University of Idaho
2015-2016 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #9

3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, October 27, 2015
Brink Hall Faculty-Staff Lounge & Scopia

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   • Minutes of the 2015-16 Faculty Senate Meeting #8, October 20, 2015 (vote)

III. Chair’s Report.

IV. Provost’s Report.

V. Other Announcements and Communications.

VI. Committee Reports.

VII. Special Orders.
   • Focus for the Future (Wiencek)

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.

IX. New Business.

X. Adjournment.

Professor Randall Teal, Chair 2015-2016, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2015-2016 FS Meeting #8
Chair Teal called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m. A motion (Jeffery/Stoll) to approve the minutes for the October 13, 2015 meeting of the Faculty Senate passed without objection.

Chair’s Report: Chair Teal noted that a volunteer to be on the board of the Vandal Strategic Loan Fund was still needed. The person could not be an administrator. Senator Hrdlicka graciously volunteered. With reference to the discussion last week on a proposed task force to look at conflict of interest policies, the Chair noted that they needed a faculty member with a background in federal grants (NSF/NIH), a faculty member from Business or the Humanities, and a faculty member with some experience with a start-up or invention. Chair Teal asked Senators to forward the names of any colleagues that might fit into one of the above categories and be interested in serving on this task force.

Provost’s Report: Provost Wiencek thanked all who showed up for the Vandal Ideas Project (VIP) kick-off Monday afternoon. He encouraged people to be patient trying new technology. Trying out such things doesn’t always go as smoothly as we might like. In particular, Yellowdig is a new platform and we are working on developing a secure sign-on. Yellowdig is a tool that is designed to be used for teaching in the classroom. We are also looking into purchasing sli.do, which was used effectively during the strategic plan retreat.

The Provost discussed plans for developing a more open and inclusive budget process. While we might not get all the kinks worked out this year, ideally we want a process that allows units to funnel requests for new funding up through the deans to the V.P. for Finance and the Cabinet. This process will be developed by working with UBFC which will have a central role in helping to prioritize requests. Ultimately the budget process will have to be tied into other processes like the strategic planning process, assessment, and program prioritization. Next week, the Provost will provide information about last year’s program prioritization (Focus for the Future). This summer Faculty Senate Leadership asked some questions about last year’s process so next week we can reflect on that process and discuss how much was saved and where these funds went. This discussion of FFF will be our primary focus next week.

FS-16-008: FSH 3720 Sabbatical Leave and FS-16-009: FSH 1640.74 Sabbatical Leave Evaluation Committee. Vice Chair Brandt noted that last week we had overlooked approving new language proposed for FSH 3720 and FSH 1640. This language dealt with requiring members of the Sabbatical Leave Evaluation Committee to recuse themselves from all votes on applications for sabbatical if they are applying for a sabbatical leave during that year. The added language on recusal for both FSH 3720 and FSH 1640 passed unanimously.

Chair Teal noted that we had been asked to look at the composition of the SLEC and that request has been referred to Committee on Committees.
FS-16-010: University Curriculum Committee. The Chair invited Dean Cori Mantle-Bromley to discuss the College of Education proposal for Ph.D. specialization of Higher Education Leadership—Self-sustaining Fee Request. She explained that this Ph.D. specialization in Higher Education Leadership has been on the books for a while, but the College of Education hasn’t offered any courses in this area in recent years due to budget cuts. The college is now proposing to revive the program with a self-sustaining budget and with a revised curriculum. The proposal is for a fee-based approach using a four-year cohort program. The four-year fee would be $36,000 per student. Senators asked a wide variety of questions:

- **Are we opening a Pandora’s Box by allowing a part-time fee based Ph.D. program?** Dean Mantle-Bromley suggested that a part-time Ph.D. program was not that unusual in this and didn’t think we were creating a problematic precedent.
- **What is the demand for such a program and where will the students come from unless they are able to offer financial incentives?** Dean Mantle-Bromley explained that they have received many inquiries about this degree and that there was no competition in the area since WSU dropped their program. We have offered this program on a trial basis to BYU-Idaho and currently have a waiting list from there. BYU-Idaho has provided subsidies for their students.
- **Is a four-year part-time program sufficient to provide the type of research-intense activities necessary for a Ph.D. program?** She felt they had built enough research courses and opportunities into the program. The students would be doing original data collection and analysis, and writing a dissertation.
- **How many students would be needed for the program to be sustainable and could the program be offered to UI employees?** Dean Mantle-Bromley stated that they would need to have a minimum of 18 students enrolling as a cohort. When the program was available on campus to UI employee’s they were able to take courses using waivers, but this made the program unsustainable. UI employees can enroll in the program, but would not receive reduced tuition. She would be open to UI employees receiving subsidies but the program has to be sustainable.
- **Can the faculty in the college handle this many new graduate students?** She acknowledged that this program would put a heavy load on their faculty, but that it would also create new resources which would allow them to make new hires. The faculty are supportive, but a little nervous.

With no other comments or questions the proposal came to a vote and passed 18-1-3.

University Curriculum Committee – Distance Education Request. The chair of UCC Professor Dan Eveleth was introduced to discuss a request from the SBOE. This request asked UI departments to define what percentage of their programs are delivered by distance education. The Board wanted us to classify programs as fitting into one of three categories:

- Under 50%;
- 50% to 99%; or,
- 100%

Professor Eveleth explained that this request was a little confusing since it wasn’t completely clear what was being asked. If the requested percentage is of the total degree requirements (120 credits and above), then almost all programs fit in the middle category of 50 to 99%. This is because virtually all general education requirements can be obtained via distance education. Thus very few programs would fail to meet the 50% standard. If most programs fit into the same category it isn’t obvious how useful this listing will be. He hopes that in the future we will collect this data in a way that provides more useful information about the extent to which a program can be obtained via distance.
Several Senators noted that having better information about what courses are available via distance is desirable, but that this attempt at categorization wasn’t very useful and could easily be accused of mixing apples with various other types of fruit. A question was also asked about how to count minors. It was generally agreed that the percentage of a minor that is offered through distance education should be computed by only considering the courses required for the minor.

** FS-16-011: APM 35.60. Hazard Communication Program.** Chair Teal introduced Tom Hicks from the Environmental Health and Safety Office. Mr. Hicks was invited to Senate to discuss a new policy statement on Hazard Communication. This policy is intended to ensure that employees are aware of, and know how to properly respond to, all hazards in their workplaces, including chemical hazards. The program is also intended to provide training to employees when new hazards are introduced. This includes maintaining proper labeling and inventories of chemicals.

A Senator worried that this plan would have significant ramifications and hadn’t been fully communicated. Mr. Hicks stated he thought there had been attempts to get input from those affected. His expectations would be that principal investigators and teaching assistants and other employees would know where the Safety Data Sheets are and that these are kept up-to-date. He expects that the biggest workload would be in doing the inventories. Responding to a question, Mr. Hicks clarified that this policy doesn’t apply to products that a typical consumer might purchase. Also, he emphasized that this policy is intended to address issues across the entire campus and not just the sciences and laboratories. The primary requirement is to make sure that the proper information regarding hazards is available.

** FS-16-012: FSH 3320—Form 2—Administrator Evaluation Form.** Chair Teal introduced two different versions of the Administrator Evaluation Form. He has been discussing this with the Provost’s Office and hoped to create less resistance to filling out the forms. Comments about questions on the forms should be directed to him and ultimately he intends to send this on to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

**Adjournment:** With no other pressing business a motion to adjourn (Latrell/Stoll) passed without objection at 4:53 p.m.

Don Crowley, Faculty Secretary and Secretary to the Faculty Senate
Focus for the Future: A retrospective outsider view

John Wiencek
Genesis: Zero Based Budgeting

• May 2013 Memo from SBOE staff indicates that the Governor’s mandate that all state agencies undergo a zero base budget process and to redirect savings to higher priorities

• Board retreat on May 15-16, 2013 probed the possibility of utilizing Program Prioritization (Dickeson) as a means to accomplish the underlying objective of the Governor’s mandate

• Institutions were to propose outcomes, targets, criteria and weights for SBOE by June 12, 2013
Interesting quote from that memo...

“The Board, with input from several institution presidents and provosts, agreed to a framework for initiating program prioritization on each of the campuses. The institutions will develop proposed outcomes (i.e. overall goal of what they hope to achieve from the program prioritization process) and targets for each outcome (e.g. a specific reallocation of resources in support of the outcome). For example, an institution could propose faculty and staff salary increases as an outcome, with a target of x% savings generated from program prioritization to reallocate towards salaries. …..”
June 12, 2013 response ....

• outcomes, targets, criteria and weights

• We did this before, so we plan to use the same process.

• Criteria: Centrality, Cost-effectiveness, External Demand, Internal Demand, Impact, Productivity, Quality, Size/Scope, Synergies

• Did the process several years earlier, eliminated 37 programs, savings already applied to budget reductions of FY09

• Target – ongoing framework that establishes a focus for the future (prioritized faculty hiring, program review, enhanced operational efficiency)

• JW Note: Semantics – UI Target vs Board Outcome
Macroscopic Timeline

Kick off
- May – Sept 2013 Communicated required process and continued use of criteria (Burnett and Aiken)
- President’s Breakfast firms up 2 Phase approach

Phase 1: Measure
- Phase 1 taskforce develop templates (Oct 2013)
- Units submit list of programs, inventory all things needing to be assessed (Oct 2013)
- Units complete forms with required measures (Nov 2013)

Phase 2: Prioritize
- Phase 2 taskforce appointed (Nov 2013)
- FFF Retreat (Jan 2014) review results in Focus Groups to divide up the work
- Focus Groups report out (Feb 2014) and results discussed at executive level
- FFF planning meeting (March 2014) – communications and implementation
- Unit meetings to discuss result of FFF (April 2014)
- Final Decisions Announced (July 2014)
Process milestones

10.10.2013
Criteria definitions and weighting scheme finalized

12.02.2013
Program level self-study with unit leader review and scoring

Leadership retreat to identify programs/processes for further review informed by industry benchmarks, productivity data and unit reviews

02.03.2014
Completion of in-depth review by topical workgroups tasked with developing recommendations

04.23.2014
Preliminary plan developed by Executive Leadership posted for a two-week open comment period

05.23.2014
Executive level decision communicated

Broad communication & participation
Measurement Tools Driving Decisions

• Criteria Forms – self assessment with next level of management also assessing (no quantitative data requirements) … the Priscilla Salant question

• Other assessment based on quantitative data
  • The primary quantitative assessment was average student headcount + student FTE + graduates for past 3 years for each major

Criteria and weighting
What is a Quintile?

- UI understanding articulated in June 12, 2013 memo from President Burnett:

  “Our process [of 2008-9] did not produce a quintile ranking of programs; however, it did identify programs that were strong, those in need of improvement in order to be sustained, and those to be closed or consolidated.”

---

**Preliminary quintiles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of programs by type</th>
<th>Preliminary/Absolute Quintile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Programs (degrees, certificates &amp; majors)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and Student Support Programs/Units</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic Programs/Units</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quintiles Redone

“any of five equal groups”

Assessing inputs

Final quintiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of programs by type</th>
<th>Final/Relative Quintile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(degrees, certificates &amp; majors)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and Student Support Programs/Units</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic Programs/Units</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of findings

Degree Programs: Moved/restructured (6), Program changes/consolidations (5), Name Changes (1), Discontinued (19)

Non-Degree Programs: Strengthened Enrollment Management and Communications/Marketing, Closed campus pharmacy and Office of Community Partnerships, Transferred the Student Sustainability Center to Facilities, Moved five interdisciplinary centers to appropriate academic unit
Financial Impacts - Where did $ go?

- Complete financial picture incomplete at this time but the following is known:
- Savings from OCP closure ~ $460K
- Reallocated to (current estimates, final analysis pending):
  - CLASS McClure Center and faculty line (~$170K)
  - Tribal Relations Office (Pow Wow and base budget adjustments of ~$23K)
  - CNR faculty line (~$63K)
  - Library and Academic Affairs base budget (~$21K)
  - Facilities Sustainability base budget (~$95K)
- One time reallocations for faculty salaries (~$190K), Bioregional Planning start up (~$20K), OCP Summer internships and Backyard Harvest program (~$21K)
- BAE move resulted in transfer of budget from CALS to COEng
- UWPs moved to colleges
- Several college-based reallocations
- Pharmacy closure yielded some additional savings (not yet clear)
Observations

• Lots of data input but not all of it used
• Manually intensive
• Misunderstandings with SBOE, Objectives not in sync or defined
• Not sustainable as is
• How Board and Legislature uses the data now ... as indicator of priority!
• Non-academic units measures were uneven
• Overall savings, if any, folded into same College/unit for the most part
Soon to be adopted Board Policy:

denied for non-budgetary reasons, no further requests for occupancy costs related to the space in question will be considered.

11. Program Prioritization

   a. “Program Prioritization” is a process adopted by the Board in setting priorities and allocating resources among programs and services with a specific focus on Mission, Core Themes and Strategic Plans.

   b. Program Prioritization shall be incorporated in the colleges and universities’ annual budgeting and program review process.

   c. Annual Program Prioritization updates are to be submitted to the Board by the colleges and universities on the date and in a format established by the Executive Director.
Do overs

• Better articulate Why? How will we use these results?
• Automation of Quantitative Aspects
• Same set of queries to non-academic units as academics – including administrative units within Academic Colleges/Units
• Lean the process
• Service units – measures of quality, quantitative surveys, unbiased measures
• Spend time with lowest quintile programs to improve, adjust or re-envision
• Open up the decision making process
• Need a fresh start
NWCCU Seven Year Self and Peer Evaluation

- Program Prioritization (FFF) viewed as a useful assessment tool by NWCCU
- FFF criteria were not always aligned with Year One report and Strategic Plan (many changes occurred at UI since those documents were generated)
- FFF is a prioritization process, “not a holistic process designed to assess [mission fulfillment]”
Program Prioritization vs Institutional Sustainability

- Selective Excellence - Market Share, Reputation, Impact
- Innovation - What is next opportunity to be excellent?
- Prioritization - Moving resources from lower to higher priority programs (those that already exist)
- Planning & Execution
- Budget models
Quality and Quantity Matter ... one drives the other

Outer loop is academic execution

University Mission and Distinctiveness (Brand Identity)

Integrated Planning and Assessment

Program Prioritization

Budget Process

Learning Innovation, Scholarship and Creative Work (New Opps)

Student Demand and Enrollment (Customers)

Tuition, State Support, Economic Development (Resources)

Faculty and Programs of Distinction (Quality)

Building Progressive, Sustainable and Complementary Cycles

Inner loop is operational execution
Sustaining momentum

• Time for a new Strategic Plan
  – Recognize and build synergies between Academic and Operational Processes
  – Align with SBOE Planning Process - Rolling 5 year plan
  – Drive Future NWCCU Assessment and Evaluation
  – Leverage FFF Process and Recommendations
  – Integrate planning efforts (academic, infrastructure, enrollment, finances, communication, development etc.)
  – Build agility, incentives, rationality, transparency in budget
Objective / Why?

• Final August 6, 2014 report (Prioritized faculty hiring, program review, operational efficiency)

• Burnett memo (similar statement in final FFF report to SBOE, June 2015)
  “Prioritized Faculty Hiring. All new and vacated faculty positions must be invested in high-level University strategic priorities …. No faculty investments will be made in low priority areas. Thus, faculty resources will migrate, beginning immediately, to higher University and State of Idaho priorities....”

• SBOE and Legislature – will not provide new funding unless in top quintile (ordering)

• Inform budget requests, budget reductions, budget increases and reallocation targets
Proposal - New Program Prioritization

Executive Committee

• Provost chairs (with staff assistance)
  • Faculty (How many?)
  • Department Chair
  • Academic Dean
  • Student
  • Finance & Admin
  • Infrastructure
  • Advancement
  • Diversity Office
  • Institutional Research (ex officio)
Proposed Charge

• Define how results will be used in substantive way
• Automate process where possible
• Publish scoring and ranking for all to see
• Provide annual assessment of the process – that is, efficacy of PP and unintended consequences via broad survey and solicited feedback from key representative groups (Faculty Senate, Staff Council, Deans Council, Center Directors etc.)
Question to audience

• Publish most recent process rankings?
  • Raw Score
  • Final quintiles included qualitative adjustments based on narratives
  • Lowest programs stayed in 5\textsuperscript{th} quintile, some higher quintile programs were adjusted down
  • Data biased by self assessments