

MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, March 14, 2018 9:00 a.m.

- I. Call to Order.....Howard
- II. Staff Member of the Month.....Chuck Hatfield
I work off the Moscow campus and get to call the Facilities department at least every month. Chuck usually answers the phone and is the most cheerful, pleasant, helpful and kind person. He recognizes voices and always has something nice to say to the caller. He is the exact same way in person. He is appreciated!
Stephanie Fox, Manager, Facilities and Operations, UI Boise.....Butterfield
- III. Roll Call – Determination of Quorum.....quorum established.....Baker
- IV. Approval of Minutes.....Jan and Feb minutes approved.....Howard
- V. Guest Presentation –
 - a. Finance and Administration – Conversation with Brian Foisy, VP Finance and Administration,
 - College mergers conversation: background – mid-December meeting disclosed finance budget that finances all operations is general education 2 groups that put money in – taxpayers and students tuition - \$180M gets allocated. Taxpayers always give the \$, but the students \$ is a guess regarding how many, where from, or what courses? Trend in enrollment is down last couple of years, and also changes in the mix – non- resident population. Current fiscal year we realized that we were \$2M short to meet budget. In the past, we could absorb it. UI had reserves. This year, we have no reserves. Since then, spring enrolment shows only about \$1.1M short. Typically spring is 92% of fall. This year we are at 96% of fall enrollment. We are not in the hole, we are acting to prevent that. State is funding less in benefits. \$1.2M so, now we have a \$3.5M problem. State has also indexed funding to credits. Enrollment workload adjustment. Last handful of years, they haven't taken money, but this year they took \$355K. Now at a \$4M shortfall.
 - This budget shortfall is not a crisis. In the entire \$200M it is only 2%. We can figure this out, and we have time. Provost still has some funds, he has carryforward to give \$1.1M for this year. Still have \$2M issue in FY19. No time to do this for FY19, but units will have to participate in giving back carryforward. Only so many things we can do. Committee will discuss options, but funds will need to be reallocated. In FY 20 that is where we need to consider base budget problems. Long term planning. Merger conversation happened there. Can do hard way – layoffs, and not filling positions. Organizational change is a viable option. Has happened in finance and infrastructure. Deans need to make a choice. Wes would raise a question paradox. Will college mergers happen? It was just a question. Deans said they need more time –we have about 10 months. A couple of possible recommendations CLASS, AA, Science are still options. CNR and CALS not happening. What is best for student experience? We need to decide what makes sense. There are vacancies. Lots of conversations still to happen.
 - Chad – if you combine colleges you save a Dean, but not \$2-4M we are still short. Brian: That would be only part, not the whole. The rest will still come from all other places - registrar, fin. aid, advancement, etc.
 - James - Facilities exempt? Brian: in the Program prioritization, one of the lowest ranked was utilities. It ranked lowest, but because everyone knew they wouldn't cut that. Brian's personal opinion is that we need an honest conversation about where to cut funds. Just across the board isn't very strategic.
 - Kari – conversation about not just being fiscally responsible. What about enrollment? How many students does it take? Brian: That is a huge question. Dean Kahler is under great pressure to raise enrollment. That is just not enough. We can't expect up to 600 new students by next year. In past, we haven't pulled funds from departments, but now we have no other reserves.
 - Darren from off-site; Is this shortfall caused by market-based compensation? Why are we increasing salaries if we have budget shortfalls? Brian: All other policies of giving funds fall under the same question. I can see that. We had \$ set aside and all the units kicked in \$ to give mid-year increase. Enrollment growth didn't balance. The problem is there. Do we stop investing in other things. Investment in people is worth it regardless of the cost. If you don't do it nothing will change. We have to do it. Firing or layoffs is not worth it, but everything else is. Tuition increase is 3% to meet the increase in salaries with no allocations.

VI. Executive Committee Reports

- a. Off-Campus.....None.....Wells
- b. Communications.....none.....Hoffmann
- c. Treasurer.....finally finished all of the lunches.....Freitag
- d. Secretary.....none.....McGarry
- e. Technology... The new tech support portal at support.uidaho.edu, You can see and comment on the ticket. Email is support@uidaho.edu.. They do want feedback.....Kearney
- f. ViceChair.....information from last revision of bylaws...meeting Friday at 1 pm want a final revision put forward to get approved.....Baker
- g. Chair...link for great colleges to work for please take it.....Howard

VII. Advisory/Other Reports

- a. FacultySenators... Discussion regarding faculty and exempt optional retirement plans at last faculty senate meeting. A plan sent to the State Board of Education from faculty in the southern schools. The UI Faculty senate wanted to make a statement to SBOE so that we not lose our voice as a University. Persi should be an option. There are still a lot of questions about what the university contributes to each plan and what the benefits of each are to both the individual and the university. The choice is a recruiting tool. State board are on Persi – so they have an appearance of conflict to favor Persi. Does affect exempt staff as well. Charles read their statement. 500 exempt employees to consider.Tibbals
- b. HumanResources.....We need to have a discussion of a staff performance evaluation upgrade. Wes wants to get input. David has several comments from his team for Wes directly?
 - Make them meaningful, do we need the comments in every field? Cindy has input from others that there are supervisors that aren't allowed to give above a meets expectation. As a supervisor, you want to be able to rate what you want. It is humiliating. Differences in supervisors give different scores, negates purpose of giving feedback. The current process devalues, it needs to be built into more of a career ladder with supervisory accountability. Setting goals should be mutual. Accountability for supervisors as well. Goal setting is important. Not in the same category as assessments. Sometimes employees are not allowed to do much in the way of opportunities. Can still have done an excellent job. Just making life pleasant is exceptional and above just meeting expectations. Evaluations need to be tied to a merit. Even extra vacation time or parking – still costs the University, Cindy wants more essay. Why cap? It means everyone is expected to excel. Inflation of scores with no incentive. Sometimes those get meets expectations that don't. Futile exercise that changes with every leadership change. There's no consistency. Should be one form? Darren Jen and James volunteer for evaluation committee. Send feedback to them to pass along to Wes..... Keim (in for Wes)
- c. Finance & Administration.....Foisy
- d. Professional Development & Learning.....Banner 9 training, chart of accounts, supervisory excellence program will be differentKeim

VIII. Subcommittee/UI Committee Reports

- Staff Awards & Recognition Emily Tuschoff - Committee will need help with gift distribution -Patricia Winner Decisions:
 - 2 per category, except for Service/Maintenance. This is due to the numbers of employees per category. All winners will receive \$1000, except for the Administrator category: recognition only.
 - Service/Maintenance: Bill Shook
 - Team: Women's Center – Bekah Miller-MacPhee
EPSCoR/ORED/Rick Shumaker
 - Technical/Paraprofessional: Ashleigh Bright
Michael Kiester (Parma)
 - Exempt: Bekah Miller-MacPhee
William (Bill) Basham (Boise)
 - Administrative/Clerical: Mandy Brocke
Ellen McKenzie

- o Administrator: Wes Matthews
- o Staff Educational Award: All winners will receive \$195.40 (\$1954 split between 10 nominees)

b. Joint Policy Committeenone.....Neilson

c. Strategic Plan is going well – need to get Staff Council faces at employee orientationSoelberg

d. Elections...

- 1 new staff council member to vote on, Samantha Dunlap vote passes,
- Post doc are unique staff members, we need one – it is an additional seat. James Van Luetthen We need to add a post doc member to the committee JT Van Leuven vote approved.
- Affirmations to continue to second term blanketed – vote approved.
- Brian Mahoney affirmed to continue as faculty senate representative
- Subcommittees: spouses and sig. others on same committees? There was considerable discussion. Wording was discussed and will be decided over email to vote on next meeting. Basically, no familial connections on a subcommittee to avoid appearance of impropriety.
- Cindy Ball volunteers for budget and finance committee – vote passes.
- Committees that have vacancies
 - o Administrative Hearing Board: needs one member, any staff
 - o Borah Foundation needs one member, any staff
 - o Ubuntu needs one member, any staff
 - o Student Conduct Board needs 2 members, any staff, high time and training commitment
 - o Parking council needs one member, any staff
 - o Classified position appeal board needs 2 members, any staff – currently inactive
 - o University Security and compliance committee needs 1 member from staff council and is currently inactive

..... Crossland

e. Restructure of Staff Council representation: leave faculty senate representation as it. Some holes in representation are changing with all the restructuring that is going along. We are waiting until the dust settles... ..Baker

f. Staff compensation task force: Lisa Miller.....meeting every couple of weeks re: CEC finalized figures with state funds. Wes and Brian will send a memo to staff in a couple of weeks. Working really hard. Similar structure as mid-year raise for CEC.

IX. Old Business – none

X. New Business - none

XI. Good of the Order - none

XII. Adjournment: 11:32

Staff Awards Meeting

March 13, 2018

Attendees: Kristin Strong, Emily Tuschhoff, Erin Butterfield, Patricia Baker, Dusty Fleener, Travis Gray, Judy Pankopf, Jess Clark, Summer Howard, Michelle Beagley, Tina Holmquist, Kevin Ketchie and Ian Leibbrandt

Winner Decisions:

2 per category, except for Service/Maintenance. This is due to the numbers of employees per category. All winners will receive \$1000, except for the Administrator category: recognition only.

Service/Maintenance: Bill Shook

Team: Women's Center – Bekah Miller-MacPhee
EPSCoR/ORED/Rick Shumaker

Technical/Paraprofessional: Ashleigh Bright
Michael Kiester (Parma)

Exempt: Bekah Miller-MacPhee
William (Bill) Basham (Boise)

Administrative/Clerical: Mandy Brocke
Ellen McKenzie

Administrator: Wes Matthews

Staff Educational Award: All winners will receive \$195.40 (\$1954 split between 10 nominees)

Possibly recognize Honorable Mentions at ceremony with plaques/mention in the program

Reservations will open for winners/longevity/retirees first, then open to all staff on April 1st (first come, first served, capped around 500 guests)

Winners and Retirees can bring one guest

Retiree gifts and items are being handled by Patricia with help from others (Judy, Erin, Jess...)

Consider after-hour/custodial staff (approximately 35 individuals)

Gifts will be distributed to non-Moscow sites prior to April 24th

Emails will be sent to winners/supervisors notifying them of their win – Ian

Paragraphs are being written for each category and turned in the week of March 19th

Continue to collect raffle items and give them to Patricia or Ian (EHS or College of Law)

Thank you all for your help and support...you all make this a great place to work☺

Staff Committee Vacancies

Administrative Hearing Board:

Minimum of 7 meetings per semester via phone and generally run 1.5 hours long at minimum. More meetings are schedule if demand requires it. There are usually anywhere from 3-7 cases, with all packets arriving (most of the time) electronically a few days prior to meeting. Case review time depends on whether you are an in-depth reader.

Cases generally include Accounts Payable issues – as the Academic Hearing board votes for ‘withdraws’ and what-not, never include reversal of fees. On occasion, there are residency arguments. Each case is taken case-by-case, but the primary ‘view’ of the committee is to determine whether there was a fail on the part of UI reps in the party’s complaint.

Time commitment TOTALLY depends on the chair-of-choice. A previous chair met at most 4 times a semester and were relatively efficient. This chair really prefers extensive discussions, opinions and additional information... so it is never a speedy vote. **There is currently 1 vacancy that can be filled by any staff member.**

Borah Foundation Committee:

Borah Foundation Committee will sponsor programs and projects focusing on understanding the causes of war and the conditions that contribute to peace. [rev. 9-02]

This committee requires a heavy time commitment; as such, elected members will serve two year terms. The Borah Foundation Committee meets weekly and elects its own chair. The Borah Foundation Committee members serve from April 1st of the year of appointment. **Any staff member can sit on this committee. There is currently 1 staff vacancy.**

Ubuntu:

A. CONTEXT: Ubuntu, as explained by Desmond Tutu, is essential to the interconnectedness of being human and living in interdependent communities. Ubuntu is affirming and inclusive of others because we all belong to a larger whole which is diminished when any members are humiliated, disrespected or oppressed. People with Ubuntu enrich themselves but do so in ways that enable the community and all its members to also improve. In this spirit the Ubuntu committee is established to advance these ideals.

B. FUNCTION.

B-1. Ubuntu will promote the values of respect, understanding, and fairness within our diverse university experience; review university policies and programs affecting under-represented and/or under-served students, staff, and faculty in consultation with appropriate representatives as necessary across campus; recommend changes and additions in university policies and programs that enhance student/staff/faculty success and advancement.

B-2. Ubuntu will monitor and advance the university’s affirmative action and equal opportunity programs [see FSH 3060] being a strong and active voice ensuring that the university’s

programs, activities and services are accessible to persons with learning, sensory, physical and other disabilities. The committee will also work closely with the Americans with Disabilities Act Advisory Committee (ADA) to identify relevant rules and regulations pertaining to specific affirmative action and equal opportunity problems at the university. Ubuntu also recommends policies and procedures to address specific disabled access challenges at the university, consistent with requirements of applicable regulations and regents' policy ensuring that the 'spirit of the law' is followed.

B-3. This committee will advise the president on matters of equal opportunity, ensuring that UI's programs, activities and services are available to persons with learning, sensory, physical and other disabilities, and identify avenues for ensuring the campus community creates a fair and inclusive environment for all.

B-4. This committee will also discharge such other functions as may be assigned by the Faculty Senate or by the president or the president's designee. It will also submit periodic reports on its activities to the Faculty Senate including recommendations for appropriate program or policy changes (see FSH 1460).

C. STRUCTURE. Two staff members (one from Staff Council—currently Ian Leibbrandt). **There is currently 1 vacancy that can be filled by any staff member.**

Student Conduct Board:

A. FUNCTION. The SCB is the reviewing body involved in the student conduct process set out in FSH 2400 D., E. and F.

B. STRUCTURE AND MEMBERSHIP. Seven staff, and seven students. Hearing panels will be drawn from these committee members. The chair will appoint the three person panels.

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). **There are 2 vacancies that can be filled by any staff members. Please note that this has a high time commitment and requires a good amount of training.**

Parking Council:

The training component is quite small. I think it took about half an hour to get logged into the system and figure out how to use it.

The monthly commitment depends on the number of violations and what they are for. Some times of year there are few or they can be pre-screened out, other times there are more violations and need more scrutiny, or even discussion with the committee to decipher. On average the monthly meeting takes about an hour, and the appeals themselves (that come the week before the meeting) take on average from 1-2.5 hours to go through. The appeals load

can be as few as 30 appeals to as many as 80. There are judgement calls, and sometimes difficult decision making required.

Classified Position Appeal Board:

A. FUNCTION. To hear, on referral from the vice president for finance and administration, appeals from decisions of Human Resources (HR) regarding position classifications; to make recommendations to the vice president as to disposition of such appeals; and to advise the vice president on problems and procedures concerning position classification. [ed. 7-06]

B. STRUCTURE. Four members of the classified staff, at least one of whom holds a supervisory position; two faculty members, each of whom holds or has held an administrative position at UI; and, without vote, the director of employment services. The staff members are nominated by the Staff Affairs Committee and the faculty members are nominated by the Committee on Committees. Members are appointed by the president and serve for three years, with one-third taking office each year. The board elects its own chair. [ed. 7-05] There are 2 vacancies that can be filled by any staff members. Please note at this time this committee is not currently meeting and is on hiatus but may be called again at any time. The preference is for these to be Staff Council members.

C. PROCEDURES.

C-1. Appeals of classification decisions made by HR are submitted directly to the vice president for finance. A "Notice of Appeal" form must be filed with the vice president, with a copy to the CPAB chair, within 30 days of the notification to the supervisor by HR of its decision. [ed. 7-06, 9-15]

C-2. The vice president will notify the director of employment services that a "Notice of Appeal" form has been received and that an advisory opinion is being requested from the CPAB. The vice president will request that HR supply seven copies of available documentation to the CPAB chair within 10 working days. CPAB will schedule a hearing at the earliest time convenient for all parties. [ed. 7-06]

C-3. The director of employment services, the employee, and his or her supervisor will be notified of the date, time, and place of the hearing. The format is as follows: The analyst from HR will present the basis for the decision that was made; the employee or supervisor, or both, will present reasons for disagreement; the human resources analyst will be given time for closing comments as will the employee and the supervisor. The board may ask questions for further clarification after the presentation. The board will then meet in closed session for deliberation. [ed. 7-06]

C-4. The CPAB will forward its recommendation to the vice president. The vice president will notify the employee, the employee's supervisor, the director of employment services, and the CPAB chair of the final decision. [ed. 7-06]

UNIVERSITY SECURITY AND COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE (USCC):

A. FUNCTION.

A-1. The USCC is charged with ensuring the University's compliance with the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Clery Act), and planning and facilitating activities that support a safe and secure living, learning and working experience. USCC will focus on accurate disclosure (reporting of Clery crime statistics) and implementation of best practices regarding safety policies and procedures. The USCC will conduct an annual review of all reportable crimes prior to submitting crime statistics to the U.S. Department of Education. The committee will also perform a thorough review of the Annual Security and Fire Safety Report (ASFR) prior to its publication.

A-2. The USCC shall meet a minimum of three times each year. Topics will include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Review updates to the law, policies and procedures related to security and Clery Act compliance
- Ensure timely collection of Clery crime statistics from applicable jurisdictions
- Recommend enhancements to security policies
- Identify programming efforts and recommend improvements
- Review crime and disciplinary data to avoid report duplication
- Conduct a final review of the data elements for the ASFR and recommend policy changes
- Confirm procedures for distributing the ASFR.

B. STRUCTURE. Executive Director, Office of Public Safety & Security who serves as Chair, one member from each of the following: Staff Affairs, Dean of Students, Moscow Police Department, Title IX Coordinator, Environmental Health & Safety Fire Safety Specialist, two faculty members, one off-site representative (faculty/staff), two undergraduate students and one graduate student; and one member from General Counsel without vote. [ed. 7-15] **There is 1 vacancy that must be filled by a Staff Council member. Please note at this time this committee is not currently meeting and is on hiatus but may be called again at any time.**

Title: Resolution on PERSI Participation and ORP Subsidy
Author: University of Idaho Faculty Senate

WHEREAS University of Idaho employees currently participate in the Optional Retirement Plan (ORP) and have a choice of investing in TIAA or in VALIC;

WHEREAS the ORP options, TIAA and VALIC, are defined contribution plans that have contracts with many other higher education institutions around the country so these plans are very portable for those considering joining the University of Idaho and for University of Idaho employees who leave for other institutions;

WHEREAS many faculty believe that TIAA and VALIC offer individual control and the opportunity for higher returns on retirement investments;

WHEREAS the retirement system known as PERSI and the ORP are two separate retirement systems of the state of Idaho;

WHEREAS since 1990 the legislature of Idaho has directed that a portion of the funds set aside for the retirement of members of the ORP be paid to PERSI even though the ORP participants are not beneficiaries of the PERSI system in their roles as ORP participants;

WHEREAS this subsidy by faculty and exempt staff at Idaho four year institutions of higher education has been required for 28 years and is scheduled to continue until 2025;

WHEREAS similar institutions in Idaho (two year colleges and technical education institutions) were only required to subsidize PERSI for 14 years;

WHEREAS the 4-year institutions in Idaho are not required to contribute as much to the ORP as they are required to contribute to PERSI;

WHEREAS the 2-year institutions and technical education institutions in Idaho are required to contribute equal amounts to PERSI and the ORP on behalf of their employees;

WHEREAS the ORP participants at the 4-year institutions are, in effect, subsidizing PERSI to their direct detriment, and have been required to do so over an extended and unfair length of time;

WHEREAS the required ORP participant subsidy to PERSI results in unfair and unequal treatment of ORP participants;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO FACULTY SENATE RECOMMENDS

- a. that the ORP continue to be offered as a retirement plan at University of Idaho;
- b. that if PERSI is offered to University of Idaho employees, it must be offered as an optional plan alongside the ORP;
- c. that any change in the retirement plan options must be revenue neutral to the institution; and
- d. that any change in the retirement plan options must not impose new or additional costs, or other disadvantages, on the ORP, or its participants.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT THE UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO FACULTY SENATE FURTHER RECOMMENDS that the leadership of the Faculty Senate work with University of Idaho Staff Council and with the university administration, State Board of Education and sympathetic leaders at other Idaho higher education institutions to seek an immediate legislative change ending the required subsidy of PERSI by University of Idaho employees.