

2007-2008
Faculty Affairs Subcommittee on Position Description/Annual Evaluation Forms
Agenda

Meeting #6

3:30-4:30 p.m.
Monday, March 31, 2008
Brink Hall Faculty Lounge
Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.

- Minutes of Meeting #5, March 24, 2008

III. Business.

- Position Description and Summary Table
- Annual Evaluation
- Civility and Collegiality
- Review and discuss changes to *Faculty-Staff Handbook* (outreach/service)

Attachments:

Minutes #5, March 24, 2008
Revised position description and summary table
Revised annual evaluation form
Faculty-Staff Handbook proposed changes (sent previously)

University of Idaho
FACULTY AFFAIRS SUBSUBCOMMITTEE ON POSITION DESCRIPTION/ANNUAL EVALUATION FORMS
Meeting #5, 3:30 p.m. Monday, March 24, 2008

Present: Crawford, Dakins (cell phone) Force, Houle, Morrison (chair), Murphy, Prather, Thompson; Stauffer (Boise) **Absent:** Hollenhorst, Fletcher

Call to Order: Minutes approved as distributed.

Business: The subcommittee reviewed the position description suggesting a few minor changes agreeing that one last version would be crafted for review. The subcommittee then embarked on a discussion of whether administration on the position description was purely for administrators or could faculty members also include a percentage for administration? There are faculty who oversee several research grants, direct programs, labs, and/or have personnel responsibilities such as employee evaluations. Considering the many new compliance requirements e.g. new homeland security laws, IPO, OSP and HR regulations these faculty should be able to put a percentage under administration. It was agreed that a definition would be clearly written into policy for administration as it applies to the position description. Only those who had a significant amount of time and personnel responsibilities, having been awarded large or many grants, would be able to enter a percentage of time under administration. Interestingly, this discussion brought out the fact that the current position description was filled out by administrators as well, yet it is not directly tied to the administrator's annual evaluation form. The subcommittee agreed that this would need to be looked into as well.

The subcommittee turned its attention to the "annual" column in the summary table, how is it used and how does summer fit into the formula. Several issues were discussed ranging from how spring, fall and summer (9 vs. 12 month faculty) were averaged; weighted by using a calculation of the weeks per semester; determined if summer salary is received; to those who leave the column blank. It was pointed out that only those with 12 month contracts are to fill out the summer column and several members questioned why. The position description is somehow tied to the salary agreement and the constraint may be due to the Board of Regents. Lacking a complete understanding of this topic it was agreed that clarification was needed. Thompson agreed to explore this further and bring her findings back to the subcommittee. *[The scribe (Thompson) discovered that the reference of 12 month contracts and the summer column was added in 2007, but was unable to discover why or who added the reference. She suggests referring this to General Counsel to determine if any Regents policy exists on this topic.]*

The subcommittee then turned its attention to the weighting column on the annual evaluation. Is weighting rated toward amount of effort expended/needed e.g. teaching graduate course compared to freshmen level, teaching one course to teaching two sections of the same course, supervising labs, etc. Teaching is weighted heavier for some departments so whatever score you received in teaching it would be reflected in the overall score. It appeared that most units/faculty ignored the weighting column and thus the subcommittee questioned whether the column was necessary. It was agreed that once again lacking knowledge as to how this column is used further clarification was needed. Houle agreed to review the forms recently received in the Provost's Office and determine how this weighting column was used. She will report back at the next meeting where the subcommittee would then be able to decide whether to eliminate this column, or not.

The subcommittee then turned its attention to the question of the decimal place in the department and college scores on the annual evaluation form. *Faculty-Staff Handbook (FSH) 3320* indicates only whole integers can be used, yet this year instructions for merit raises are to go to those with a 3.0 (Meets Expectations) or above. Does the decimal score mean someone with a 2.9 is below expectations or do we round up? There is no clear description as to how this is handled in the FSH. It was pointed out that faculty will quibble over one decimal point whereas administrators, feeling that a 1.5% merit raise does

not justify the time it takes to quibble, will give everyone a score that awards the raise. After a lengthy discussion on rounding at the department and dean level and where the cutoff would fall for rounding, the subcommittee agreed that it would happen at the college level. The rounding would be as follows: 2.1–2.5 = 2; 2.6–2.9 = 3. It was felt that doing so would do two things: 1. award merit raises to those who deserve them (those above a 2.5) yet still send a clear signal that the faculty member is in trouble and improvement is needed. Both scores would be on the form, the department chair will need to work with or initiate a mentoring process for the faculty member to guide them towards improvement, and the dean is aware there is a problem and it is being addressed.

The subcommittee then took up the narrative evaluation language agreeing to add "for all faculty" following the word narrative in the second sentence; and add the words "by the college" at the end of the third sentence. This change would make it clear that a narrative is required for ALL faculty, not just those who have yet to be tenured and/or promoted. It was pointed out that the narrative needs to be carefully written and follow criteria as described in the unit by-laws; otherwise, mixed messages are sent and legal issues take root. Training in this area is the key. It was also pointed out that unit by-laws need to be up-to-date and must follow FSH 1590 created and approved in 2004.

The subcommittee then questioned the purpose and benefit of the department and college average boxes on the annual evaluation form. The intent of the boxes is to provide overall feedback of where one falls among his/her peers, but the boxes tend to anger faculty causing problems. The subcommittee questioned the value and function of these boxes with one member pointing out that staff are not provided averages of other staff within their unit. It was suggested that perhaps we find out what the criteria was that warranted putting the average of the department and college on the form? *[The scribe's research uncovered the intent of the department/college averages was to put the onus on the faculty member so they would realistically and honestly reflect on their performance relative to that of other faculty members in the unit and take appropriate steps, if necessary.]*

Although the hour was late the subcommittee was unable to avoid dabbling a bit into the agenda item of Civility and Collegiality, referring to it as the "nice quotient." They pondered the questions: What defines the "nice quotient?" and How is the "nice quotient" measured? It was agreed by all that its importance should not be overlooked and that it does tie into Goal IV of the Strategic Action Plan. There is no recourse unless something is written into policy discouraging inappropriate behavior. To be able to hold someone accountable and deny them a raise, documentation is necessary. Scenarios, such as tenured faculty (having nothing to lose) who shut down the productivity of an entire department to the detriment of the unit and university, can then be addressed.

Civil behavior can be included in the Organizational Leadership category. Another suggestion was to include language in the position description that faculty are to be cooperative and a good citizen for the good of the department and university. Another suggestion was that perhaps it could be included in the disclosure of conflicts on the annual evaluation. This suggestion brought up a discussion as to the confusion the disclosure of conflicts has caused, more specifically for staff. It was felt that there appeared to be a lack of information and description as to how to fill out the form when a conflict existed. There is confusion as to what is meant by a "perceived conflict of interest." Many grey areas appear to exist and it was unclear whether a management plan was needed for all perceived conflicts. The subcommittee, having reached no resolution to this issue or whether it wished to explore it further, adjourned at 5:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Assistant to the Faculty Secretary and Scribe
Ann Thompson

UI FACULTY POSITION DESCRIPTION FOR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW for 20__
(REVISED 7-08)

Date: _____ **Department:** _____
Name: _____ **Title/Rank:** _____
Appointment: Academic Year Fiscal Year **Other:** _____
Tenure Status: Nontenured Tenured **Year Tenured:** _____

TEACHING:

Semester	Subject	Course #	Section	Course Credits	Credit Responsibility	Course Title
Spring						
Fall						
Summer						

1. Instruction (FSH 1565 A-2, FSH 3050; Strategic Action Plan Goal 1):

a. Describe additional instructional responsibilities (course redesign; introduction of new delivery methods; involvement in course, program, and university level assessment of student learning outcomes; etc.):

b. Provide a statement of your goals and objectives for teaching. Additionally, include the following areas, as appropriate: advancement, interdisciplinary activity, professional development and professional service*.

Est. Instruction Percentage of Responsibility: Spring: _____ Fall: _____ Summer: _____

2. Advising and Mentoring Students (FSH 1565 A-5; Strategic Action Plan Goal 1):

Advisees (#): Undergraduate (Approx.): Major ____ Minor ____ Certificates ____
 Grad (Major Professor): Doctoral ____ Masters Thesis ____ Masters Non-Thesis ____

Mentees (#): Graduate ____ Undergraduate ____

a. Other Service to Students (organization/program advisers, masters/doctoral committees as opposed to major professor, etc.):

b. Provide a statement of your goals and objectives for advising and mentoring. Additionally, include the following areas, as appropriate: advancement, interdisciplinary activity, professional development and professional service*.

Est. Advising and Mentoring Percentage of Responsibility: Spring: _____ Fall: _____ Summer: _____

Total Teaching Percentage of Responsibility: Spring: _____ Fall: _____ Summer: _____
 (carry forward to summary table)

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (FSH 1565 A-4 & A-10; Strategic Action Plan Goal 2): [Include Teaching/Learning (FSH 1565 A-3-a), Artistic Creativity (FSH 1565 A-3-b), Discovery (FSH 1565 A-3-c), Integration (FSH 1565 A-3-d), and Application and Engagement Activities (FSH 1565 A-3-e)]

Provide a statement of your goals and objectives for scholarship and creative activities. Additionally, include the following areas, as appropriate: advancement, interdisciplinary activity, professional development and professional service*.

Est. Percentage of Responsibility:

Spring: _____ **Fall:** _____ **Summer:** _____
(carry forward to summary table)

OUTREACH AND EXTENSION ACTIVITIES (FSH 1565 A-3-e & A-7, Strategic Action Plan Goal 3):

Provide a statement of your goals and objectives for outreach and extension activities. Additionally, include the following areas, as appropriate: advancement, interdisciplinary activity, professional development and professional service*.

Est. Percentage of Responsibility:

Spring: _____ **Fall:** _____ **Summer:** _____
(carry forward to summary table)

ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP:

1. University Service (See FSH 1565 A-6):

Provide a statement of your goals and objectives for university service. Additionally, include the following areas, as appropriate: advancement, interdisciplinary activity, professional development and professional service*.

Est. University Service Percentage of Responsibility: **Spring:** _____ **Fall:** _____ **Summer:** _____

2. Administration (See FSH 1565 A-8 & A-9):

Provide a statement of your goals and objectives for administration. Additionally, include the following areas, as appropriate: advancement, interdisciplinary activity, professional development and professional service*.

Est. Administration Percentage of Responsibility: **Spring:** _____ **Fall:** _____ **Summer:** _____

Total Organizational Leadership Percentage Responsibility: **Spring:** _____ **Fall:** _____ **Summer:** _____
(carry forward to summary table)

* advancement (FSH ?; Strategic Action Plan C), interdisciplinary activity (?), professional development (FSH ?; Strategic Action Plan E) and professional service (FSH 1565 A-6; Strategic Action Plan D).

Percentage of Responsibility Summary				
Area	Planned Percentage Allocation			
	Spring	Fall	Summer*	Annual
Teaching				
Scholarship and Creative Activities				
Outreach & Extension Activities				
Organizational Leadership				
Total	(All must equal 100%)			

*Summer column should only be completed by faculty members who have a twelve month, fiscal year appointment.

Note from Ann: Because the position description describes a faculty member’s responsibilities, as is set out by the dates indicated on their salary agreement, the summer column should only be completed by faculty members who have a twelve month, fiscal year appointment. Faculty with nine month appointments should address summer activities on their annual evaluation, where appropriate. It could be included, but not be limited to, activities in the areas of advancement, interdisciplinary, professional development, and professional service in any of the four areas.

Chuck if the above is not true with respect to being tied to one’s salary agreement then we need to get General Counsel to come up with a solution that will address those faculty who have a continued responsibility in the summer, e.g. James Fazio who was discussed, and engineering folks who do the JEMM program. I also think we need to have some sort of formula like Pete Haggart shows in his email (below) to a question posed to him so that they understand how the summary table is done. However it does not address an example for someone with summer duties.

Question: All columns in summary table equal 100%? Response by Pete Haggart: Each period column should add up to 100% at the bottom of the column – spring-fall-summer. The PD is showing what the person is doing for each time period and in each period you are accounting for 100% of that person’s time.

Confusion comes in with the “annual” column. There is a basic assumption that needs to be used....most faculty are on 9 mo. Contracts, work in fall and spring (summer should be treated on its own – and would have been had it not been for ag professor who are on 12 mo. Contracts).

Thus, 50% of a normal faculty member’s contract time will be done in each semester. That allows an administrator (or faculty member) to use a multiplication factor of .5 when computing and adding up the effort for each time period in each row of the form (unless some other weighting had been agreed to be all parties – like ag) – the result being a weighted percentage total in the annual column which would also add up to 100% at the bottom of that column – but would also clearly indicate the weighted percentages of the annual contract – like 40% teaching, 55% scholarship, 5% advising.

Example:

	Spring	Fall	Annual
Teaching	10% (x.5)	70% (x.5)	= 40%
Scholarship	85% (x.5)	25% (x.5)	= 55%
Advising	5% (x.5)	5% (x.5)	= 5%
Total	100%	100%	100%

PROPOSED CHANGES TO DATE 3/28/08 w/minor edits/notes.

(FSH 3320)

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM 1: EVALUATION OF FACULTY (INCLUDES DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICTS FSH 6240)

(Confidential)

Name: _____

Date: _____

Department(s): _____

Evaluator(s): _____

Faculty and administrator(s) are to:

1. review and address the objectives as stated on the previous year's position description; and
- ~~2. include under each area any accomplishments in the following areas, as appropriate: advancement (FSH ?; Strategic Action Plan C); interdisciplinary activity (?); professional development (FSH ?; Strategic Action Plan E); professional service (FSH 1565 A-6; Strategic Action Plan D) This is on pos. desc. does it really need repeating here when they are to do 1 above? Eliminating the categories in scholarship: simplifies form and if clearly written in policy (** reference too) it is unnecessary on form, it is on PD.~~

Assigned Responsibilities	Position Description Percentage	Numeric Score *	Weighting (optional)	COMMENTS INCLUDING ACCOMPLISHMENTS and IMPACTS WHEN APPLICABLE (Use back if necessary)
TEACHING** 1. Direct Course Instruction. (FSH 1565 A-2, FSH 3050; Strategic Action Plan Goal 1) 2. Advising and Mentoring Students. (FSH 1565 A-5; Strategic Action Plan Goal 1)				
TOTAL TEACHING				
SCHOLARSHIP and CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (FSH 1565 A-4, A-10; Strategic Action Plan Goal 2) Teaching and learning ** (FSH 1565 A-3-a; Strategic Action Plan Goal 2) Artistic creativity (FSH 1565 A-3-b; Strategic Action Plan Goal 2) Discovery (FSH 1565 A-3-c; Strategic Action Plan Goal 2) Integration (FSH 1565 A-3-d; Strategic Action Plan Goal 2) Application/Engagement (FSH 1565 A-3-e; Strategic Action Plan Goal 2)				
OUTREACH and EXTENSION (FSH 1565 A-3-e, A-7, Strategic Action Plan Goal 3)				
ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP 1. University Service (FSH 1565 A-6) 2. Administration: (FSH 1565 A-8, A-9)				
TOTAL ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP				

~~** The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning is differentiated from Teaching by the requirement that it must be communicated and validated.~~

(Continued on next page)

DRAFT PROPOSED by Houle, Morrison, Thompson

(FSH 3320)

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM 1: EVALUATION OF FACULTY (INCLUDES DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICTS FSH 6240)

(Confidential)

Name: _____

Date: _____

Department(s): _____

Evaluator(s): _____

NOTE: Faculty and administrator(s) are to review and address the objectives as stated on the previous year's position description.

Position Description (PD) Responsibilities	PD %	Numeric Score	PD% x score = total	<u>Weighting? FSH 1590; 3140 B-1; FSH 3320 A-1-d (second paragraph); 3520H; 3560 E-1.</u>	COMMENTS INCLUDING ACCOMPLISHMENTS and IMPACTS WHEN APPLICABLE (Use back if necessary)
TEACHING 1. Instruction (FSH 1565 A-2, FSH 3050; Strategic Action Plan Goal 1) 2. Advising and Mentoring Students (FSH 1565 A-5; Strategic Action Plan Goal 1)					
Total TEACHING					
SCHOLARSHIP and CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (FSH 1565 A-3,A-4,A-10; Strategic Action Plan Goal 2)					
OUTREACH and EXTENSION (FSH 1565 A-3-e,A-7, Strategic Action Plan Goal 3)					
ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP 1. University Service (FSH 1565 A-6) 2. Administration (FSH 1565 A-8, A-9)					
Total ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP					

***Scoring Key**

- 5 = Exceptional performance
- 4 = Above expectations
- 3 = Meets expectations
- 2 = Below expectations
- 1 = Unacceptable performance

Scoring Example:

PD%	Numeric Score	Total	Weighting?
Teaching 65%	4	.65x4 = 2.6	
Scholarship 15%	1	.15x1 = .15	
Outreach & Extension 10%	3	.10x3 = .3	
Org. Leadership 10%	3	.10x3 = .3	
Dept. Chair Score (transfer total to box below)		3.35	

Department & College Score

May reflect a weighting—not necessarily a mathematical average—of the numerical scores by the appropriate position description percentages. The weighted, department score may extend one decimal place. The college dean score is to be rounded: 2.1 – 2.5 = 2.0; 2.6 – 2.9 = 3.0

Department Chair Score

College Dean Score

Narrative Evaluation: A narrative on progress toward promotion and/or tenure is to be completed by all appropriate evaluators (Unit, Center, and/or Interdisciplinary Administrators). Each evaluator is to include a signed narrative for all faculty using separate pages and attach to this form. **If the narrative is not attached the form will be returned by the college.**

Unit Administrator Signature

Interdisciplinary/Center Administrator (when appropriate)

Interdisciplinary/Center Administrator (when appropriate)

Faculty Signature

___ Agree

___ Disagree (summarize reasons below)

Summary of Reasons:

Dean Signature

FSH 6240 Required Disclosure of Conflicts

You must complete this disclosure annually with your performance evaluation. If you have a conflict to disclose then you also will need to complete Form FSH 6240A. Likewise, if there is any change in your circumstance that may give rise to potential conflicts or eliminate potential conflicts previously disclosed, then you will need to complete Form FSH 6240A within 30 days of the change. University of Idaho FSH Policy 6240 Conflicts of Interest or Commitment is available at <http://www.webs.uidaho.edu/fsh/6240.html>. If you have any questions about the form or about specific potential or actual conflicts of interest, please contact your unit administrator or the Chair of the university's Ethical Guidance and Oversight Committee. **Disclose outside employment for compensation of more than 20 hours/week by completing FORM 6240 B – Disclosure of Outside Employment or Consulting for Compensation.**

- I have reviewed FSH 6240 and **DO NOT** have any conflicts of interest, conflicts of commitment or apparent conflicts to report. Please sign and date below.
- I have reviewed FSH 6240 and **DO** have conflicts of interest, conflicts of commitment or apparent conflicts to report. Please, sign below, and fill out form FSH 6240A. Submit completed FSH 6240A to your unit administrator along with separate pages describing a plan to manage each conflict or apparent conflict.

Your signature below certifies that you have reviewed FSH 6240 regarding disclosure of conflicts, and that the information that you provide regarding disclosure of any conflict is accurate to the best of your knowledge as of the date of this document, and you commit to providing an update if a material change occurs in the information you have provided.

Faculty Signature

Weighting Column:

FSH 1590: Each academic unit will develop a set of bylaws, setting forth the rules by which the unit is governed [see 3560, E-1]. The majority of the faculty of the unit, the unit administrator, the dean of the college, and the provost must approve the bylaws and any revisions. The bylaws will undergo review and be re-approved at least every five years and a copy shall be sent to the Office of the Faculty Secretary. Unit bylaws must be consistent with college bylaws and the Faculty-Staff Handbook, and in the event of conflict, the unit bylaws are subordinate. Each unit's bylaws must contain the following information:

1. the mission statement of the unit, including the objectives of the unit and its role;
2. policies on unit governance, including rules of order, meeting procedures, quorum, attendance at meetings, student representation, and voting rights;
3. the organizational structure of the unit, including the responsibilities of the unit administrator and the constitution and function of committees, their terms, and selection procedure;
4. specific departmental procedures, in addition to human resources procedures, by which faculty and staff searches and hirings are conducted;
5. the unit's criteria and procedures for annual performance evaluation and third-year review;
6. the process for negotiation of annual position descriptions;
7. the unit's promotion and tenure guidelines [see 3140, B-1] and procedures; and
8. the procedures for amendment of the bylaws.

FSH 3140 B-1: (Performance Expectations) Each department or unit shall determine the faculty roles and how much value or weight is to be assigned to each of these roles. These determinations shall be documented in the department's or unit's by-laws. Each document shall be reviewed and approved by the college faculty or a committee of the college faculty.

FSH 3320 A-1 d. (Performance Evaluation section). d. Evaluation of Faculty by Unit Administrators. Unit administrators evaluate their faculty members; the performance of each faculty member over the period covered by the evaluation is judged on the basis of the position description(s) in effect during that period. In the case of faculty members holding joint appointments in two or more academic or administrative units, it is the responsibility of the administrator in the faculty member's primary academic discipline to solicit and consider relevant information on job performance from other administrators with responsibility for the faculty member's work. [See also 3080 E.]

Ratings are determined by comparing the faculty member's performance to the position description and the weightings set forth in the departmental by-laws approved by the unit members [*effective Fall 2003*]. The results of the student evaluation of teaching are carefully weighed and used as a factor in this evaluation. For each area of responsibility evaluated, the unit administrator shall describe the basis for conclusion/judgment in assessing the performance of the faculty member. The ratings and additional comments or narrative as the evaluator deems appropriate are entered as indicated on the form. The annual evaluation score for an individual faculty member in Form 1 relates to the individual faculty member's performance evaluation relative to his/her job description. The overall unit average is provided so that each faculty member can gauge his/her performance relative to other faculty members within the unit. After the unit administrator has completed written evaluations and ratings of faculty for the annual review, he or she shall provide, as they become available: [*rev. 7-03*]

- (1) a copy of the written evaluation and ratings to the faculty member,
- (2) comparative information to help assess their performance evaluation and numerical ratings, including, but not limited to:
 - (a) Frequency distribution for overall ratings for the unit
 - (b) Frequency distribution for overall ratings for the college **(Note dept.&college averages reference.)**

FSH 3520 H. (Tenure section) H-1. Departmental Criteria. The faculty of each department or equivalent unit establishes specific criteria in teaching, research, and service pertaining to tenure of their members. The criteria include a statement regarding the value and weight ascribed to interdisciplinary activity. Departmental criteria are subject to review by the college committee on tenure and promotion for consistency with the college criteria. Such criteria may be changed at any time by a majority vote of the departmental faculty, but they must be reviewed for possible changes at intervals not to exceed five years. Any such revision may not be retroactive but, for evaluation purposes, are considered proportionately in conjunction with criteria that were previously in force.

FSH 3560 E. (Promotions section) E-1. Departmental Criteria. The faculty of each department or equivalent unit establishes specific criteria in teaching, research, and service pertaining to promotion in rank of their members. The criteria include a statement regarding the value and weight ascribed to interdisciplinary activity. Departmental criteria are subject to review by the college standing committee on tenure and promotion for consistency with the college criteria. Such criteria may be changed at any time by a majority vote of the departmental faculty, but they must be reviewed for possible changes at intervals not to exceed five years. Any such revisions may not be retroactive but, for evaluation purposes, are considered proportionately in conjunction with criteria that were previously in force.

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO SALARY AGREEMENT FACULTY AND NON-CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL

()
()

Date:

(Name, Department, Title, and Rank)

Base Salary:

TERM OF APPOINTMENT: **August 17, 2008 through May 16 2009 (AY)**
June 29, 2008 through June 27, 2009(FY)

Enter dates if for period **shorter** than fiscal or academic year:
FROM: **TO:**

This agreement confirms the concurrence of the University and the employee regarding the compensation to be provided to the employee for services rendered during the period indicated. The employee is subject to, and responsible for compliance with, the Idaho State Board of Education and Regents of the University of Idaho Governing Policies and Procedures Manual and Rule Manual, as well as the University of Idaho Faculty-Staff Handbook, the University of Idaho Administrative Procedures Manual, and other University policies as all may be amended from time-to-time without notice. The employee specifically recognizes and agrees to abide by the terms set forth in Faculty-Staff Handbook Section 5400, Employment Agreement concerning Patents and Copyrights. Employee also is subject to termination for adequate cause, as a result of a declared financial exigency or program closure, and is subject to non-renewal, all as defined in Regents policies.

Academic-year appointees are committed to fulfill duties and assignments for 1,560 hours (19.5 bi-weeks or 39 weeks -- nine-month appointments). The majority of the faculty will fulfill this assignment during the fall and spring semesters, beginning on August 17, 2008 and ending on May 16, 2009. Payroll dates for academic year employees are June 29, 2008 through June 27, 2009.

It is further agreed that any academic-year appointee who ceases to work for the University during the term of employment provided herein and has received more than a pro-rata portion of the salary to which that person is entitled must repay the University the excess payment within 30 days after the termination of his or her service. This provision is applicable to persons who resign, are discharged for cause, or are granted leave of absence without pay.

All fiscal-year employees are subject to regular assignment throughout the year. Appointment and payroll dates for fiscal year employees are June 29, 2008 through June 27, 2009. Salary will be paid in bi-weekly installments on the usual paydays of the University.

This agreement constitutes the entire agreement of the parties, and there are no oral or other written agreements existing relative to the employment relationship of the parties unless specifically incorporated under "Other Conditions" below. This agreement may be modified only in writing when signed by all parties and, when applicable, approved by the Regents of the University of Idaho.

This agreement is subject to final approval by The Regents of the University of Idaho or the President of the University and must be signed by the employee and returned to the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President by June 6, 2008 to make the appointment effective.

OTHER CONDITIONS:

ACCEPTED:

Employee

Date

For the University

Date