University of Idaho
Faculty Senate

University of Idaho
2024 – 2025 Faculty Senate Agenda

Meeting #10

Tuesday, October 15, 2024, at 3:30 pm
Zoom Only

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes (Vote)
- Minutes of the 2024-2025 Faculty Senate Meeting #9 (October 8, 2024) **Attach. #1**

III. Chair's Report
- Who We Are - Stefanie Ramirez, Senator from the College of Business and Economics

IV. Provost's Report

V. Committee Reports
- University Curriculum Committee (Vote)
  - UCC120 Academic Regulation M-4: Drop for Non-Attendance – Lindsey Brown, UI Registrar **Attach. #2**

VI. Other Policy Business
- Grade Rollout Schedule Request – Lyudmila Barannyk, Senator from the College of Science
- Proposed Resolution on the Course Schedule tool (potential Vote) - Steve Shook, Senator from the College of Natural Resources **Attach. #3**

VII. Other Announcements and Communications
- FLSA Change Contexts – Brandi Terwilliger, Director of Human Resources
- CEC Salary Determination Conversation, Continued – Torrey Lawrence, Provost and Executive Vice President

VIII. New Business

IX. Adjournment

Attachments

- **Attach. #1** Minutes of the 2024-2025 Faculty Senate Meeting #9 (October 8, 2024)
- **Attach. #2** UCC120 Academic Regulation M-4: Drop for Non-Attendance – New Proposal
- **Attach. #3** Proposed Resolution on the Course Schedule tool

Attach. #1

University of Idaho
Faculty Senate

2024 – 2025 Faculty Senate – Pending Approval

Meeting # 9
Tuesday, October 8, 2024, 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm
Zoom only

Present: Aus, Barannyk, Borrelli, Buchen, Chapman, Corry, Hagen, Haltinner, Hu, Kenyon, Kirchmeier Torrey Lawrence (w/o vote), Maas, McKenna, Miller, Murphy (vice chair), Pimentel, Ramirez, Raney, Remy, Rinker, Roberson, Roe, Sammarruca (w/o vote), Shook, Strickland, Tohaneanu, Thorne
Absent: Rinker (excused)
Guests: Lindsey Brown, Michael McGriff, Florian Justwan

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

Approval of Minutes (vote):

Minutes of the 2024-25 Meeting #8 October 1, 2024
The minutes were approved as distributed.

Chair's Report:

- Chair Haltinner asked senators to forward to her any concerns about morale they or their constituents might have.
- Who We Are – Craig Miller, Faculty Senator from CLASS, Associate Professor of Acting and Directing

  Craig spent most of his career as a producer and a theater administrator and a leader in the professional nonprofit theater world. He served as the artistic and education director at 6th Street Playhouse in Santa Rosa, California, where he produced 9 seasons of theater and directed over 30 productions. Craig is also the founder of the Texas Repertory Theater Company in Houston.

  Most recently, Craig appeared in the one-person production of "Every Brilliant Thing," which started as an Idaho repertory theater play, but has since been selected to be one of the keynote presentations for the University's Suicide Awareness week. He is also a two-time recipient of the Elaine Ambrose storytelling fellowship here on campus. Presently, he is directing the musical "The Addams Family," which is coming here at the end of October, beginning of November. He is a proud member of the Society of Stage Directors and Choreographers, which is the American Labor Union for Professional directors and choreographers. Currently, Craig is an associate professor of acting and directing in the Department of Theater Arts, as well as the head of our MFA directing programs in the department, and teaches a variety of classes, both undergraduate and graduate. Craig is the major professor for 34 MFA candidates across the landscape of our campus and the distance program. The unit has almost 50 undergraduate majors in BA or BS tracks. They offer the only Bachelor of Fine Arts program in Idaho for students in theater performance, design, management, and technology. They are working towards the creation of a BFA certificate in musical theater, hopefully ready in the near future. In our graduate program, we welcome both on campus and distance MFA students in acting, directing design, including scenic design, lighting design, costume, design, technical direction, and more. They are one of the few theater MFA programs in the Pacific Northwest, and the only MFA theater degree in the State of Idaho. MFA is the terminal degree and is becoming the expected level of training and degree for the industry, both in educational theater and in the professional world. Hence, many mid-career theater artists and educators need their MFA to take the next steps in their career. We are home to over 100 MFA candidates from around the United

States and internationally, and the distance MFA program is the largest graduate program in CLASS, and perhaps the largest on campus.

- Common Read: The kick-off event is next Wednesday. The keynote speaker will be English department faculty member Erin James. You will be able to attend in person, in the Vandal Ballroom at 7pm. Members of the UI community can use their UI credentials to zoom in to the event. To attend the event via Zoom: https://uidaho.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZ0odeqgrj0iGNZZ6mSYkqucMbDvWHAjCyW_

Provost's Report

- Midterm grades are due October 14 at noon.
- Next faculty gathering: October 17, 4:30pm – 6:30pm, at the IRIC Atrium. Hosted by CNR. https://www.uidaho.edu/provost/faculty-gathering
- POP talks: Also on October 17, 4-5pm, just before the faculty gathering.

Committee Reports (vote)

- University Curriculum Committee (vote)
  - UCC 557 Politics and Law Undergraduate Academic Certificate – Florian Justwan, Chair –Politics and Philosophy
    This is the first of three certificates from this department. The certificate is not earned from classes that students automatically take. They must make a conscious choice to work toward the certificate.
    Discussion:
    A senator asked about the difference between the certificate and the minor and the benefits of having it out in the job market. Provost Lawrence took the question and explained that certificates have come up in higher education as focused programs. A minor must be tied to a major and needs more credits – 18 credits for a minor vs. 12 for a certificate.
    Vote: 19/20 yes; 1/20 no. Motion passes.

  - UCC 562 Undergraduate Academic Certificate in Creative Writing – Michael McGriff, Co-Director of Creative Writing Program, Associate Professor of Poetry
    Michael gave a brief overview of the proposed certificate (described in attach. #3.)
    There were no questions.
    Vote: 19/19 yes. Motion passes.

  - Resolution on the Class Schedule Tool – Steve Shook, Senator from College of Natural Resources
    Steve explained the rationale for the UCC resolution. Although both the class schedule and the class search tool provide the same information, the class search tool requires a longer process, and, thus, it is a productivity reducing tool. It will have a negative impact on faculty morale, especially those faculty who have a large number of advisees.
    Discussion:
    A senator disagreed with the resolution. Letting go of the old and outdated system is the right move.
    Registrar Lindsey Brown (asked by the chair to speak, with no objections) pointed out that the current system is outdated and unsupported, and not compliant with ADA. Her office wants to make the transition as easy as possible by making some adjustments, but the new system cannot be made to work exactly like the class schedule.

Senators reported conflicting feedback from other faculty, students, and advisors. Some heard that professional advisors do not like the change because it is more time consuming, and that students prefer to use the class schedule. Others received the opposite feedback. Lindsey Brown noted that the "Schedule Planner," which can be prepopulated and is used by advisors, helps reduce advising time.
Other senators spoke in favor of the UCC resolution. They argued that the class schedule is helpful in circumstances other than advising, for instance when a faculty must be absent on short notice and arrangements must be made. The class schedule gives an immediate overview of all information concerning the course, such as time and classroom.
Lindsey Brown noted that the class search tool allows to search by a variety of parameters, such as the instructor, whether a class is from Gen Ed, and more. One does not have to be logged into the UI system to use the class schedule tool, which is available to all and can be used for recruitment. There is, however, a secure login, where faculty and advisors can navigate the system differently than students do.
The class search tool and class schedule can be accessed here:
https://www.uidaho.edu/registrar/classes
The UCC resolution is being presented to senators for them to consider adopting it as a senate resolution. The resolution will be in the next binder.

Announcements and Communications:

- Market Based Compensation (MBC) Overview – Diane Kelly-Riley, Vice-Provost of Faculty Affairs
  https://www.uidaho.edu/provost/faculty/salary/mbc
  Diane provided some history on the MBC system, implemented in 2018, and the Compensation Task Force, chaired by chemistry professor Patrick Hrdlicka and Wesley Matthews, Executive Director of Human Resources. The goal was to develop, for both faculty and staff, an evidence-based model that is objective and transparent about how salaries are determined. Vice Provost Kelly-Riley will focus on what was done concerning faculty.
  Market-based compensation is a salary model that establishes a market rate based on the average salary reported in the reference database for a specific Classification of Instructional Programs designation (CIP)/rank combination within U of I's institutional salary comparison group. The target salary is calculated taking several fixed measures into account. A faculty member's actual salary may be below, equal to, or exceed their target salary. U of I's institutional salary comparison group encompasses all U.S. public and private doctorate-granting institutions, and includes R1, R2 and R3 institutions as defined within the Carnegie classification framework. So, "market" refers to a particular position and how it maps onto similar positions in the country, whereas "target" is about a particular individual, their level of experience, and type of contract. Market rates are established by CUPA-HR (Colleges and University Professional Association for Human Resources). CIP codes are about the position in a particular unit, not the individual's training and credentials. They are determined by the instructional program the individual is hired into. It's a classification system managed by the Federal Government in the US Department of Education. The CIP codes assigned to our faculty positions are drawn from the CIP codes of the undergraduate academic degrees and programs offered at the University of Idaho. CIP codes represent the responsibility areas of the position, and do not reflect the training of the person who eventually comes to occupy that position.
  The target rate reflects the faculty member hired in that position in a department. The variables considered include rank, their tenure status, the longevity in the position, and the type of contract (academic year or fiscal year).
  Discussion:

A senator asked for clarification. Their understanding is that salaries are based on which department you're in, not the position. Sometimes, departments hire a person who is trained in a discipline other than the one of the department, because the units need expertise in that area. Nevertheless, the person's salary is based on the department rate. Provost Lawrence commented that there can be exceptions, such as people teaching in multiple programs. But, as a rule, MBC is about the instructional program. The senator added that salaries based on CIP codes make it hard to hire the best people. Another senator asked what we can tell prospective hires regarding the salary range they can expect.
Diane Kelly-Riley replied that the website language is clear, but the issue is far more complicated than what can be easily captured. Aside from junior applicants to a tenure-track assistant professor position, there is no common starting point for people who come to us with diverse levels of experience.
A senator inquired about the scenario where departments are combined. Would the CIP code reflect the department as opposed to the position or the program? Diane Kelly-Riley replied that, if a program were moved from one college to another, those CIP codes would probably be moved over as well, being tied to the instructional program.
The conversation moved to merit, and how merit comes into play in this system.
Vice Provost Kelly-Riley replied that merit increases are not part of MBC, although they help faculty move ahead. Once you reach a hundred percent of the market, you are not capped. Many faculty are above their market rates for several reasons.
Provost Lawrence interjected a quick comment about the last question. It is important to realize the MBC is nothing but a reference point. It doesn't determine salaries. It determines a range, only for reference.
A senator raised the issue of salary compression. Response: Concerns about compression and being competitive in hiring are often competing priorities. We want to hire the best people we can. Sometimes that means they are coming in at salaries that are high relative to someone else hired some years earlier. This has nothing to do with the quality of those people. Unfortunately, the longer one is here, the worse the compression becomes, and that is the reality of higher education. All our new hires are at 92% of their target, while the people we hired 3 years ago are at 85%. That might be an area we can focus on, at least to clarify the problem of compression and improve the way we deal with it.
There was a question about salaries of non-tenure track faculty, and why they are systematically lower in comparison with those of tenure-track faculty.
Diane and Torrey: The reason is unequivocally not about the worth or value of the person's work. It reflects the market data and how people are paid for similar positions across the country.

- CEC Procedures – Torrey Lawrence, Provost and Executive Vice President
  The process starts in the fall with an analysis of the previous year's CEC, which is finalized in the summer. Kim Salisbury shared that analysis at the senate a couple of weeks ago. We also consider input from the Staff Compensation Committee, who makes an annual recommendation on CEC distributions. Senate has started the Faculty Salary Committee, who will start meeting in the next week or two, with the intent to make a similar recommendation from the faculty perspective. In August, we received a recommendation letter from AFT. We will take all this input into consideration and discuss possible changes to the system, and, in late Fall, produce a preliminary plan for the next CEC cycle. At this point, the plan is based on several assumptions, until the spring, when those assumptions may become a reality, which is mostly determined by the legislature. They look at CEC increase rates for state employees, including the public universities. Usually, they do it as a percentage increase, and that is the pool of salary dollars that goes up by 1% or 3% or whatever they decide. Two years ago, they did it from a per- hour standpoint, which translates into a flat rate across employees, and

that was the year we did a flat rate as recommended by the Staff Compensation Committee. It matched how the State was funding it, but there was much frustration, and thus last year we returned to the percentage rate.

A big issue and challenge from the legislative standpoint is what they call "fund shift." When they give us a 3% CEC, the increase is based on Gen. Ed. dollars. We have many salaries that are not funded on Gen. Ed. dollars, but they're funded from student fees or other sources. So, the State only pays for about half of the total CEC needed for UI employees. This is often managed by increasing tuition, which puts it on the back of the students. But when the legislature says that everybody is getting a 3% CEC on average, we could only give out half of that. That is one option. We have tried to supplement it with this additional money, so tuition increases are largely driven by the need to supplement state dollars. Torrey was impressed when we talked to ASUI about this. They have been supportive of reasonable increases. They say they want great faculty and staff, and that is a strong message.

Once these pieces come together, we estimate how many dollars are available for CEC. Then we go through that plan and make allocations into three different buckets. The system then goes out to vice presidents and deans, for them to work with their leadership teams using the guidelines. Leaders then make recommendations for raises, that go into a large spreadsheet. That comes back and is carefully checked out for compliance with the rules. That goes to the President, the Provost and the Vice President for Finance and Administration, Brian Foisy. Once all is finalized, the Budget Office puts all the information into the payroll system. We generate contracts around late May, sometimes into June, and then the new fiscal year starts around July 1. Then, the whole cycle starts again.

We are looking at some changes for this upcoming year. Should there be a lower total cap? If so, at which number? Certainly, some salaries got a lot of attention because of a substantial percentage increase. We usually have a chance to request special funding, sometimes called "line items." In practice, they are a chance to request an increase in funding from the state for something specific, such as equipment or starting a new program. The President has decided that our top priority for any additional money we can get next year from the State would be for CEC, with, of course, the rationale that the inflation of the last few years and the rising cost of living, and that our salaries have not kept up. Line items are political questions. They are not necessarily logical or heartfelt discussions; they are about what will resonate with legislators. In general, we hear that they think university employees are very well paid, or even overpaid. It is a perception that we need to try and navigate to show that we want to continue to retain and attract the best employees we can.

CEC money goes into 3 buckets, each receiving, roughly, a third of the total CEC. Last year we gave 1% across the board. So, everybody who met expectations got a 1% raise as a minimum. The second part is a merit pool, that was roughly a million dollars. How those raises are allocated and the process are prescribed in FSH 3420. The 3rd bucket is for obligations that we have, such as funding promotions. That comes out of the 3rd bucket, along with any raises necessary to meet exempt minimums as well as minimum wage requirements.

A senator asked how raises are determined for administrators.

Provost Lawrence responded that administrators' salaries are handled in the exact same way as everyone else. For example, Brian Foisy gets a list of the people that report directly to him and the Merit pool that's associated with that group, and he makes his decisions with the same rules, the same parameters. The President gets a list for the provost, Brian Foisy, Chris Nomura, and the people that report to him. 3% is an average. Some may have gotten only the 1% across the board, others may have gotten the 1% plus promotion raise. Some employees might have been at 78% of target, another parameter where we raised the floor by trying to keep people at 80% as a minimum this year. These funds come from the 3rd bucket. We did not limit raises to 3%. There are a fair number of people that did get more

than 3%. The average raise last year was 3.49%. Scott Green's salary is determined separately by the state board, to whom he reports. All the people that report to President Green are managed through the same process as just described.

Due to the late hour, Kristin proposed to continue this conversation next week. For the sake of time and efficiency, please send Torrey your questions in advance.

Adjournment:
The agenda not being completed, Chair Haltinner asked for a motion to adjourn. So moved (Murphy, Chapman). The meeting was adjourned at 5:02pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francesca Sammarruca
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate

Attach. #2

120: REGULATION M-4 DROP FOR NON-ATTENDANCE

In Workflow

1. Registrar's Office (none)
2. Provost's Office (kudas@uidaho.edu; stoutm@uidaho.edu; jvalkovic@uidaho.edu; gwen@uidaho.edu; cari@uidaho.edu; brendah@uidaho.edu; sandeschlueter@uidaho.edu)
3. Ready for UCC (none)
4. UCC (none)
5. Post-UCC Registrar (none)
6. Faculty Senate Chair (stoutm@uidaho.edu; cari@uidaho.edu; nvietz@uidaho.edu)
7. Catalog Update (sbeal@uidaho.edu)

Approval Path

1. Wed, 21 Aug 2024 15:25:30 GMT
   Theodore Unzicker (tunzicker): Approved for Registrar's Office
2. Thu, 05 Sep 2024 15:15:48 GMT
   Sande Schlueter (sandeschlueter): Approved for Provost's Office
3. Tue, 24 Sep 2024 23:28:28 GMT
   Sydney Beal-Coles (sbeal): Approved for Ready for UCC
4. Tue, 01 Oct 2024 17:27:09 GMT
   Sydney Beal-Coles (sbeal): Approved for UCC
5. Wed, 02 Oct 2024 22:16:26 GMT
   Sydney Beal-Coles (sbeal): Approved for Post-UCC Registrar

New Proposal

Date Submitted: Tue, 30 Apr 2024 00:00:54 GMT

Viewing: Regulation M-4 Drop for Non-attendance

Last edit: Tue, 01 Oct 2024 17:26:34 GMT

Changes proposed by: Lindsey Brown

Faculty Contact

Faculty Name	Faculty Email
Lindsey Brown	lindseybrown@uidaho.edu

Request Type

Add/Drop/Change an academic regulation

Effective Catalog Year

2025-2026

Title

Regulation M-4 Drop for Non-attendance

Request Details

Minor change in regulation to encourage students to reach out to their instructor if they will not be in attendance during the first week of classes.

Supporting Documents

M-4 Drop for Non-attendance 4-29-24--UCC Edit.docx

Reviewer Comments

Sande Schlueter (sandeschlueter) (Thu, 05 Sep 2024 15:15:30 GMT): approved by VProv AI/SS

Sydney Beal-Coles (sbeal) (Tue, 01 Oct 2024 17:26:34 GMT): Updated form with a minor edit from UCC

Key: 120

M-4. Drop for Non-attendance

Students are responsible for notifying their instructors ~~through the Registrar~~ when extenuating circumstances not covered as an official absence as defined in M-1 prevent their attendance during the first week of the semester. Instructors may notify the Registrar to drop students who have not attended class or laboratory meetings nor notified the instructor ~~through the Registrar~~ by the end of the sixth business day following the start of the class. Valid reasons for missing classes do not relieve the student of making up the work missed.

Attach. #3

Resolution FS2425-1

Resolution to Continue the Publication of the University of Idaho Class Schedule
(https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/schedule/)

Whereas it is the responsibility of the Faculty Senate to "recommend" general policies and procedures concerning the welfare of faculty members, including, but not limited to…working conditions…" [FSH 1520.]

Whereas the Office of the Registrar has communicated to faculty and staff that it intends to cease the publication of the online Class Schedule and provide information contained in the Class Schedule through the Banner Class Search tool.

Whereas the *University of Idaho General Catalog* stipulates that course information will be "listed in the class schedule."

Whereas the *University of Idaho General Catalog* stipulates that course and lab fees will be "noted in the Comment section for each course in the online Course Schedule."

Whereas the *University of Idaho General Catalog* stipulates that cooperative programs will "be listed in the Class Schedule."

Whereas the *University of Idaho General Catalog* (Policy O-7) stipulates that "Departments are required to submit the names of instructors for all course sections for publication in the class schedule."

Whereas the *University of Idaho General Catalog* (Policy O-9) stipulates that "it is the responsibility of the registrar to see that listings in the class schedule conform to the respective course descriptions."

Whereas the Class Schedule is a critical, high value online publication that is extensively used by faculty, staff, and students for advising and registration purposes and general course and schedule management due to the utility it provides users in the format of its presentation of information relative to the Class Search tool.

Whereas Faculty Senate believes that ceasing publication of the Class Schedule will detrimentally impact the working conditions of faculty and staff as well as making registration and course management more difficult for students.

Resolved, Faculty Senate strongly recommends that the Office of the Registrar continue to publish the online Class Schedule until such time as a new system is operational that provides substantially the same functionality as the Class Schedule so as to allow for the continued efficient and effective advising and registration of students and to avoid detrimentally impacting the working conditions of faculty and staff.

Adopted by vote of Faculty Senate on _____.