University of Idaho
2008-2009 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA
Meeting #13

Tuesday, December 2, 2008, 3:30 p.m.
BRINK HALL FACULTY LOUNGE

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2008-09 Faculty Council Meeting #12, November 18, 2008

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.
   • Approval of Fall 2008 Graduates
   • Advising, Assessment, Professional Development (Christiansen)

VI. Committee Reports.

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.
   • Program Prioritization Process

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Karen Guilfoyle, Chair 2008-2009, Faculty Council

Attachments: Minutes of 2008-2009 FC Meeting #12, November 18, 2008
Present: Baker (w/o vote), Battaglia, Chandler, Crowley, Eveleth, Fairley, Frey, Guilfoyle (chair), Hill (w/o vote), Holbrook, Huber, Machlis, Miller, Murphy, Oman, Das, Schmeckpeper, Sullivan, Wilson. Liaisons: Budwig (Boise), Newcombe (Coeur d’Alene), Crepeau (Idaho Falls).
Absent: Baird, Fritz, Holthaus, Limbaugh, Schmiege, Williams
Guests 3.

A quorum being present, the chair called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m. in the Brink Hall Faculty Lounge.

Minutes: It was moved and seconded (Murphy, Machlis) to accept the minutes of the November 11 meeting (Meeting #11) of the 2008-2009 Faculty Council as distributed. The motion carried.

Chair’s Report: The chair thanked the FAC chair for the work he did in presenting the PD&AE and FC vice-chair for his efforts in bringing the two constitution changes (faculty council to faculty senate and center representation) to the General Faculty meeting held the previous day. The chair thanked those who were able to attend then noted that there was not a quorum, and asked for suggestions from FC members to encourage faculty attendance at General Faculty Meetings.

Calculation of the quorum number and the potential to introduce the notion of off-campus voting was discussed. A quorum requires 1/6th of the Moscow faculty number to be present in the meeting. By tradition and bound to Roberts Rules of Order, those eligible to vote need to be physically present.

The chair moved on to the topic of the president search and noted that there were approximately 40 applicants and the process was moving forward. Brief questions and discussion followed:

Was a professional recruitment firm involved in the process?
Yes. The chair felt comfortable with the integrity of the firm that was engaged.

The chair also noted that she had received feedback from FC members who had been proactive in meeting with their deans to discuss the PPP. The chair encouraged FC members to continue active involvement and looked forward to the discussion items that would ensue in up-coming FC meetings.

Provost’s Report: The provost wished to provide further clarification on budget reallocations and process as discussed in the recent General Faculty Meeting. Last summer UI instituted a budget reallocation in the amount of $6.2M to focus funds to strategic priorities. In the fall, the governor forewarned of a possible state hold-back of 1% of state funds and recommended to also hold an additional 1.5%. With the national fiscal meltdown, this number may now be revised to be as high as 5% and will be confirmed this week by the DFM. Questions and discussion followed:

The president had mentioned in the General Faculty Meeting that the total hold-back may be $20M. Is this the case?
Clarifying, the summer reallocation was $6.2M. This year (FY09) the total hold-back will be in the range of $2.5 to $5M, and in FY10, an additional $2.5-$5M. In addition, normal inflationary increases would add a further $2-$4M. In this last-mentioned category, the following are included: enrollment workload adjustment, an increase in insurance costs, and planning for an emergency fund reserve. Thus, the $20
M figure represents a reduction in funding available over two to three years. In the context of the entire institutional annual budget of approximately $440M, this reduction will be coming from the state allocation of approximately $96M.

*Was it possible for UI to put pressure on the state board to defer the enrollment workload adjustment amount in the present fiscal climate?*

The provost noted that the question will be put and discussions with the state board on this issue will be pursued.

*Considering the large inflationary costs noted, what are longer-term plans for dealing with these items?*

The cost of energy is a moving target. For example last year the $30M ESCO (energy savings program) was implemented to reduce energy consumption across the board. On the other side of the ledger, some revenues are projected to increase through previous strategic investments.

The question of apportionment of appropriated fund cuts was raised. There are some parts of the university that are more dependent than others on appropriated funds. If an across-the-board cut is made to deal with the short-fall it is in effect, a disproportionate cut to some units. *The question is: should units that have access to funds that aren’t appropriated bear a larger proportion of the cuts?* Yes this factor will be taken into consideration. A model for the process is under development.

*As salary lines hold a large proportion of total funds, is it feasible to continue the position hire pause?*

The deans have already held back positions. This has been under discussion in Provost’s Council and deans will be coming forward with a subset of priority hires. The great majority of new hires over the last year have been consistent with the SAP.

*How far into the future will the negative effects of the enrollment workload adjustment persist?*

Being on a three year rolling average, student numbers are up this year so this will take a further two years to take effect on the EWA.

*What is the return and when will we see further returns on the recent strategic investment?*

The most immediate effect was seen in a 24% increase in graduate enrollment. There will be lag effects with the other categories for example investment in advancement and in the research office.

*Many faculty are very concerned about the future of the institution following the President’s comments on the budget holdbacks.*

It is a very serious situation but we are well-placed to deal with it and it does not mean the end of the university. We have to plan carefully. We are well into the PPP and RFI. The deans continue to meet twice weekly to explore options on program reduction and what is viable. It is very important to consider our decisions and avoid unintended negative effects such as effects on enrollment and also look to improve synergies and partnerships. How we restructure and what we want to look like are all packaged into this PPP.

*There is a lot of discussion on restructure on the academic side. What of the non-academic aspects of UI?*

One example is work on process engineering. Finance and Administration is doing a self-study and actively working through this process now. It is noteworthy that for UI statistics such as administrative intensity, the number of administrators per faculty or per student, the number is approximately 50% of our peers. Thus, numbers of administrators are very thin.
A further question arose because of the recent change in approach to the PPP. Staying with the coarse review at unit level would have involved faculty input by this time. The change to Provost’s Council working down to program level has delayed faculty involvement and many faculty are very concerned about this issue.

Because of the complexity of the data that came out of the coarse review – some strong units with weaker programs, some weak units with a stronger element, the change in strategy seemed to be the best way forward. However, it will be essential to get faculty involvement as soon as possible and the process is working towards that point.

The chair noted that it was important to keep the process highly transparent.

It was also noted that it would be very important to get more detailed information out to faculty by very early in the spring.

**University Budget and Finance Committee.** The chair moved the discussion to the budget report noting that the Intercollegiate Athletics By-Laws required further discussion with the director of athletics before being further discussed at FC.

The UBFC chair distributed a one-page university-wide budget summary for FY09. He noted the following points:

1. Budget issues presented a moving target and in the present national fiscal situation, budgets were being revised regularly. The UBFC was meeting with F&A every two weeks and the UBFC chair was meeting with F&A leadership weekly.

2. Salary and Promotion: Money for CEC is not likely. Money for promotion increment is unthreatened for now although the source is not apparent.

3. Benefits: Health Care program renewal is open until November 28. There is an error on the summary page for Plan H. There is a new change to eliminate the embedded deductible for employees who enroll in Plan H - family coverage. Instead of an individual deductible of $1150, the family must meet a deductible of $2300 before the 70/30 co-pay begins. Furthermore there is a glitch in the CY08 plan where the individual deductible was misapplied by Blue Cross. We have been using $1500 as the individual deductible but IRS regulations require us to use a $2200 deductible per individual when enrolled in Plan H – family coverage. For those employees who began to receive the 70/30 co-pay after reaching $1500, they must now pay an additional $700 out of pocket before the 70/30 co-pay begins again. In some cases, individuals may have a tax problem at the end of the year, primarily those who received the benefit of a $1500 deductible but will not reach a total of $2200 in qualifying expenses. For example, if someone has had $2000 in qualifying medical expenses so far this year and will not have any more medical expenses for the rest of this benefit year, they will have received the 70/30 co-pay benefit on $500 of expenses. This is not compliant with IRS regulations. It is not clear what the IRS will do to someone in this case.

4. Reallocation of funds: Cuts will not be permanent until 2012 at earliest; an enrollment increase of 12% with a fee increase of 5% would generate $6M. We have yet to see a business plan for reinvestment of money, although we know that COGS was given $425K in this process, $221K for new
awards, invested $582K in various awards and realized an increase of 102 students this fall. We are at the bottom of Oklahoma State Survey data in TAs and RAs (total value not considering cost of attendance).

5. Budget crunch: The provost mentioned last week that 1.5% is called in and we’re looking for the next shoe to drop. The President reaffirmed this yesterday. This is in addition to the reallocation process. In the grand scheme this is a small financial hit. The UI works on $432M, only $147M coming from the state. Of the $147M, only $96M is subject to the holdback, a total at this point of $2.4M which is 0.55% of the UI total budget. The most radical numbers we’ve heard ($20M) are still less than 5% of our overall budget. And yet, we have consistently carried over $16-17M from one year to the next for the last 4 years. Salaries and benefits account for 73.7% of the $147M total.

6. UBFC chair’s personal observations:

a. Confusion: There are multiple discussions going on and we should be careful not to confuse them: Program Prioritization, Request for Innovation, state holdback of 2.5%, reallocation of $6.2M, and the hiring pause. It is critical that we resist panic attacks and sort out the true urgency from the temporary emergency. We are engaged in meaningful strategic planning and there is a true need to plan for long-term financial security; they are mutually affected by the other but one is not driving the other.

b. Strategy vs. tactic: The strategy is to be better at what we do, and our finances must facilitate us, not restrict us. The tactic is to find budget cuts.

c. Methodology: Of course balanced budgets are the product of a combination of income and expenses. We have openly explored various options for cutting back and some others have been quietly listed (pay cuts, benefits cut, sell land, close facilities, close a campus, enhance labor efficiencies, furloughs, short work weeks, etc.). These are tactics and all must be put on the table, regardless of whether they are used or not, it is important that they are discussed. Before we cut programs in an effort to save money, we must be sure that the savings are real and that the cost in prestige or credibility is not too great, a strategic decision.

d. Recommendations: We cannot cut back much further and hope to keep a healthy organism.

1) We need to raise income. Last week the provost mentioned avenues to budget growth with enrollment growth as the most likely solution. VP-Advancement is reporting an increase in giving of 50% but donors tend to give to special projects and not to mundane causes like our rising energy bill. No one is donating to the cost of running the institution. Income from investments in research will take some time to realize. Improved retention is the quickest and least expensive way to increase our enrollment. With an increase in enrollment comes an absolute need to measure capacity. However, increases to EWA will take 2-3 years depending on how rapidly we grow (we give back $1.139M for FY10). The suggestion to suspend EWA is a viable short-term tactic; in the long-term EWA protects us from sudden slumps in enrollment.
Increase in scholarships and TA funds won’t help as long as fees are offset by financial aid.

Increases in tuition and fees are our only immediate option to grow the income side of our budget. 2) **It is time to debate our capacity to charge tuition or to use fees for instruction.**

This is not the first time we have experienced a financial challenge and it certainly will not be our last. 3) **Our best strategy is to establish a contingency fund of sufficient heft that will allow us to avert the next crisis.** The President’s 3 Bucket model (Base, Reserve, Investment) is a good idea.

In the absence of a government bailout, we must solve this financial dilemma ourselves. This is a challenge that is bigger than any one administrator’s capacity to find a solution. The President said in his speech on Thursday that no one understands the entirety of the budget. It takes all of us to run this institution; it takes all of us to make strategic decisions.

Questions and Discussion:

*Can the $16M in carry-over each of the past three years be used in a contingency fund?*
No. This amount is located across the entire institution and appears in different budget from year to year as part of the overall operating of the institution. Thus, it is not available. A dedicated, identified line would be needed to properly fill this need.

*Is not the attitude of the legislature to view those carry forward funds as excess and use this to argue for further cuts to the UI budget?*
It is widely believed that this factor is paramount in the selection process for the new president. He must be very effective in communicating with the legislature and the regents and presenting the reality of our budgets to them.

**FC-09-020: FSH 1640 – Dismissal Hearings Committee, Faculty Appeals Hearing Board and University Curriculum Committee.** Changes to more efficiently conduct the business of these committees (as distributed) were briefly discussed. On the call of the chair, FC approved these changes coming as a seconded motion from Committee on Committees as proposed.

**FC-09-021: NOI – Human Safety Performance Certificate.** There being no questions to the presented NOI, the seconded motion from the University Curriculum Committee passed unanimously.

The chair noted that discussion of the criteria for the PPP would be delayed until the meeting of Dec 2 and wished all a happy Thanksgiving.

**Adjournment:** It was moved and seconded (Miller/Murphy) to adjourn at 4:59 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Rodney A. Hill
Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Council
Advising Work Group

- Partnership between Goal 1, UIACADA, College of Graduate Studies, and Academic Affairs
- Coordinated by Jeanne Christiansen, Alton Campbell, and Adrien Loehring
- Focus on undergraduate and graduate advising

Members: Alice Allen, Zach Arama, Becky Byers, Alton Campbell, Heather Chermak, Jeanne Christiansen, chair, Chris Dixon, Janice Fletcher, Mary Gardiner, Jean Henscheid, Jo Lacher, Mark Nielsen, Ken Noren, Valerie Roberts, Kris Roby, David Roon, Dana Stover, Christina Veloz (Former members: Adrien Loehring, Katie Scott, Debbie Storrs, Melanie Thomas)

Charge: Building on existing studies and reports, this work group will review and refine our institutional advising mission and vision; help provide clarity to and strengthen expectations, roles, and responsibilities for faculty, staff, and students; recommend systemic approaches within and across units to support, recognize, and reward effective advising models and practices, support student learning and development, and facilitate faculty and staff development; and integrate tools for assessment for continuous input and improvement.

Actions to date:

- Developed advising action plan with mission, vision, and values, statements, commitment to students statement, learning and process outcomes, and implementation plan
- Recommended providing data gathered by the university for assessment at the program level
- Developed survey to learn about existing models and practices in each department
- Developing assessment strategies including student assessment of advising (in process) and faculty and staff assessment of advising (to be developed)

Next steps:

- Communicate the work of the committee broadly
- Work with colleges and departments to implement the advising action plan
- Develop and implement assessment strategies to provide information for continuous improvement of advising
Program Assessment
December 2008

Ad Hoc Assessment Committee
Diane Armpriest, Jane Baillargeon, Dick Battaglia, Suzi Billington, Liz Brandt, Alton Campbell, Jeanne Christiansen, convener, Gail Eckwright, John Foltz, Paul Gathercoal, Jeannie Harvey, Laura Hutchinson, Mark Nielsen, Howard Peavy, Bruce Pitman, Diane Prorak, Kris Roby, Dana Stover, Mike Whiteman (Former members: Rula Awwad-Rafferty, Frank Cheng, Marla Kraut, Dean Panttaja)

Major Accomplishments

- Undergraduate and graduate degree and approved certificate programs have adopted learning outcomes aligned with the university learning outcomes and consistent with the university strategic action plan
- Assessment plans that include direct and indirect measures of student performance and structured interviews with students are in place for degree and certificate programs
- Faculty and staff members have completed at least one full cycle of assessment
- Academic and student affairs units have adopted learning outcomes and have or are finalizing assessment plans. Many of these units have completed one full cycle of assessment.
- Processes are in place to support program assessment including web support and information, automated email communications, technical assistance, and assessment brown bag sessions (see the assessment web site for additional information: http://www.webs.uidaho.edu/ira/assess/assessment_plans.htm).
- A rubric was developed for use at the department and program level to assess the quality of assessment plans to provide information for continuous improvement of the assessment process.
- The Ad Hoc Assessment Committee provides regular and continuous input to the Office of Assessment and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Office, assisting in the integration of the cycle of continuous improvement in the reporting process and in the continuing development of faculty and staff knowledge and skills in assessment.
- The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs share responsibility for the implementation of the program assessment processes.

Next steps

- Continue to refine the assessment system and template based on user input
- Work through the college and department structure to refine program assessment plans and processes
- Continue to provide brown bag sessions on topics of interest to support continuous growth in assessment knowledge and skills
University Professional Development and Learning
Strategic Action Plan
2008-2011

Task Force Members: Jeanne Christiansen (Academic Affairs), Debbie Eisinger (Division of Finance and Administration), Karen Guilfoyle (Faculty Council), Mike Jolly (Human Resources), Deborah Manning (Organizational Development and Learning), Kent Nelson (General Counsel), Dan Noble (Staff Affairs) (Patty Houle [Provost Office] and Paul Michaud [Human Resources] were members in 2008-2009)

Charge to Work Group: The primary charge of the task force is to develop recommendations for a sustainable system of educational opportunities for our employees to support and strengthen their skills, talents, and expertise for the work place. The committee’s responsibilities include: an analysis of priority employee professional development needs; a centralized and coordinated system of delivery; identifying synergies in events, participation, and fiscal resources; establishing policies, expectations, and practices for levels of employee participation; and developing a fiscal plan. The recommendations of the committee will be provided in a strategic action plan, built on existing reports and recommendations from the Goal 4 team, to fully implement a system of initial and ongoing professional development for university employees.

Purpose
- Recruit and retain high quality employees who value life-long learning
- Provide a culture of development and learning to build capacity, knowledge, and skills and provide growth opportunities within the university community
- Invest in employees to increase motivation and morale
- Develop a defined and sustainable product, i.e., a system that supports employee development with a university commitment to fiscal, time, personnel, and other needed resources
- Build a culture of policy awareness, providing the means for education on applicable policies, procedures, regulations and laws for the University to integrate into an expectation of compliance

Current Actions
- Preamble, vision, mission, values, organizational commitments, and initial action items document - completed
- Inventory of current employee development and learning opportunities sponsored at UI has been developed, field tested, and refined – ready to distribute electronically
- Needs assessments: from staff, supervisors, and faculty – ready to distribute electronically
- Preliminary budget request submitted
- Communication strategies and tools – being finalized

Next Steps
- Engage university community in gathering information through the inventory and needs assessments (fall 2008)
- Appoint steering committee to expand representation, seek observations and recommendations, and increase communication
- Vett and begin implementation of action plan aligned with university strategic action plan and including recommendations from Goal 4 team
- Share action plan for comments and suggestions; refine based on input
- Refine budget request
- Begin implementation process

Action from Faculty Council
- Affirmation and support employee professional development with constituents
- Encourage participation in inventory and needs assessment surveys