I. Call to Order.

II. Consent Agenda.

III. Minutes.
   - Minutes of the 2014-15 Faculty Senate Meeting #16, January 27, 2015 (vote)

IV. Chair’s Report.

V. Provost's Report.

VI. Committee Reports.
   - University Budget & Finance Committee
     - Change in Employee Compensation Distribution (Pendegraft)

VII. Other Announcements and Communications.

VIII. Special Orders.

IX. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

X. New Business.

XI. Adjournment.

Professor Marty Ytreberg, Chair 2014-2015, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2014-2015 FS Meeting #16
              UBFC reports
Chair Ytreberg called the meeting to order at 3:34. A few minutes were spent sorting out the new system of connecting with off campus sites. Neither the visual nor the audio quality is what we would hope for.

A motion to approve the minutes (Wolf, Lowe) for meeting #15, December 9th, 2014 was approved without objection and three abstentions.

Chair's Report: We had a great turnout at the UFM on January 15th. All Senate proposals from the fall semester were passed. Next week Norm Pendegraft and Keith Ickes from UBFC (University Budget and Finance Committee) will present their thoughts to the Senate. This will be the only agenda item for next week which should leave a lot of time for discussion. Trish Hartzell will be back to discuss student evaluations in two weeks. The 5th Woman's Leadership Conference will be at the UI on March 25th. Those who have ideas about workshops should submit them by February 2nd.

The Chair noted that Mark Miller current Senate member and longtime Associate Director of the Idaho Commons & Student Union is retiring. A retirement celebration will be held tomorrow at 3:30 in the Panorama Room of the Commons.

Provost Report: Jeanne Stevenson (sitting in for Provost Aiken) discussed President Staben’s presentation to JFAC. She noted that the UI proposed that if the state legislature fully funds a 3% change in CEC (change in compensation) than we will not seek a tuition increase. Last week in Boise the UI celebrated the conclusion of its fundraising campaign. The campaign exceeded its initial target. Vice Provost Stevenson encouraged Senators to attend open forums for the various ongoing searches. The Chamber Auditorium Series featuring the Jupiter String Quartet is this Thursday at 7:30. The nomination deadline for various excellence awards is at end of this week.

The Chair invited representatives from the Tobacco Compromise Group to present their ideas to the Senate. Professor Steve Peterson and students Joseph Cook and Erin Phipps came forward to present their plan for a compromise on the question of whether the UI campus should be tobacco free by next year. Mr. Cook noted the various activities his group had engaged in to help inform the campus community on the issue. He suggested that many people still did not realize that this change was coming. His group is proposing that instead of a “tobacco free” campus we should seek a compromise involving designated smoking areas. The group believes their desired compromise has not received enough attention as an option to either no change or a complete ban.

Professor Steve Peterson suggested that if given an open choice on campus the designated smoking area would prevail but that option has been taken off the table from the very beginning. He argued that pursuing a complete ban had too many parallels to the “war on drugs” which has generated a great deal of negative consequences in the United States. Professor Peterson also suggested that there has been a lot of misinformation on campus about their proposed compromise as well as the likely consequences of a complete tobacco ban. He stated that there is no evidence that a failure to enact a ban will lead to a
loss of research dollars. A ban will not have a positive effect on student enrollment and their proposal for designated areas will not cost a lot of money. He also suggested a ban would have a discriminatory effect on UI classified staff who would have a far more difficult time getting off campus than faculty. His assertion that a person would have to go 1-2 miles to get off campus was disputed by various Senators.

Generally Professor Peterson doubted that campus tobacco bans would work and suggested that exposure to outdoor smoke was more of a nuisance than a serious health risk. The tobacco compromise group would like to see a ballot involving faculty, students, and staff to decide among the various options. If this occurred they believe that the designated smoking areas would prevail. Several Senators indicated general support for a poll or ballot measure testing support for the possible options although one Senator doubted that a vote was the best way to arrive at a finely tailored policy that respected the needs of the variety of groups on campus while also promoting a healthy campus.

A Senator inquired as to the current status of the tobacco ban proposal. Chair Ytreberg responded that in his view there has not been an official plan endorsed by the President. President Staben has made comments that suggest support for a tobacco free campus but that he wanted the University community to decide.

Asked if there weren’t already designated smoking areas on campus Professor Peterson suggested that there currently isn’t an effective policy and many of the smoking areas were too close to buildings. He acknowledged that any policy would have enforcement problems but that under their plan smokers would have incentive to make it work to avoid a complete ban.

Several Senators were highly critical of aspects of the presentation of the tobacco compromise group. Some suggested that the group was engaging in exaggeration and scare tactics and the analogy to the “war on drugs” was disingenuous and embarrassing. Professor Peterson defended his use of the “war on drugs” analogy saying he hoped to communicate that such prohibitions don’t work and have unintended consequences.

A Senator suggested that she was less interested in the discussion of enforcement and more interested in the University modeling desirable behavior for future generations. The University has a responsibility to consider the culture of our campus and what behaviors we want to model. The compromise group suggested that a ban would not decrease smoking for future generations while a member of the Tobacco Task Force suggested that there was research indicating that individuals faced with a ban would be more likely to make an attempt to quit.

Another Senator noted that tobacco is a carcinogen and exposing people to second hand smoke is dangerous. As the conversation came to a close the status of tobacco on campus remained cloudy.

**Facilities.** The Chair invited Brian Johnson (Assistant Vice President, Facilities) to discuss the status of facilities on campus. Mr. Johnson presented a number of slides regarding investment in facilities and building maintenance. A Canadian consulting firm (Sightlines) recently visited campus and pointed to an alarming increase in unmet capital renewal needs. Sightlines did state that we were spending our resources on the right things. There is around a billion dollars in facilities on campus and it is thought to be desirable to reinvest 3% a year in keeping everything functional. That would mean around 30 million a year for the UI. This is an idealized target which we clearly don’t meet. The UI remains below the level that our peers are able to reinvest in building maintenance and housing struggles at an even lower rate.
Mr. Johnson also discussed the current University priorities which include: the IRIC, the Education Building, Northern Idaho Collaborative Education Facility, Research and Classroom Facility, the Aquaculture Research Lab, and the Idaho Law and Justice Learning Center in Boise.

When asked how faculty can help Mr. Johnson noted that apart from being able to make a major contribution that faculty can help by getting rid of unwanted items and report anything that is broken.

A Senator asked about the benefits of investing in the President’s House. Mr. Johnson noted that when President Nellis left it appeared to be a good time to look at the house with the hope that a new house would serve as a recruiting tool. Some donors who wanted to fix the badly outdated President’s House were found although that process has taken a while.

Another Senator asked about the condition of sidewalks after the last snowstorm. Mr. Johnson acknowledged that the condition of the sidewalks after the last snow/ice storm was bad. In general he commended our crew for doing a good job dealing with snow and making the campus a lot better than other areas in town.

There was a short discussion of housing and the aging dorm facilities and their possible effect on the UI’s goal to increase student enrollment. While noting that he was not the housing expert which is handled by another office on campus, University Housing, he mentioned Housing must generate their own funds. The only way to do this is to charge students but that alone does not support Housing’s needs. Housing has some very tough challenges and are in a different situation than Facilities.

Mr. Johnson was asked several questions dealing with the difficulty of addressing the deferred maintenance problem which now is over $220 million. Mr. Johnson pointed out that we had received one time funding to deal with some problems but that we struggled to obtain funds to deal with the ongoing problem. The State does not always provide occupancy costs and it is frequently easier to focus on immediate problems than deal with long term maintenance. In a similar vein donors are usually less interested in providing funds for ongoing maintenance than in providing funds for new facilities.

**Adjournment:** The Chair thanked Brian for the discussion and entertained a motion (Foster/Teal) to adjourn at 5:07. The motion passed unanimously.

Don Crowley, Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Senate
To: Marty Ytreberg, UI Faculty Senate Chair  
From: Norman Pendegraft, Chair  
   University Budget and Finance Committee  
Re: CEC Allocation

Attached is the committee’s report to the Senate regarding allocation of Change in Employee Compensation (CEC). The committee’s discussions were spirited and far ranging. I believe that the final report reflects the overall consensus of the committee.
Summary

Pursuant to your request of 24 Sept. 2014, the UBFC has discussed the allocation of Change in Employee Compensation (CEC). We first identified a number of possible policies that might be used. We used approval voting to select a shorter list. We examined those in more detail to determine our recommendations. Please note that the committee was not necessarily unanimous in its opinions, but the recommendations are a fair representation of the members’ opinions.

The committee’s recommendations include suggestions that portions of a CEC be allocated across the board, to merit, to relieving compression and inversion, and to raising the university’s lowest salaries. We also recommend that division heads be given some flexibility in the allocation and that some consideration be given to addressing compression and inversion over the long run.

Discussion

We begin our report with a brief review of the university’s budget for the current fiscal year ending 30 June 2015 (FY2015).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Operating Budget:</th>
<th>$371M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Budgeted Faculty FTE:</td>
<td>~825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budgeted Faculty Salary:</td>
<td>$66M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budgeted Staff FTE:</td>
<td>~1,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budgeted Staff Salary:</td>
<td>$75M (includes TA/RA and IH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budgeted Salary:</td>
<td>$141M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of a 1% salary increase:</td>
<td>$1.4M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In our first discussions, we identified several possible policies. CEC could be allocated according to: merit, compression, inversion, lowest paid staff (with several variations), peer comparisons, allocating more to staff than to faculty, investing in new faculty, retaining current faculty, using a rolling average, and longevity. Many of these overlapped. After some discussion we used approval voting to select a subset for more detailed examination. That resulted in four policies making the short list: merit, inversion, compression, and low pay. Subsequent discussions resulted in “across the board” being added to the list. After further discussion we lumped compression and inversion together because they represent similar issues. Ultimately, the committee decided to lump these together with merit believing that they are inseparable. We discuss each of these below.

The opinion has been expressed in the Senate that a disproportionate share of any CEC should be directed to staff. The committee did not share this opinion.

Merit

By merit we mean evaluation via annual performance reviews. (Concern was raised that in the past merit was not evaluated consistently across campus. The committee believes that this is an important issue but not within the purview of this assignment.) This policy may also address compression and inversion.
It was noted that in the past the legislature has occasionally mandated that CEC (or some of it) be used for merit. The opinion was expressed that the long-term health of the university depends on its ability to attract and keep good faculty, and that this need is partly addressed by the merit policy. Thus, we concluded that merit is a very important part of any CEC allocation.

Inversion and Compression

Inversion and compression are related and so are addressed together. By compression, we mean a situation in which an employee who has had good annual evaluations for many years is making only slightly more than someone in a similar position who has been employed a much shorter time. This is an issue for faculty as well as staff. Inversion is the situation in which a long-term employee is paid less than a newer employee. This is also an issue with faculty and staff. There are some departments that have assistant professors paid more than some full professors.

The committee examined data from six academic departments with salary plotted against time since last degree. There were many cases of compression and inversion. There are many possible explanations, so these data are not prima fascia evidence of inequity, but nonetheless raise questions. The committee recommends that division heads be asked to examine cases of inversion or compression and either offer a justification for each case or a plan for relieving it over time. The committee also recommends that dealing with inversion and compression should be long term goals of the university’s allocation of future CEC’s. The committee notes that these are not problems that will be dealt with quickly. Because the issue is so important, the committee believes that the university should start now and continue to address the issue over the coming years.

Low Pay

The final issue on the short list was lowest paid employees. In particular, there was concern over those paid less than $27,600 for full time employment. That number being the “living wage” for a family of four in Moscow. It is important to note that some of these employees are low skilled workers at ag stations outside of Moscow, so the Moscow “living wage” is not necessarily the correct metric. (The committee chose the term “low pay” rather than “living wage” because the latter is a technical term with a specific meaning.) The committee obtained data from the HR department which is summarized in the Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
<th>Current Salary Total for Group</th>
<th>Annual Cost of Goal $22,000</th>
<th>Annual Cost of Goal $25,000</th>
<th>Annual Cost of Goal $27,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$22,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$42,328</td>
<td>$1,673</td>
<td>$7,673</td>
<td>$11,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$22,000 - $25,000</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>$2,319,400</td>
<td>$130,601</td>
<td>$326,601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $27,000</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>$1,664,840</td>
<td>$63,159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,026,568</td>
<td>$1,673</td>
<td>$138,274</td>
<td>$401,433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Total Cost of Raises by Group and Target Minimum

The committee recommends that some of a CEC be used to raise the salaries of those with the lowest pay. Since these employees are not distributed uniformly across units, the committee recommends that this portion of a CEC be managed centrally.

The committee understands that in recent years many such low paid positions have not been approved by the administration. The committee applauds that position and suggests that it be maintained.

Finally, the committee calls your attention to the fact that any part of a CEC allocated this way will exacerbate the problem of compression. Since it will raise the salaries of those in a
particular salary range but not the one above, it will reduce the difference between those ranges. Many of those in the next ranges will have greater time in rank and skills than those in the lower range and may feel that they have been selectively disadvantaged by this policy.

CEC Recommendations
The committee’s primary recommendation is summarized in the table below. The committee also recommends that
1. The portion of any CEC used to raise the lowest wage to $25,000 should be managed centrally.
2. Division heads should be directed to examine inversion and compression cases and, for each, justify the situation and, when applicable, offer a plan for relieving the situation.
3. CEC allocated for merit / inversion / compression and across the board should be allocated based on current salary before any low pay adjustment is made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1% CEC</th>
<th>2% CEC</th>
<th>2.5% or greater CEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>merit / inversion / compression</td>
<td></td>
<td>remainder</td>
<td>based on current salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>across the board</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low pay</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>~$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Considerations
The committee reviewed a portion of the WSU Faculty Manual. It clearly delineates how raises for faculty are to be allocated at WSU. This may be of some interest to senators. [http://facsen.wsu.edu/faculty_manual/Faculty_Manual_2014%2808.20.14%29.pdf](http://facsen.wsu.edu/faculty_manual/Faculty_Manual_2014%2808.20.14%29.pdf) (see p61:6,Salary)

Across the board raises apply only to those meeting or exceeding expectations.
Any CEC will likely result in increases in rates charged by auxiliary services as they must fund their own raises.
Federal regulations require that all employees be treated the same way with respect to CEC.
To: Marty Ytreberg, UI Faculty Senate Chair

From: Norman Pendegraft, Chair
        University Budget and Finance Committee
Re: Cost of Hiring Faculty

Attached is the committee’s report to the Senate regarding Cost of Hiring Faculty. The committee assigned this task to a subcommittee chaired by Prof. Brandt. The full committee subsequently adopted the report of the subcommittee as its own.
University of Idaho  
University Budget and Finance Committee  
Report to Faculty Senate  
on  
Costs of Hiring New Faculty  
28Jan2015  

We contacted the deans of each of the colleges and asked them to supply three sets of information: 
1. Cost of the search process. Please include the following costs where applicable: advertising; travel for either the candidate, candidate’s spouse or members of the search committee; meals associated with the hiring process; communication costs over and above normal budget items such as for conferencing). 
2. Costs of bringing a new employee on board at the UI such as travel to look for housing if subsidized and moving expenses. 
3. Startup costs. Please include whatever costs your college/department would consider in bringing in a new faculty member such as scientific equipment and laboratory startups, specialized equipment and software acquisitions, summer salary. 

The attached spreadsheet summarizes the information provided. 

It is clear from the information that hiring new faculty is an expensive and time consuming effort for the University. The average cost of a faculty search is $5800. This number does not include the time of the staff and faculty engaged in the search. Dean Stauffer of the College of Engineering estimated the time cost to the College of Engineering for evaluating faculty candidates exceeds $12,000/search accounting for the involvement of faculty committee members, the chair of the search committee, the involvement of the Dean and the time of staff supporting the search. 

Moving expenses for new faculty averaged $7000. 

By far the greatest and most variable cost of hiring new faculty was the “startup” investment made by the University. This cost varies substantially depending on the discipline of the new faculty member. Moreover, the cost to the university does not represent the full cost of start up as many of the deans detailed the efforts undertaken with granting agencies and other institutions to share and control startup costs. Each of these arrangements represents a substantial investment of time and good will by University officials. 

Startup costs ranged from $2500 to $600,000. These startup costs involve three different components. First, colleges make direct financial investments in supporting new faculty. These startup investments are reflected in the attached spreadsheet. Depending on the college and department, these costs can include outfitting laboratories and purchasing equipment to support scientific research, providing computing resources to support teaching and research, upgrading art, dance, music and physical education studio space to support creative activity and enabling faculty to arrive on campus to begin their research and prepare for teaching prior to the start of the academic year contract on August 15. 

Second, opportunity costs are incurred when experienced faculty leave and new faculty are hired. These costs are not reflected in the spreadsheet numbers. Whenever an experienced faculty member is replaced with a new faculty member, opportunity costs are incurred. Dean Stauffer reported that since 2011, the College of Engineering has hired 27 new faculty members. All but two of these hires
replaced more senior faculty who retired or left the university. This turnover results in a substantial lost opportunity cost to the University as it takes three to five years before a new faculty member is able to be a productive and contributing member of the faculty. He concludes that “[a]bout 40% of our college faculty will be new in a 5-year period. This is a tremendous disruption.”

Third, startup often includes indirect costs and cost sharing by research and agency partners of the University. A number of college deans reported on indirect costs associated with hiring new faculty. Dean Pregitzer, of the College of Natural Resources, reported recent startups have included such costs as negotiating super-computer time with another institution. Dean Joyce, at the College of Science elaborated that to implement recent startup packages, his college has worked with institutes such as IBEST, and granting agencies such as INBRE and EPSCoR. WWAMI faculty startup is covered by the WWAMI program itself. Moreover, Dean Joyce adds, that the College of Science has left positions open in order to capture the salary savings for startup, given up F & A on research grants that new hires obtain in exchange for startup support and borrowed from the Vandal Loan Fund to support startup packages.

The cost of hiring new faculty is significant. On average, combined search and moving expenses for a new faculty member are almost $13,000. As indicated, this number does not include the time of UI faculty staff and administrators devoted to the search and hiring process. Moreover, the University invests heavily in startup costs for new faculty. The burden of these start up investments has resulted in serious compromises at the College level in hiring, commitments from external partners of the university, and loan liability.
# Faculty Hiring Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agricultural &amp; Life Sciences</th>
<th>Art &amp; Architecture</th>
<th>Business &amp; Economics</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Letters, Arts &amp; Social Sciences</th>
<th>Natural Resources</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total hires, if available</td>
<td>14 since 2010</td>
<td>27 since 2011</td>
<td>4 since 2011</td>
<td>16 since 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average search costs</td>
<td>$4,118.50</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$9,693.79</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$7,300.00</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
<td>$4,626.00</td>
<td>$4,631.00</td>
<td>$3,989.00</td>
<td>$5,762.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving and onboarding</td>
<td>$5,527.75</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$8,395.52</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$9,300.00</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
<td>$5,700.00</td>
<td>$6,700.00</td>
<td>$6,712.50</td>
<td>$7,037.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Startup range:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High startup</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$280,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low startup</td>
<td>$27,000.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average, if provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$117,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University Budget Finance Committee - Hiring Costs Subcommittee

1/20/2015