University of Idaho
2007-2008
FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA

Meeting #22
Tuesday, March 25, 2008, 3:30 p.m.
Brink Hall Faculty Lounge

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2007-08 Faculty Council Meeting #20, March 4, 2008

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.
   • Advancement (Chris Murray)
   • Goal IV (Mark Edwards/Jeanie Harvey)
   • Enrollment Management (Bruce Barnes)

VI. Committee Reports.

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Don Crowley, Chair 2007-2008, Faculty Council

Attachments:
   Minutes of 2007-2008 FC Meeting #20, March 4, 2008
University of Idaho
FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES

2007-2008 Meeting #20, Tuesday, March 4th, 2008

Present: Adams (w/o vote), Baker (w/o vote), Crowley (chair), Fritz, Guilfoyle, Griff, Machlis, McCaffrey, McCollough, McDaniel, Mihelich, Miller, Oman, Rush, Schmiege, Sullivan, Ci. Williams, Wilson. Liaisons: Crepeau (Idaho Falls), Newcombe (Coeur d’Alene).

Absent: Hubbard, Murphy, Ripplinger, Rowland, Schmeckpeper, Ch. Williams, Stauffer (Boise)

Observers: 4

A quorum being present, the chair called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m. in the Brink Hall Faculty Lounge.

Minutes: It was moved and seconded (Miller, McDaniel) to accept the minutes of the February 26th meeting as distributed with one editorial correction. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair’s Report: The chair reported a request for a member of Faculty Council or, more generally, a faculty member to be part of a task force reviewing responses to the RFP for outsourcing the bookstore. He noted that the request came with a very tight time-line and any proposed names would have to come by this Thursday. He also noted that, at the request of the presenters of the resolution of indirect costs, further discussion of the resolution would be postponed until council’s March 18th meeting when vice president Tracy, and perhaps others, could be present.

Provost’s Report: The provost devoted his comments to outlining the schedule for the adoption of the FY09 budget. February 29th was the deadline for deans and other unit administrators to produce reallocation plans, this week he expected the legislature to signal strongly what would be the universities’ appropriation for next year, and on April 7th proposed student fee increases would be presented to the board and hopefully a decision made at that time. With all the major revenue pieces in place, there would follow a ten-day period of final planning, estimating, and consideration of the cost/benefits of proposed reallocations. The final budget would be presented to the Regents on May 22nd.

The ensuing discussion noted that reallocating funding meant that there were trade-offs and those trade-offs needed to be looked at seriously, as should be the long-term return on new (i.e., reallocated) investments. A councilor noted that almost everything we did as an institution (he excepted auxiliary services) involved some sort of subsidy: reallocation meant shifting a subsidy from one unit to another.

FC-08-044: Planned Retirement Options Program: Paul Michaud, Assistant Vice President of Human Resources, and Linda Peavey, Director of Benefit Services, frequent (and welcome) visitors to Faculty Council provided background on the administrative proposal to offer an optional, two-year phased retirement program (as mentioned by the president at our last meeting). Employees (staff and faculty alike) would be eligible if they were at least 55 years of age and had at least ten years of service to the university (at the time of retirement). In the first year of this two-year program, a participant would reduce his or her workload to between 75 and 50%, with a concomitant reduction in salary; in the second year workload and salary would be 50%. The university would continue to make the equivalent of a full-time contribution to the participant’s health insurance premium. This program would be voluntary but would have to be mutually acceptable to employee and to the administrator of his or her unit (the college dean in the case of faculty members).

The possible advantages to the employee were the ability to bridge the transition from full-time work to full-time retirement and to better deal with the vicissitudes of life, e.g., the necessity of becoming a caregiver for parent or spouse. For the unit it might mean a smoother transition between the old employee and a newly hired replacement, particularly as it might be possible to hire a new employee using the half-time
 savings from the old employees line (plus presumably some extra money from other sources) while the old employee is still present, though with reduced workload.

Subsequent discussion elicited the fact that a faculty member entering PROP would not have to relinquish his or her tenure. The relinquishment of tenure would come only upon full retirement. For faculty and staff on PERSI, each of the two PROP years would count as twelve full months as far as the PERSI formula is concerned; the “highest 42 months” part of the formula would presumably remain exactly where they were on entering PROP, as it would not be expected that two years at a three-quarter or half-time would be in an employee’s peak earning years. (Incidentally, employees would remain eligible for raises under PROP but would not be eligible for promotions or, if faculty, sabbatical leaves or professional leave for staff.)

Several councilors wondered whether this program would have many takers, given the relative lack of incentives (e.g., when compared to past retirement programs offered by the university). Obviously only time could answer that question. Another councilor argued strongly that the program being offered was too restrictive, particularly in being only two-years long. His experience showed that going half-time for longer periods (e.g., five years) had produced mutually beneficial results for a faculty member and college. The provost assured council that, if adopted, PROP would not preclude other, individually negotiated, mutually beneficial, phased retirement possibilities.

FC-08-042: FSH 3440, Compensation for Classified Employees and FC-08-043: FSH 3460, Overtime Work, Comp Time & Holidays: April Preston, Director of Employment Services, noted that these changes, brought to Faculty Council as information items, made corrections to these sections of the Handbook made necessary by the disappearance of the “classified exempt” category. There were no questions.

FC-08-040: Report from Committee on Committees: Karen Guilfoyle, chair of the Committee on Committees, briefly introduced the proposed changes to the Campus Planning Advisory Committee and to Juntura. In the case of the Juntura, the Committee on Committee’s recommendations were based on the recommendations of the affected committee and its former chair. In the case of the Campus Planning Advisory Committee the recommendations arose from the long-standing difficulty of finding three willing members of Faculty Council and the desire for non-Faculty Council faculty to be able to serve. The motion came as a seconded motion from the Committee on Committees and carried unanimously.

FC-08-041: Editorial Change to FSH 1620, University-Level Committees: In introducing this proposed change to FSH 1620, the faculty secretary noted that it was basically editorial. The council had voted last fall to make Faculty Council the final approver of additions, deletions, and changes to the Faculty Council committee structure. That change had been approved by the university faculty and by the president. However, the resultant wording was not as explicit about that responsibility as it should be; the proposed change was to make it explicit. The motion carried unanimously.

Adjournment: It was moved and seconded (Sullivan, Griff) to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Q. Adams,
Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Council
Campaign Idaho: Silver and Bold

Faculty Council Report

March 2008
Presentation Objectives

• Private Support
• Building a campaign infrastructure
  – People
  – Processes
  – Funding
• Campaign update
Funding Sources

• State appropriations
• Tuition/fees
• Contract/grants
• Private support
Private Support

• Most opportunity/potential
• Encourages prioritization
• Leverage/matching
Total Needs?

• In excess of $1 Billion
A Campaign Goal

• The most we can successfully raise
• Doubling formula ($19M 4-yr avg.)
• Infrastructure analysis
• Prioritizing
• Donor Interest
Testing $300 Million:

- Campaign table
- Gift pyramid
- Prospect review/wealth screening
- Bentz Whaley Flessner report
Campaign Table

- See Attachment A
Gift Pyramid

• See Attachment B
Infrastructure

- Virtually non-existent
- Hybrid Model (deployment)
- Major Giving = Personnel
  (Benchmarking)
- Annual Fund vs Major giving
- Alumni participation
Major Giving = Personnel

- 80/20 rule – 90/10 rule
- Major Gift program results are heavily dependent on investments in staffing
- Increases in total gifts occur because of productive major gift programs

See Attachment C
Development Infrastructure

- 20 incumbents from 7-1-06
- Hired 20
- 15 positions open
- Total development staff - 55
Processes

• U of I Organization – MOU
• Foundation – organization and fees
• Portfolio guidelines – measuring ROI
• Moves management system
Funding

- University must invest
- Foundation investment is critical
- Measuring those investments is key
Campaign Update

• Campaign plan is complete
• Campaign priorities are complete
• Silent phase
  – Leadership gifts
  – Volunteer structure/involvement
Campaign Priorities

• Campaign cornerstones
  – Students $45.85 million
  – Faculty $49.35 million
  – Programs $48.15 million
  – Facilities $156.65 million

• Case statements
  – University, units
  – Needs menu
Questions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/unit</th>
<th>Campaign Goal</th>
<th>Annual Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural and Life Sciences</td>
<td>$30M</td>
<td>$3.75M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and Architecture</td>
<td>$5M</td>
<td>$625K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>$50M</td>
<td>$6.25M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Economics</td>
<td>$25M</td>
<td>$3.125M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$7M</td>
<td>$875K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>$30M</td>
<td>$3.75M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>$13M</td>
<td>$1.625M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences</td>
<td>$15M</td>
<td>$1.875M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>$13M</td>
<td>$1.625M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>$12M</td>
<td>$1.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>$100M</td>
<td>$12.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$300 Million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Campaign Gift Pyramid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gift Range</th>
<th># Gifts</th>
<th>Range Total</th>
<th># Prospects</th>
<th>Cumulative Total</th>
<th>Averages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>30,000,000</td>
<td>$17M/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>$55,000,000</td>
<td>1-2 gifts /year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>$75,000,000</td>
<td>3/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>9 – 15</td>
<td>$105,000,000</td>
<td>4/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>$135,000,000</td>
<td>5/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum Principal</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>36 - 60</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$17M/year</strong></td>
<td><strong>153 gifts/year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,000+</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>60 - 100</td>
<td>$155,000,000</td>
<td>3/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>60 – 100</td>
<td>$170,000,000</td>
<td>3/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>90 – 150</td>
<td>$185,000,000</td>
<td>4/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>120 – 200</td>
<td>$195,000,000</td>
<td>5/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>600 – 1,000</td>
<td>$210,000,000</td>
<td>25/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000+</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>900 – 1,500</td>
<td>$225,000,000</td>
<td>38/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>1,800 – 3,000</td>
<td>$240,000,000</td>
<td>75/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum Major</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,210</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,630 – 6,060</strong></td>
<td><strong>$105,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13M/year</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7.5M/year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $25K</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>$60,000,000</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>$300,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum Annual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$7.5M/year</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Development Staff Sizes: Idaho and Peer Universities

**FY2006 - 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Major Giving</th>
<th>Planned Giving</th>
<th>Annual Giving</th>
<th>Donor Relations/Stewardship</th>
<th>Prospect Development</th>
<th>Other Development Staff</th>
<th>Total Staff*</th>
<th>Total Gifts FY 2002 – 06 Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$24.4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$33.8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>$52.1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>$45.2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>$118.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico State</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$33.2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$33.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>$35.2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>$126.4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>$140.7M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada, Reno</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$22.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$21.8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$18.8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>$47.0M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Professional staff
Source: Staff Rosters on universities’ website and CASE Directory; Voluntary Support of Education/CAE Reports

Source: Voluntary Support of Education/CAE Reports