University of Idaho
2008-2009 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA
Meeting #16

Tuesday, January 20, 2009, 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 #15, December 16, 2008

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.
   • Program Prioritization Process
     o Legal Aspects (Kent Nelson)
     o Provost Council Recommendations (Provost Baker)
   • Fall 2009-Spring 2010 Sabbaticals

VI. Committee Reports.

VII. Special Orders.

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.
   • FC-09-028: NOI CLASS – BS/BA Organizational Sciences major.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Karen Guilfoyle, Chair 2008-2009, Faculty Council

Attachments:  Minutes of 2008-2009 FC Meeting #15
Sabbatical Approvals
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 (Sullivan, Schmeckpeper) to accept the minutes of the December 9 meeting (Meeting #14) of the 2008-2009 Faculty Council as distributed. The motion carried unanimously.

**Chair’s Report:** The chair welcomed FC members, the deans as invited guests and other guests and noted that her comments would be brief to allow maximum time for the discussion with the deans. The chair noted that it was impressive that so many of the deans had made themselves available at quite short notice, showing their commitment to working with the faculty during these difficult times.

**Provost’s Report:** The provost provided a power-point presentation that was proposed as a communications tool to overview the main elements of the university transformation process including the response to the governor’s holdbacks, the PPP, the RFI process and the process re-engineering. The provost noted that the presentation was currently a draft and he welcomed input for additions/revisions.

The provost then spoke to the presentation: UI is the state’s leading university and has an obligation to set the standard of excellence and impact in the state. Participation of the UI community is a vital part of the transformation. The key elements of the vision are innovation with impact, the institution being the top choice of the state’s best students; cross-disciplinary activity featuring active learning; to create a sustainable workplace with measurable outcomes and success. Leadership is a central plank. The drivers of change are: leading to build upon strengths; being “all things to all people” is not sustainable; and the current fiscal situation reinforces the need to reduce scope to remain vibrant and vital. The transformation will engage the objectives of the Strategic Action Plan using its measures of success: excellence, cost effectiveness and client satisfaction. The vision is to implement the process over three or more years in three stages: reducing costs, prioritizing programs and innovation to redesign, re-engineer and consolidate while focusing upon institutional impact.

The hold-backs will be met through internal reallocations ($6.2 M in FY09 and ~$2 M in FY 10) and external reductions (~ $5 M in state holdback in FY09 and an additional $7.6 M in FY10). Holdbacks are being dealt with by universities across the nation. At UI these will be addressed in the short-term by carry forward funds, travel, hiring freezes and other cost savings. Permanent solutions are required to deal with the holdbacks in FY10 by developing a sustainable, strategic budget model. Considering the $6.2 million strategic internal reallocation to invest resources in critical areas to increase long-term revenue and support the Strategic Action Plan, these investments will be continued and evaluated annually for return on investment.
Through implementation of the PPP, UI will reduce the number of programs offered while building the programs that remain. The RFI will seek bold new ways to reorganize the university. Several examples of RFIs that were presently suggested were discussed. Process re-engineering was underway in the research office and in finance and administration. Additional re-engineering projects will be initiated in the summer of 2009. The decisions of the PPP, the innovations of the RFI and evaluations and re-engineering of the non-academic enterprises will evolve a new operational model for UI.

The provost briefly overviewed the planned rapid time-line for the processes through to the summer of 2009. Community participation through the RFI process was strongly encouraged.

**Discussion and questions followed:**

*Are nominations for the RFI review committee still open?*
Yes but nominations must be submitted very soon.

*Will program closures follow the normal NOI process?*
Yes.

*What is the process for suggestions on revisions to the presentation?*
Please e-mail comments to the provost’s office.

The chair then asked council for approval to change the order of business to follow on from the provost’s presentation to the discussion with the deans and the meeting turned to that discussion. The chair noted that faculty council was interested in working together with the deans in a spirit of cooperation, and then more formally introduced the deans to the meeting. The first of the questions as distributed to the deans was brought to the discussion.

*Where are you in the process? What is guiding your considerations?*
Several of the deans were working through similar processes intended to engage faculty. A theme was regular meetings between deans and leadership teams that also included faculty, or alternatively, regular step-wise processes that followed on from leadership meetings followed by meetings with faculty and staff. The “retreat” meeting format was another regular mechanism in one college.

It was noted that all colleges were facing the same macro-challenges. Because of the magnitude of the most recent holdbacks, this impinged upon the strategic PPP. It was desirable to make “clean” distinctions between responses to the holdbacks and strategic planning for the longer-term transformation process. However, the reality was that they intersected.

It was also stated that no one in the institution is doing anything that is unimportant. Thus, it is extremely challenging to identify where cuts will be made. Program closures will be made strategically, applying judgment to the available metrics. It was further noted that another challenge is to find ways to reduce the scope of offered programs without affecting student numbers. It was important to move the process forward without losing key elements. Another concern was that recently won strategic decisions should not be reversed because these might be tied to pools of funds that are easily identified, for example, recent improvements in graduate stipend levels should be protected.

It was further noted that the UI worked under a strong shared governance model. The desire was to be inclusive of faculty input, but still being driven on by the fiscal imperative to move through the decision process quite quickly were two faces of the problem that were challenging to maintain in balance.
When recommendations from the PPP come to faculty council from provost’s council, how specific will they be?
Recommendations will be for closure of specific programs (a program being defined as a degree major). During provost’s council meetings January 15-16th some subset of the 215 programs presently offered at UI will be reviewed in detail.

Is it anticipated that there will be a set of “rolling” recommendations coming from the provost’s council review?
In part this will depend on results of that first set of programs that are identified for closure and what success we have in meeting our budget needs. This may mean that additional programs will need to be considered for closure after the initial analysis from the first cycle.

What do you anticipate would be the personnel implications of closing a program?
When we close a program we will look at everything in that program, from staff, non-tenured and tenured faculty. One of the deans commented that cutting tenured faculty positions would be a last possible option and did not anticipate that this measure would be required. Another of the deans suggested that redeployment of personnel from closed programs to other programs will be considered. Other options may include providing retirement incentives. It was noted that many such options will likely be identified later in the process as decisions are made.

It was further noted that one of the biggest challenges is the so-called “denial-acceptance process”. It takes time for organizations to accept that part of the establishment will have to be closed. Once acceptance is realized, consideration of alternatives and scenarios comes into closer focus.

The danger of getting into a “death spiral” of cumulative cuts and the need to avoid this kind of scenario was discussed at length.

How do we avoid the potential problem of implementing cuts that are then seen by the state board and regents as evidence that resources to UI may continue to be cut, leading to a rapid downward spiral of resources?
The president and provost have individually met with each of the Regents as well as talking to them collectively. The power-point presentation showed the strategic approach and scope. The Regents are very supportive of the process and understand the magnitude of the transition. The provost noted that frequent communication with the Regents has been and will continue to be part of this process.

It was also noted that it is important that college advisory councils should go to legislators and to members of SBOE to continue to send the message that the university has been asked to work through a very difficult and painful process. One that is diminishing to their professions and that further cuts will not be sustainable. Outside constituent voices are heard far better than any coming from inside the university.

Is it envisaged that nonacademic programs will be looked at relative to the importance of academic programs? This is a topic of discussion that UI has not had.
This issue lies in the bailiwick of the president. This will be considered in the overview of the total package. It was pointed out that in the whole scheme of things, academic and non-academic have been and will all be considered. For instance, Facilities cut ~70 positions last go around and as such are understaffed to continue in this direction, so we must tread lightly. There are no large pots of hidden money and all recommendations must be looked into as to how they affect the university as a whole.
It was noted that the explicit inclusion of staff in the discussion process was well received.

The deans were very much looking for greater engagement of the faculty and staff and that more great ideas would be welcomed. The importance of ideas that led to enhanced revenue was noted and was a welcome addition to many previous comments and discussion that perhaps focused too much on program closure and disinvestment.

The provost pointed out recent discussions with students uncovered some great ideas and encouraged faculty to speak to students as well as staff in development of RFIs. The importance of getting RFI groups to integrate was paramount as many similar ideas and themes had been suggested from various groups. It was noted that the RFI process had this element built in following the initial round closing on January 12.

The chair then asked for questions from guests in the remaining few minutes of discussion.

*Was it possible to lay off tenured faculty without declaring financial exigency?*  
Yes, if a program is closed, it is possible that tenured faculty can be released.

*Is declaration of financial exigency not under consideration?*  
At the present time under the current planned process, that is correct.

The chair then thanked the deans for the considerate and forthright discussion and moved to the final item of business for the day.

**University Budget and Finance Committee Report (Murphy).** The UBFC chair noted that the following items were brought as unanimous recommendations from the committee: 1) Promotion pay increases should be honored (realized in FY 10). 2) Holdbacks about to be implemented should not be applied across-the-board. (Murphy/Fritz). A friendly amendment was provided to consider the two issues as separate motions.

Discussion followed: It is difficult to identify strategic versus non-strategic elements in the context of the short-term holdback. Some felt that at some level, strategic elements were being incorporated at college level.

The chair called for the questions:

1) promotion pay increases honored, approved.

2) strategic implementation of holdbacks, 8 for and 5 against, approved.

**Adjournment:** It was moved and seconded (Miller/Murphy) to adjourn at 5:04 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Rodney A. Hill  
Faculty Secretary and  
Secretary to Faculty Council
DATE: January 13, 2009

TO: Karen Guilfoyle and Jack Miller
Faculty Council

FROM: Doug Baker
Provost and Executive Vice President

SUBJECT: Items for Faculty Council

The following members of the faculty have been recommended for sabbatical leave for 2009-10:

Leah Bergman  Physics
Kenton Bird  Journalism & Mass Media
Brian Dennis  Fish & Wildlife Resources
Jerry Fairley  Geological Sciences
Rodney Frey  Sociology, Anthropology & Criminal Justice Studies
Frank Gao  Mathematics
Thomas Gorman  Forest Products
Joseph Guenthner  Agricultural Economics & Rural Sociology
Gundars Rudzitis  Geography
Adam Sowards  History
Jack Sullivan  Biology
Barbara Williams  Biological & Agricultural Engineering

Fall 2009  Spring 2010
Fall 2009  Academic Year 2009-10
Fall 2009  Academic Year 2009-10
Fall 2009  Academic Year 2009-10
Fall 2009  Academic Year 2009-10

This is a request for approval by Faculty Council.

cc: Rod Hill