies-reports/gpr69-022621.pdf?la=en&hash=66BF76846EA2DAC2DAD488798CA88799AD1BDF86. The items on this policy report were approved by Faculty Senate on February 23 and will be considered to have the necessary faculty approvals unless a petition requesting further consideration of these items is signed by five faculty members and submitted to the chair of the Faculty Senate by the end of the day on March 12, 2021. If no petition is received by the deadline, this report will be submitted to the president for approval and, if required, transmittal to the Board of Regents.
• Reminders:
  o Deadline to request delay for promotion and/or tenure is March 14, 2021.
  o Nominations for Honorary degrees for the December 2021 commencement are due April 15, 2021.
Sabbatical applications for the 2022-2023 year are due March 31, 2021. Please help us spread the word about upcoming deadlines by sharing with your colleagues.

There were no questions or comments about the Chair’s report.

**Provost’s Report:**
- COVID-19 update: Last week, of approximately 800 administered COVID tests 7.61% were positive. This increase appears to be confined to specific groups – two Greek living groups and one campus housing group are currently in isolation. The overall positive rate for the semester is 2.16%. We are monitoring the situation and we will keep everyone updated.
- The next “Talks with Torrey” event is tomorrow at 11:30am.

**Discussion:**
A Senator thanked the Provost for the recent memo about class formats for the fall. He needed clarification about the offering of a virtual section along with an in-person one. While classes with low enrollment are discouraged, with this arrangement, there could be sections with as few as one or two students. The Provost responded that these “dual-listed” sections – a Classroom Meeting and a Virtual Meeting – are in fact the same class and the enrollment in the two sections would be considered together. This may solve problems – for instance, it will be easier to make rooming adjustments, such as going back to 50% room capacity, or to address restrictions on virtual classes that international graduate students are allowed to take. Although it may create some complications for departments, at this time it is the best way to ensure flexibility. The Senator had a follow-up question to confirm that joint-listed or cross-listed classes will be counted as one class with respect to the enrollment.

In response to another inquiry, Provost Lawrence clarified that, if two sections are not meeting together, they will be considered separately when counting enrollment. The issue being addressed at this time is when the same class has an in-person section and a virtual one.

There were no more questions or comments for the Provost.

**Committee Reports:**
- University Staff Compensation Committee – Amber Feldman, Attach. #2
  To provide context, Amber Feldman first gave a brief history of staff compensation systems at the university. The mission of the committee is to increase all staff compensation to 100% of target salary. Per FSH 1640.81, the Staff Compensation Committee (SCC) is charged with being involved in the annual Change in Employee Compensation (CEC) process and to advise and provide reports to the administration, Staff Council, and Faculty Senate. Today, they are seeking the Senate endorsement of the SCC recommendations for the FY22 CEC. Based on the Governor’s proposed budget and discussions, the University of Idaho anticipates receiving a 2% CEC allocation to our General Education (GenEd) base budget for FY22. In addition, the university received a 2% CEC GenEd allocation for FY21 that was not utilized due to directions provided by the state. However, because approximately half of our GenEd personnel cost is supported through tuition funding versus state allocated funds and the university has not increased tuition, what appears to be a 4% pool of funds is more realistically described as slightly more than a 2% pool of available funds. Three key points are itemized in the SCC memo based on current Budget Office distribution estimates.
1. It is proposed that a portion of the CEC funds be allocated to GenEd-funded graduate student appointments. SCC endorses using a proportional amount of CEC funds to advance graduate student competitiveness.

2. When faculty successfully achieve tenure and/or advance in rank (P&T) they receive an increase in salary aside from any other university equity or merit adjustments. These increases have not been funded by the state in recent years and, out of budget necessity, administration has looked to CEC funds as the source for P&T increases. Staff recognize and support the use of CEC funds this year to celebrate these important achievements.

3. They request support for a proportional amount of funding for staff salary equity. Although significant progress was made from FY18 to FY20 to bring staff salaries up to their calculated target in our market-based compensation system, a lot more progress is needed. There are currently 67 staff below 80% of their calculated target and 189 below 85%. Using FY21 rates, in January staff averaged 94.02% of their calculated target salaries and faculty averaged 97.799%. When FY22 data is available next month, target percentages are expected to drop for both faculty and staff. At the start of FY20, a portion of the allocated CEC funding was used to bring staff up to 85% of their calculated target salaries. While market rates and target salaries continue to increase, salaries have not, and therefore both staff and faculty are losing ground – on average, staff are lagging farther behind target than faculty. Although we will not return to the university-wide progress of 85% of target that was achieved in FY20, the recommended allocation provides funding to bring staff farthest behind up to 83.5% of target.

After the three investments mentioned above, an estimated $2,160,931 in CEC funding remains. SSC recommends allocating the remaining funds proportionally based on a percentage of total GenEd salaries by employee type – 51% to Faculty and 49% to Staff. The committee does not advise on faculty compensation practices – they support an allocation model based on Faculty Senate and Provost’s Office recommendations. For staff, they recommend across the board salary increases based on a percentage of their target salary – 2020 was an extremely difficult year and staff have gone to extraordinary lengths to maintain operations and support our students. The committee would like everyone to receive a portion of the CEC funding. They support an “across the board” (ATB) approach and, to ensure equity within the staff compensation system, they recommend that the allocation be based on target salaries versus current salaries. If ATB allocations are made based on salary, the farther behind target an employee is, the farther disadvantaged they will be when their increase is calculated on their already lower-than-target salary. Although an investment in merit-based increases for staff was discussed, institution-wide equity remains the major concern. Because everyone will receive an increase through an ATB distribution, they prioritized allocating funds to raising salaries for those farthest behind their target salaries over merit increases to regain some of the ground lost during the last two years. University of Idaho staff continue to be supportive of our market-based compensation system and use of target salaries as a way of establishing and maintaining equity. The committee urges Faculty Senate to support the long-term goals to raise all employees’ salaries to their calculated target as a matter of institution-wide equity. At the same time, they work to identify funding and an allocation system for merit-based increases on top of equity.

Discussion:
A Senator asked for clarification on the allocations to faculty and staff salaries (p.10 in the binder). Amber Feldman responded that CEC funds are distributed through the state. The Budget Office makes computations based on base salaries, and 51% and 49% in the attached memo reflect the proportions of base salaries for faculty and staff, respectively.

Provost Lawrence asked for clarification on how “across the board” is used in the present context. Lodi Price clarified that they refer to an increase based on the employee’s target salary, not their current salary. This definition better supports their equity goals, helping people who are farther away from target.

Vice Chair Meeuf thanked the SCC for the hard work they put in their recommendations. His question, perhaps best addressed to the Provost, is whether we have guidelines for handling CEC money. Provost Lawrence cited a policy in FSH (Diane Whitney provided the policy number, FSH 3420), and said that we may need to look at the whole process and figure out a consistent system that works for both faculty and staff, while recognizing the differences between the two groups. Trina Mahoney joined the conversation and added that, while they focus on a market-based compensation system, what is actually done from year to year may look different because the state may have specific instructions on how to allocate the CEC funds.

A motion to endorse the SCC recommendation was made and seconded (R. Smith/Lee-Painter). The motion passed with 22 votes, or 85% of the votes.

Other Announcements and Communications:

- FYI – FSH 3360 Probation, Promotion, Demotion, & Transfer of Classified Employees – Diane Whitney, Attach. #3
  This policy was last updated in 2009. Ever since, our internal procedures have changed, responsibilities have shifted, and the law has changed as well. This is basically a “clean-up” to align these sections with the Idaho Administrative Procedure Act.
  Discussion:
  In response to an inquiry, Diane Whitney confirmed that the document had been sent to Staff Council for their approval and is being presented to the Senate as an FYI.

  Another Senator wondered whether some of those sections should be moved to the APM while keeping in FSH only the parts addressing internal procedures. Diane Whitney responded that, if the policy is not too long, it is generally better to keep it in FSH, so that people need only to look in one place. A question concerning probationary period will be forwarded to Brandi Terwilliger.

- Faculty Statement of Values – Francesca Sammarruca, Attach. #4
  After January 6, Faculty Affairs wondered whether we should write something as a committee in response to the insurrection.
  Following some discussion, the motion was made an approved to ask Senate to take that initiative, as the statement would be stronger coming from Faculty Senate rather than a committee. FSL drafted the statement of values in Attach. #4. If approved, this would be a statement from Faculty Senate to be posted on our website and become part of our official
records. It focuses on our responsibilities as scholars and educators. We emphasize non-partisan values, such as seeking the truth from evidence, critical thinking, and respectful dialogue.

**Discussion:**
A Senator reported that his constituents expressed concerns about the timing – it seems late for a response to the January 6 events. He noted that WSU released a statement on the same day. His constituents were also concerned about coherence with the administration and possible challenges with external organizations. The Secretary and the Vice Chair disagreed with the timing issue for a variety of reasons: the values expressed in the statement are timeless; the magnitude of the events is such that it’s not too late to talk about them; on January 6, the semester had not even started and Senate didn’t meet until the end of January, after which due process had to be followed.

The Vice Chair and a number of Senators proposed to include in the language that we took the time to reflect on many current issues and then we had to go through the appropriate channels – hence the delay.

Another Senator asked for the upper administration perspective and for more information about the Idaho Freedom Foundation activities. Provost Lawrence addressed the question. The administration discussed on January 6 and 7 if and how to respond to the insurrection, and decided to wait and see how things unfold. Generally, it is never easy to decide how to respond to a particular event or take a stand in a public manner, unless there is an immediate danger or direct impact to U of I. The university was in contact with law enforcement to monitor possible safety issues. As for the IFF, (the link was provided in the chat: https://idahofreedom.org), they are active in the political landscape and try to be heard among legislators.

A Senator commented (in the Zoom chat) that IFF has been lobbying the legislators to decrease funding to institutions involved in what they deem to be “social justice activities.”

A Senator said that, although he expects negative reactions from IFF, as a university, we have an obligation to stand up for what is right, regardless the consequences. The Vice Chair suggested that our decisions should not be guided by concerns about IFF, which will continue to provide misinformation about us in any case.

A motion (Lee-Painter/Fairley) was made to approve the statement with the first line changed to: “The Faculty Senate of the University of Idaho continues to reflect on the January 6…. and condemns…”

**Further discussion:**
Would a delay be helpful with respect to legislative decisions? Did other institutions in Idaho release a similar statement? The Secretary noted that the proposed statement is in a similar spirit as the one released by the faculty of the College of Law, in that it calls on our responsibilities as educators. The Senator representing the College of Law added that their letter was requested by the students, and written in such a way as to draw a connection to their obligations as lawyers when they take the Oath of Office.
Provost Lawrence will look into a possible timeline for approving this statement. Other Senators strongly supported the idea to give people time for a more informed discussion. The previous motion was withdrawn. The discussion will continue.

- Principles Statement – Torrey Lawrence, Attach. #5
  Somewhat related to, but different from, the previous item, the list of principles in Attach. #5 could be a tool for use or reference in communications. It is not meant to be a response to a particular event. These are high-level points describing how we engage with one another. Discussion:
  Feedback was offered, such as: using “Guiding Principles” in the headline; replacing “civility” with “non-violence” or include both; replacing “all Vandals” with “all people”; including “acting with integrity” and “think critically.”

The Provost expressed gratitude for the feedback.

Adjournment:
The agenda being completed, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:59pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francesca Sammarruca
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate
I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes (Vote)
   • Minutes of the 2020-2021 Faculty Senate Meeting #20 February 23, 2021 Attach. #1

III. Chair’s Report

IV. Provost’s Report

V. Committee Reports
   • University Staff Compensation Committee (Lisa Miller) Attach. #2

VI. Other Announcements and Communications:
   • FYI – FSH 3360 Probation, Promotion, Demotion, & Transfer of Classified Employees.
     (Brandi Terwilliger) Attach. #3
   • Faculty Statement of Values (Francesca Sammarruca) Attach. 4
   • Principles Statement (Torrey Lawrence) Attach. 5

VII. Special Orders

VIII. New Business

IX. Adjournment

Attachments:
   • Attach. #1 Minutes of the 2020-2021 Faculty Senate Meeting #20 February 23, 2021
   • Attach. #2 USCC Recommendation for Fiscal Year 2022 Staff CEC
   • Attach. #3 FSH 3360 Cover sheet and redline
   • Attach. #4 Faculty Statement of Values
   • Attach. #5 Principles Statement
2020 – 2021 Faculty Senate – Pending Approval
Meeting # 20
Tuesday, February 23, 2021, 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm
Zoom only

Present: Attinger, Brantz, Bridges, Carney, Carter, Chapman, Dezzani, Fairley, Hickman, Keim, Kirchmeier (Chair), Torrey Lawrence (w/o vote), Lee-Painter, McIntosh, McKellar, Meuf (Vice-Chair), Paul, Quinnett, Raja, Rashed, Rinker, Rose, Sammaruca (w/o vote), Schwarzlaender, A. Smith, R. Smith Tenuto, Tibbals, Wargo, Powell (proxy for Ahmadzadeh)

Absent:

Guest Speakers/Presenters: Toni Broyles, Edwin Lewis, Brenda Schroeder, Lori Wahl, Taylor Raney, Brian Smentkowski, Rachel Halverson

Call to Order: Chair Kirchmeier called the meeting to order at 3:30pm.

Approval of Minutes (vote):
- Minutes of the 2020-21 Meeting #19 – Attach. #1
  The minutes of the 2020-21 Meeting #19 were approved with a correction in the attendance list.

Chair’s Report:
- Welcome to our visitors! If you have questions for any of our guests today, on any of our topics, please send your questions directly to your Senators. Senators, please update your names to include which college you are representing and keep a close eye on your emails in case questions come in from folks visiting us today. Like in any Senate meeting, we will only take questions and comments from Senators.
- Updates on visits to Faculty Senate: next week we will welcome an update from the Staff Compensation Committee. Please review the document that will be included in next week’s binder and come prepared to discuss their recommendations.
- Work continues on drafting a statement in response to the insurrection on January 6. In the binder for today’s meeting, you have a copy of the current draft of the statement. We have set aside time in our meeting next week to have a conversation about this document. Thanks to FAC for continuing to work on this project.
- We are looking for a Faculty Senate member to participate on the Vandal Star Implementation Committee. They meet every other Wednesday from 1:30-2:30pm. Please email me if you are interested.
- The UCC items that we vote on today will not be on the agenda for the University Faculty meeting; however, if we vote in support of these items today, we will put them on a General Policy Report which will be circulated according to FSH 1540-C. The general policy report is another way to approve these changes and will allow for them, if approved, to go into effect on the same timeline as those we are voting on at Thursday’s University Faculty Meeting.
- The next University Faculty Meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 25 at 2:30pm. It will be held via Zoom. There are a number of voting items on the agenda, so please help us ensure that we reach a quorum.
- Reminders:
  - Deadline to request delay for promotion and/or tenure is March 14, 2021.
  - Nominations for Honorary degrees for the December 2021 commencement are due April 15, 2021.
Sabbatical applications for the 2022-2023 year are due March 31, 2021. Please help us spread the word about upcoming deadlines by sharing with your colleagues.

There were no questions or comments about the Chair’s report. Chair Kirchmeier invited everyone to give a special “thank you” to Joana Espinoza, who is leaving the Provost’s Office, by raising a note with a message for Joana. Vice Chair Russ Meeuf presented Joana with a gift from Faculty Senate Leadership. We all wish her the very best and we will miss her!

Provost’s Report:

- COVID-19 update:
  - Positive test rate continues to be low – last week, a rate of less than 1% would have been reported for the previous week, with no students in isolation or in supported quarantine. Due to the snow closure, a smaller group was tested last Tuesday, and the positive rate went up to 1.2%, with a few people in isolation or quarantine. Surveillance testing continues.
  - Vaccine and advocacy discussion for higher education: The Idaho State Vaccine Advisory Committee met February 19. No decision was made about higher ed personnel. We hope to be on the agenda of their next meeting, probably March 5.
  - Gritman is using the Student Recreation Center for its vaccination efforts. The university is only providing space and support – we do not handle or administer the vaccine.

- Upward feedback process for evaluation of administrators: there was a 15% increase in the number responses received, and a 32% increase in the number of administrators who were evaluated. The surveys provided a lot of good feedback about administrators.

- Communications and interactions on campus: during the past year and the beginning of 2021, our country and the world faced multiple challenges. Often, the UI administration is asked whether the university will release a response to an event. We have been working with UCM and Yolanda Bisbee’s Office to draft a statement that clarifies the principles we stand for as an institution, which can be used for and referred to for a variety of circumstances. They are high-level points in broad language, not meant to address a particular event or specific situation. It will be made available to senators so that it can be discussed at the next Senate meeting.

Discussion:

A Senator asked for an update on commencement plans. The Provost responded that those will be communicated prior to spring break. Of course, plans we make two months prior to graduation concerning in-person events can still change, depending on circumstances and state restrictions.

There was a request to clarify plans for after spring break. Provost Lawrence responded that everyone will be tested after the break. Delaying return to in-person classes by one week would delay return to campus and thus testing. Our January testing showed that facilities are much better and faster. Furthermore, we did not observe a spike in positive cases after a return to classes in January.

A Senator reported that the COVID-19 dashboard is live. He expressed gratitude to the COVID-19 Advisory Committee and all who made this possible.

In response to a question, the Provost confirmed that, as done in January, lists of students who are ineligible to attend in-person classes will be provided daily to the instructors during the first week of in-person classes after spring break.

There were no more questions or comments for the Provost.
Committee Reports:

- University Curriculum Committee (Vote).
  - New B.S. in Global Disease Ecology - Edwin Lewis and Brenda Schroeder Attach. #3
    - This is to establish a new undergraduate program in the department of Entomology, Plant Pathology and Nematology (EPPN). A most important component of this new program is a research requirement for one semester. With the establishment of the new Center for Health in the Human Ecosystem at the U of I, it is a perfect time for EPPN to develop a new program that utilizes the multidisciplinary nature of the department to support the Center’s goal of building a more sustainable human ecosystem.

  Discussion:
  
  A Senator noted that the curriculum does not include a course in human demography – such as GEOG 360, Population Dynamics and Distribution – which he finds essential for such a program. Edwin Lewis replied that part of the problem is the absence of a course in epidemiology. However, the department would be happy to include GEOG 360 in the list of electives for the proposed program.

  In response to another question, Edwin Lewis clarified that the type/level of course students select (such as Math 160 or Math 170, or a particular chemistry or biochemistry class) is related to the type of research they have chosen, and is decided in consultation with their research mentor depending on their professional goals.

  A Senator proposed an amendment to the UCC motion to include GEOG 360 in the new program. There was a brief discussion and search to ensure that no prerequisites to GEOG 360 would make the proposed solution unfeasible. None were found. (The statistics background desirable for GEOG 360 is covered by STAT 251.) The motion to amend was made and seconded (A. Smith/Dezzani).

  Vote: The amendment and the amended UCC motion were voted on separately and both approved unanimously.

- New Minor in Apparel, Textile and Design - Lori Wahl Attach. #4
  - This minor focuses on appearance, human behavior, economic and purchasing decisions. Students will learn about social, historical, and cultural factors and be able to apply them in the workplace.
  
  There were no questions or comments.
  
  Vote: the UCC motion was approved unanimously.

- New Graduate Certificate in Technology Integration - Taylor Raney Attach. #5
  - This new certificate will prepare students to be technology integration specialists. K-12 schools are seeking individuals to fill such positions.
  
  There was no discussion.
  
  Vote: the UCC motion was approved unanimously.

- New teaching endorsement in Computer Science – Taylor Raney Attach. #6
  - This new program addresses growing market needs for computer science teachers. It is intended for pre-service and in-service teachers.
Discussion:
A Senator asked whether the courses will be taught by faculty in Computer Science or in Education. Taylor Raney responded that faculty in Computer Science will teach the classes for the new endorsement.
Vote: The motion was approved unanimously.

Other Announcements and Communications:

- COVID update – Toni Broyles

Toni Broyles started with an update on vaccination. Presently, we are in the mist of Group 2 (individuals 65 and older), while Group 1 (a long list) continues to receive the vaccine. Lists of which categories are in each group can be found on the webpage of the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare. There can be fluctuations in the vaccine supply chain – this week the supply was low, but a bigger rollout is expected next week. The next group is the one we are trying to join, scheduled for early April. If we are unable to get into that group, we will go to the next with the other essential workers, scheduled for late April. One-third of the states decided to include higher-education employees in the same group as K-12 teachers. Idaho is among the states that did not. In Idaho, the group of 65 and older has about 250,000 people. Regionally, individuals 65 and older can sign up in Moscow or surrounding clinics, such as in Lewiston. SEL is also operating a vaccination clinic. As we all learned from a memo last Friday, Gritman announced in its social media that it had some extra doses for those 65 and older. Incomplete information was passed around, and some misinformed people, not in a priority group, went to SRC to be vaccinated and were turned away. Everyone should make sure that the information they receive is reliable and complete before sharing that information. The university has created a priority list within its faculty and staff: frontline food workers, faculty and staff who work with children, people who work in the classroom, and people who telework. The general public – individuals aged 16 to 64 not belonging to any priority groups, will be vaccinated in May. Toni Broyles asked the Senate to help communicate the importance of everyone adhering to the process.

Discussion:
In response to an earlier question, Toni Broyles clarified that anybody can be tested the week before spring break and during the break. For the semester, 5,744 students were either tested or submitted paperwork for remote instruction. Freezing access to Bblearn for untested students who are registered for in-person classes was effective.

Toni Broyles confirmed that any instructor, faculty, or graduate assistant who works in the classroom or teaches in hybrid mode this semester will have priority over virtual workers who have filled out the paperwork with HR to only work from home.

There were a few more questions about vaccination timelines. The decision is with the State committee. If university employees do not get in the next group, the rest of us (not part of any priority group) will be vaccinated with the general population. It is expected that it may take a few months to get through the general population.

All data is included, including total number of tests and percentages of positive results. Random surveillance testing takes place every week. Last week we administered a lower number of tests because SRC was closed due to the snow. Our rate of positive tests never exceeded 1.8%. Events such as the latest three-day weekend, or snow-day gatherings, can cause an increase in infection rate, and we are keeping an eye on those factors. The K-12 teachers will soon have received their second dose of the vaccine and plan to return fully in person after spring break.

A Senator asked about the disparity between the figures reported by the university and those from other sources, such as Latah County, which report over 15% infection rate since about December 2020. Response: Latah County data include Moscow Family Medicine and every clinic, also in Kendrick. Typically, people who get tested at clinics have symptoms or have been exposed to the virus. With surveillance testing, we test a random sample. Thus, positive rate at clinics is statistically likely to be higher than ours. We do mass asymptomatic testing of our full in person classroom student population – the only institution in the state to do that. So far this semester, our numbers from campus have been low, and we bring down the county average. All of our data goes to Gritman and to Public Health and is included in their numbers.

To conclude, Toni Broyles added that any new information will be posted. Chair Kirchmeier thanked our guest and asked that any other questions be emailed to her.

- Peer observations – Brian Smentkowski, Rachel Halverson, Barb Kirchmeier
Brian Smentkowski spoke about using peer observation of teaching as a way for faculty to support one another. After conversations with the Teaching Committee and others, they decided to initiate efforts to support faculty at every stage of their careers by building evidence to support their teaching efforts. Student evaluation of instruction is a small component that captures a student’s perception of a faculty member. They are thinking of a collaborative, collegial, developmental approach to build a sense of community, with no a priori assumptions on what is good or poor teaching. Small-group instructional observations at CETL were very insightful. They had conversations with students. The very fact that the instructor is showing concern for the students – rather than just relying on the end-of-semester evaluations, which may benefit the next generation of students – is appreciated by the students and tends to raise course evaluations scores. Chair Kirchmeier added that this kind of approach has been practiced in her department, where many classes are taught by TAs, who are observed by faculty for the purpose of mentorship. They try to have good, constructive conversations about what may be going wrong, and to create a friendly and fun environment where ideas can be bounced off without judgement. Brian Smentkowski reminded the audience that on March 2, 12:30 – 1:30pm, he will showcase some of the strategies his team has come up with to improve the teaching/learning experience while supporting one another. Rachel Halverson is doing a great job with her efforts to support meaningful teaching and learning.

Adjournment:
The agenda being completed, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:01pm.
Respectfully Submitted,

Francesca Sammarruca  
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate
To: University of Idaho Faculty Senate

From: University of Idaho Staff Compensation Committee

Date: February 11, 2021

Re: FY22 Staff CEC Allocation Recommendations

In preparation for the February 16 Faculty Senate Meeting, please find the attached draft memo regarding our committee’s recommendations for the allocation of Change in Employee (CEC) funds for Fiscal Year 2022. It was reviewed and endorsed by Staff council on Wednesday, February 10.

We look forward to discussing our recommendations, and we will be asking the Senate to endorse the attached memo moving forward to President Green.
To: Staff Council, Faculty Senate and University Administration

From: University of Idaho Staff Compensation Committee

Date: February 5, 2021

Re: FY22 Staff CEC Allocation Recommendations

FSH Policy 1640.81 provides for the Staff Compensation Committee to be strategically involved in the annual Change in Employee Compensation (CEC) process and to advise and provide reports to the administration, Staff Council, and Faculty Senate.

As we seek to fulfill our responsibility, we are providing this recommendation for the FY22 CEC and ask for your endorsement to the President.

Based on the Governor’s proposed budget and discussions to date, the University of Idaho anticipates receiving a 2% CEC allocation to our General Education (GenEd) base budget for FY22. In addition, the university received a 2% CEC GenEd allocation for FY21 that was not utilized per direction provided by the state. However, because approximately half of our GenEd personnel cost is supported through tuition funding versus state allocated funds and the university has not increased tuition, what appears to be a 4% pool of funds is more accurately represented as slightly more than a 2% pool of available funds. As a committee, we have based our analysis and recommendations for implementation through utilization of both FY21 and FY22 CEC allocations.

Our recommendation for use of these funds is as follows based on current Budget Office distribution estimates:

- Although we receive some state funding for graduate student appointments (primarily TAs), it has been static for many years. It has been proposed that
a portion of the CEC funds be allocated to GenEd-funded graduate student appointments. Attracting and retaining the best and brightest graduate students is paramount to reaching our goal of Carnegie Highest Research (RI) status; we endorse using a proportional amount of CEC funds to advance graduate student competitiveness (est. $130,339).

- When faculty successfully achieve tenure and/or advance in rank (P&T) they receive an increase in salary aside from any other university equity or merit adjustments. These increases have not been funded by the state in recent years and, out of budget necessity, administration has looked to CEC funds as the source for P&T increases. Staff recognize and support the use of CEC funds this year to celebrate these milestone achievements. (est. $264,716)

- However, we request support for a proportional amount of funding to be dedicated to improving staff salary equity. Although significant progress was made from FY18 to FY20 to bring staff salaries up to their calculated target in our market-based compensation system, there is still significant progress to be made. There are currently 67 staff below 80% of their calculated target and 189 below 85%. (See Figure 1.a.) Using FY21 rates, as of mid-January, staff averaged 94.02% of their calculated target salaries and faculty averaged 97.799%. When FY22 data is available next month, we expect both faculty and staff percentages of target to drop.

At the start of FY20, a portion of the allocated CEC funding was used to bring staff up to 85% of their calculated target salaries. While market rates and target salaries continue to increase, salaries have not. Both staff and faculty are losing ground made in past years and, on average, staff are lagging farther behind target than faculty. Although the requested funding will not return us to the university-wide progress of 85% of target that was achieved in FY20, it would help close some of the growing gap. This recommended allocation provides funding to bring staff farthest behind up to 83.5% of target. (See Figure 1.b.) (est. $253,114)

After the three above investments, an estimated $2,160,931 in CEC funding remains. We recommend proportionally allocating the remaining funds based on percentage of total GenEd salaries by employee type; 51% to Faculty and 49% to Staff.

- We recognize the committee’s position is not to advise on faculty compensation practice and therefore, we support an allocation model based on Faculty Senate and Provost’s Office recommendations (est. $1,104,674).

- For staff, we recommend Across the board (ATB) salary increases based on a percentage of target – 2020 was an extremely difficult year and staff have gone to extraordinary lengths to maintain business operations and support
our students. We would like to see everyone receive a portion of the CEC funding. We support an ATB approach and, for equity within the staff compensation system, we strongly recommend that the allocation be based on target salaries versus current salaries. (See Figure 2.)

If ATB allocations are made based on salary, the farther behind target an employee is, the farther disadvantaged they will be when their increase is calculated on their already lower-than-target salary. (est. $1,056,257)

Although, as a committee, we discussed and considered an investment in merit-based increases for staff, we remain extremely concerned about institution-wide equity. Our conclusion was that, because everyone will receive an increase through an ATB distribution, we prioritized dedicating funds to raising salaries for those farthest behind their target salaries over merit to regain some of the ground lost the last two years.

University of Idaho staff continue to be supportive of our market-based compensation system and use of target salaries as a way of defining and maintaining equity. The system was implemented in December 2017 and we appreciate the university investment in FY18 through FY20. We fully appreciate the challenges the last few years have had in terms of maintaining and advancing employee compensation: a budget correction, state holdbacks, added expenses related to COVID, and a need to invest in growth initiatives. However, we urge Staff Council, Faculty Senate, and university administration to “stay the course” on our long-term goals to raise all employees’ salaries to their calculated target as a matter of institution-wide equity while working to identify funding and an allocation system for merit-based increases on top of equity for those who go above and beyond in service to the institution’s mission and goals.

Attached is early modeling of the two staff salary investments we recommend based on Mid-January staffing and FY21 market rates.
All data is based on current and calculated target salaries January 14, 2021.
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PREAMBLE: An original part of the 1979 Handbook, this section underwent a full revision in 2003 to bring it in line with Regents policy. In 2009 a definitions section was added, APM 50.15 was incorporated into this policy and various minor edits were made. For further information, contact Human Resources (208-885-3638).
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A. DEFINITIONS.

A-1. Certification to Permanent Status/Certified Status. In this section and related policy statements, reference to "certified status" means that the employee who has successfully completed the probationary period, as required herein, is certified to permanent status, also referred to as "certified."

A-2. Demotion. Any personnel action, reassignment of an employee from his or her present position to a new position that: one that is in a lower pay grade and in which uses a different position control number; which is a reduction of an employee from a position which the employee occupies in one classification to a position in another classification with a lower market rate; calls for decreased responsibility or decreased skill level; results in a decreased market rate range; and results in either a decreased salary or ineligibility for a salary increase.

The employee must have has previously held certified status or for which he or she meet has the minimum qualifications for the new position.

A-3. Permanent Status. Subject to removal only as provided for by Board of Regents and University of Idaho policy.
A-43. **Probation.** A working test period to provide unit administrators with an opportunity to evaluate a person's work performance and suitability for the position. The probationary period for classified employees beginning a new position is six months.

A-54. **Promotion.** Any personnel action that reassigns an employee from his or her present position to a new position that creates a new classification to a position in another classification having a higher market rate.

- a. uses a different position control number;
- b. calls for increased responsibility or increased skill level;
- c. results in an increased market rate range; and
- d. results in either increased salary or eligibility for a salary increase.

The employee must meet the minimum qualifications of the new position.

A career opportunity that involves greater responsibilities, and may also involve an increase in salary and a change in title. Promotions are not intended to be used where duties are changed on a temporary basis. A promotion is distinct from a reclassification in that it moves the employee into a different position, retaining little, if any, of the responsibilities of his or her previous position, as long as the employee meets the minimum qualifications of the position.

A-5. **Reclassification.** An employee retains the majority of his/her original responsibilities while accepting duties requiring a higher level of knowledge, skills or abilities.

A-66. **Transfer.** An opportunity for an employee to move into a different unit at the university with the same classification, level of responsibilities, and market rate range, and title.

B. **PROBATION.**

B-1. **Required Probationary Period.** Each employee, following initial appointment or promotion to a classified position, must successfully complete a probationary period of at least six full months. The probationary period in a given classification must be completed within a single unit and not be interrupted by resignation, termination or dismissal. An employee who satisfactorily completes the probationary period becomes certified to permanent status, and thus received certified status. An employee who has been separated during the probationary period (not certified), other than by layoff (see FSH 3930-3930-B), is not certified and must begin a new probationary period upon being rehired or promoted to that classification and must meet the minimum qualifications for the position. Employees who previously held certified status in a given classification is not required to complete a subsequent probationary period.

[ed. 7-03, 7-09]
B-2. **Evaluation.** The unit administrator/supervisor is encouraged to complete an employee performance Individual Development Plan available on the Human Resources Development website at http://www.uidaho.edu/human-resources and a three-month and six-month evaluation. Staff Personnel Evaluations using the “Staff Personnel Evaluation” form (see FSH 3340), the forms for which are available provided on the Human Resources website at http://www.uidaho.edu/human-resources. Before the probationary period ends, the supervisor must complete a six-month evaluation and discuss it with the employee, and the second-level supervisor must review the evaluation. The supervisor is required to complete a 6-month evaluation which must be completed, discussed with the probationary employee, and reviewed by the second level supervisor before the probationary period ends. A probationary employee may be dismissed, demoted, or, in the case of promotion, returned to his or her former classification, without cause being assigned, upon the recommendation of the unit administrator at any time before the completion of the probationary period with prior approval of the executive director for human resources or designee. Normally, a probationary employee whose appointment is to be terminated will be given two weeks' notice. Dismissal under these circumstances is not a basis for recourse to the grievance procedures described in FSH 3860. [rev. 7-02, 7-03, 7-09, ed. 7-10]

C. PROMOTION.

C-1. **Eligibility for Promotion.**

a. An employee may be considered for promotion on the basis of his or her past record, length of service, performance in the present position, and qualification to perform the duties of the higher positions. The employee must meet the minimum qualifications of the new position. A supervisor may promote an employee into a vacant position in the unit if the employee has demonstrated exceptional competency and skill for that position.

b. A supervisor may promote an employee into a vacant position in the unit if the employee has demonstrated exceptional competency and skill for that position. [See also 3380 D1] [ren. 7-09]

c. A promotion may occur in a unit that is undergoing reorganization. In this case, the supervisor must provide to Human Resources written explanation of the office or unit changes and the reasons why the employee is qualified for the promotion. [rev. & ren. 7-09]

C-24. **Probationary Period.** If the employee is promoted into a classification in which they were not certified, a new six-month probationary period is required (see FSH 3360, B-1). [rev. 7-03, ed. 7-09]
C-5. When there is more than one internal candidate who meets the minimum qualifications for the position within the unit, the hiring administrator must, at a minimum, conduct a UI-only search to document the candidate's qualifications and identify the most qualified individual. The hiring administrator must send an email to the Director of Human Rights, Access and Inclusion Employee Development and Workforce Diversity at eo-aareview@uidaho.edu requesting a UI-only internal search stating that there is one promotional opportunity and more than one qualified internal candidate. [add. 7-03, rev. 7-09, ed. 7-10]

C-36. Procedures. The Director of Employee Development and Workforce Diversity Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity officer Human Rights, Access and Inclusion is the approving authority for all promotions of classified employees. [add. 7-03, ed. 7-09, 7-10]

a. When there is more than one internal candidate who meets the minimum qualifications for the position within the unit, the hiring administrator must, at a minimum, conduct a UI internal search to document the candidate's qualifications and identify the most qualified individual. The hiring administrator must send an email to the Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity officer at eo-aareview@uidaho.edu requesting a UI internal search, stating that there is one promotional opportunity and more than one qualified internal candidate. [add. 7-03, rev. 7-09, ed. 7-10]

b. If more than one qualified internal candidate exists, To promote an employee, the unit must follows all affirmative action and equal employment opportunity policies by posting the position for the required recruitment period in the Applicant Tracking online applicant tracking system (ATS) and evaluating all the applicants. To be considered for the promotional position, the employee must applies for the position using the ATS online applicant tracking system. See APM 50.02. [add. 7-09]

bc. Exceptions to the requirement for posting internal promotional opportunities require the review and approval of the Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity officer Director of Employee Development and Workforce Diversity or designee. The unit administrator must work with the Human Resources Workforce Diversity office at e-mail the Director of Human Rights, Access and Inclusion at hrai@uidaho.edu or eo-aareview@uidaho.edu to request an internal promotion without a search, stating the justification for waiver of a search. Information on the search waiver process and forms can be found at https://www.uidaho.edu/human-resources/equal-employment-opportunity-affirmative-action/recruitment-and-hiring/waivers. The unit must provide:

1) A current Results Oriented Job Description (ROJD), reviewed and approved by the classification and compensation analyst in Human Resources;
2) A resume from the promotion candidate;
3) The plans for the "to be vacant" position;
4) A salary recommendation (optional).

C-7d. The unit must complete and/or upload the required forms and supplemental documentation within the online applicant tracking system standard.
Authorization Form, and the forms which must then be processed through regular approval channels. This includes any processes unique to the unit. [add. 7-09]

C-8e. The Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity officer Director of Human Rights, Access and Inclusion Employee Development and Workforce Diversity or designee will review and provide a written response to the request for promotion. The unit CANNOT shall not offer the position until it receives approval from the Human Resources Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity officer Workforce Diversity Director of Human Rights, Access and Inclusion. For additional information email eo-aareview hrai@uidaho.edu call (208) 885-4285. [add. 7-09, ed. 7-10]

D. DEMOTION.

D-1. Reasons for Demotion. An employee may be demoted, subject to the approval of the unit administrator in consultation with and the executive director for human resources senior HR officer Human Resources executive or designee. The unit administrator may recommend the demotion of an employee for any of the following reasons: [ed. 7-02, ren. & ed. 7-09]

a. The reallocation or reclassification of a class or position to a lower pay grade.

b. The restructuring of a position or unit.

c. The elimination of the employee's position because of lack of work or lack of funds.

d. The failure of the employee to complete successfully the probationary requirements of a higher position.

e. Disciplinary action for causes stated in FSH 3930 C-1 but not of a degree of severity that would sufficiently severe to warrant suspension or dismissal.

f. At the request of the employee. [rev. 7-02]

D-23. Procedure. The unit administrator supervisor shall submit their recommendation that an employee be demoted in consultation with and the executive director for human resources senior HR officer Human Resources executive or designee. An employee with certified status must be given notice of demotion at least 15 calendar days before its effective date and must be given the reasons for the demotion. For circumstances where the demotion is not for disciplinary reasons, the provisions of FSH 3930 do not apply. [ed. 7-03, ren. & ed. 7-09]

D-34. Effect of Demotion on Salary. When an employee is demoted, his or her the new salary is based on the market rate range and target salary of the new position reduced to a step in the lower pay grade as recommended by the unit administrator in consultation with and the executive.
E. TRANSFER.

**E-1. Voluntary Transfer.** An employee may voluntarily transfer from one unit to another in the exact same position title, classification, job duties and market rate range and pay grade.

**E-2. Voluntary Transfer Procedure.**

**E-2.a.** A transfer request can be made only by an employee who is beyond their initial or any performance probationary period, and cannot be requested if an employee has documented performance concerns within six months of the transfer request.

**E-2.b.** An employee who wishes to be transferred must notify their current supervisor and make a written request to the unit administrator and Employment Services. The request includes verification of notification to the employee’s supervisor. The employee must also provide a current resume and other requested materials through Human Resources before a transfer request will be considered. [rev. 7-03, ren. and ed. 7-09]

**E-2.c.** A transfer is made without reduction in hourly wage unless such reduction is agreed to by the employee. [ed. 7-02, ren. 7-03, ren. and ed. 7-09]

**E-2. Involuntary Transfer.** UI may transfer an employee involuntarily as long as there is no loss of compensation. The employee will be notified in writing by the unit administrator of an involuntary transfer. [rev. 7-02, 7-03, rev. and ren. 7-09]

**E-3. An employee requesting transfer between units must complete application and provide a current resume and other requested materials through Employment Services in HR/Human Resources before a transfer request will be considered. [rev. 7-03, ren. and ed. 7-09]**

**E-3. An employee requested transfer between units also requires the written approval of the unit administrators concerned, the employee involved, and the director of employment services. [add 7-03, ren. and ed. 7-09]**

**E-4. A transfer is made without reduction in hourly wage unless such reduction is agreed to by the employee and the unit administrator. [ed. 7-02, ren. 7-03, ren. and ed. 7-09]**

**E-35. Effect of Transfer.** The transfer of an employee does not affect his or her prior earned credited state service. However, the transfer may affect the employee's leave accrual rate, which
is based on years of service, hours worked, and percentage of appointment. [rev. 7-02, 7-03, ren. 7-03, 7-09]

F-6. A transfer request can only be made by an employee who is beyond their initial or any performance probationary period, and cannot be requested if an employee has documented performance concerns within six months of the transfer request.

**F. REPORTING.**

F-1. Human Resources maintains records for new hires, promotions/demotions, transfers and terminations. This information—Affirmative Action data is reported annually in the University of Idaho's Affirmative Action Plan, available by request at eo-aareview@uidaho.edu.
The Faculty Senate of the University of Idaho condemns in the strongest terms the January 6, 2021 insurrection at the Capitol, and any form of violence and terrorism.

As scholars and researchers, we have dedicated our careers to discovery and reasoning. We believe in science and in seeking knowledge by weighing appropriate evidence and rejecting intentional misinformation.

As citizens and educators who serve the university’s land-grant mission, we prepare students to be thoughtful, civic-minded participants in our local, state, and national communities. We are committed to democracy and due process, and to civil discourse and respectful communication.

To support these goals, we encourage all faculty, when appropriate, to directly address the issues and challenges facing our world, including misinformation, radicalism, racism, bigotry, and violence. We call for a collective commitment to shine light on the root causes of polarization and extremism. Whether by analyzing our histories and culture, or cultivating information literacy, or teaching responsible communication skills, faculty must continue to provide a transformative and ethical education for the next generation of leaders.

Additional Language to Consider:

Serving the university’s land-grant mission, faculty members prepare students to be thoughtful, civic-minded participants in our local, state, and national communities. This includes a commitment to democracy and due process, a commitment to seeking knowledge by weighing appropriate evidence, and a commitment to civil discourse on contemporary issues.
To support these goals, we encourage all faculty, when appropriate, to directly address the issues and challenges facing our world, including misinformation, bigotry, and violence. We call for a collective commitment as educators to shine a light on the root causes of polarization and extremism. Whether by analyzing our histories and culture, or cultivating information literacy, or teaching responsible communication skills, faculty should continue to provide a transformative and ethical education for the next generation of leaders.
THE UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO:

- Welcomes and respects all people;
- Supports the free and open exchange of ideas and civil discourse;
- Provides the tools and practice to think critically;
- Believes in the unfettered pursuit of knowledge;
- Supports peaceful demonstration and condemns violence as a means of expressing beliefs;
- Affirms democracy and our basic commitments to its fundamental principles;
- Encourages civility in the resolution of conflict;
- Nurtures an environment for all Vandals to succeed.

Each person at U of I brings their own experiences, their own stories, their own perspectives. Each is valid and adds to the dynamic environment of our public university. Open communication and the exchange of ideas are foundational to how we engage as Vandals.