Present: Anderson (Mike), Anderson (Miranda), Barbour, Brandt, Caplan, Chung, Crowley (w/o vote), Folwell, Foster, Godfrey (Coeur d’Alene), Ostrom (Idaho Falls), Hrdlicka, Johnson, Markuson, Morrison, Nicotra, Pregitzer, Vella, Wiencek (w/o vote), Wilson, Wright. Absent: Adekanmbi, Boschetti, Brewick, Brown, Donohoe, Fisher, Payant, Sixtos. Guests: 11

The Chair called meeting #24 to order at 3:30 pm. A motion (Folwell/Chung) to approve the minutes from the April 4th meeting passed without objection.

Chair’s Report: Chair Brandt started to congratulate the Senate for completing all college elections for next year’s Senate, but then had to recant when it was discerned that several colleges had not completed the election process. She expressed hope that all colleges will complete their elections before the April 15th deadline.

The Chair also tried to organize a potluck dinner for May 8th, but when it was pointed out was that the Coeur d’Alene graduation was that evening she stated that she would go back to the drawing board. Stay tuned. [N.B. Potluck will be May 2nd]

Chair Brandt announced that the University Faculty Meeting is scheduled for May 2nd at 3:00 in the Vandal Ballroom. Please make sure this is on your and your constituents’ calendars.

Provost’s Report: Provost Wiencek reported on meetings with the Program Prioritization workgroups. They have agreed to make changes based on feedback to align the process more clearly with the strategic plan. The Provost felt most participants thought the process was moving in the right direction, but more clarity was needed. Three criteria have been identified. Two of the three criteria will be uniformly applied to all units. The first focuses on impact and essentiality. A tool is being developed to measure these criteria. The other involves a measure of institutional investment. The final criterion (contributions to the strategic plan) will allow units to choose different metrics. The workgroups are still working on improving the metrics. The Provost felt that the workgroups are moving closer to finalizing the process.

The Provost reported on ongoing searches. The internal search committee for a dean of the College of Graduate Studies has interviewed four candidates. The feedback has been received and he expects to make an announcement in the near future. The search for a Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives is still in progress and candidates for this position will be visiting campus in the next few weeks. The Provost also encouraged applications for a replacement for Professor Kenton Bird as Director of General Education.

A Senator suggested to the Provost that it would be helpful to provide more guidance in determining what sub-categories non-academic units should be placed. The Provost stated that they were reaching out to units to help determine this. The Senator wondered if a more detailed narrative description of the areas was available. The Provost stated that units should engage in a discussion to determine what sub-category provides the best fit if they are unsure.

The Provost was also asked when UBFC decisions on proposals would be made public. The Provost stated that final decisions could not be made since it was still unclear what resources were available. For instance, a final decision on tuition hasn’t been made as enrollment is still unclear. Thus, it will be at least a month until these decisions are made and made public.
FS-17-068 (UCC-17-027): Architecture in Boise. Chair Brandt invited former Senate Chair Randall Teal and Professor Diane Armpriest to discuss this proposal. Professor Teal explained that this is a proposal to provide the first two years of the architecture program in Boise. The UI is the only school in Idaho accredited to provide a professional architecture degree. Boise is a good area for expansion due to the number of architectural firms in the area. The State Board has suggested that the program be expanded into the Boise area. Offering the first two years in Boise is a good way to expand the program and to test the market in that area. A Senator expressed surprise that the estimated number of students wasn’t larger. Professor Teal suggested that they had kept the estimated numbers modest and this would have to be evaluated after three years. There is also a limited amount of space currently available in Boise. If the numbers in Boise really increase, then we might need to look at a complete parallel program in Boise.

Senators asked about funding from the university and whether this had gone through UBFC. The Provost stated that funds were available through central funding. This funding had been embedded in a Provost Office request to UBFC, although the committee might not have been fully aware of it. The request included funds for new academic initiatives to fund on a trial basis. In response to a question as to why the UBFC had not been more directly involved, the Provost suggested that the request was not for permanent funds. He stated that it would be handled as part of existing funds available in the Provost Office.

Professor Teal was also asked why a previous program offered by Boise State had not succeeded. Professor Teal suggested that the BSU program was offered by the Art Department and wasn’t really equipped to offer an Architecture program. Also, the program was offered during the economic downturn. A Senator wondered whether the proposed two faculty were really sufficient to offer the program. Professor Teal answered that the two faculty who would be teaching were very experienced in offering the foundation courses. Plus, Boise has a lot of people who could offer courses as adjuncts.

There were other questions raised as to whether the proposed budget was sufficient, whether the faculty salaries were at market, and whether the program enhanced our desire to reach Carnegie R1 status. Several Senators expressed the sentiment that this program would ultimately be a success. The Provost noted that obtaining R1 status was aspirational, but that our real goal was to expand research opportunities and terminal degrees. There were also concerns raised about past problems with program expansion in Boise. The Provost noted that the SBOE had changed its philosophy. If a program was within the core responsibilities of an institution, there was an obligation to offer the program around the state. The proposal passed without objection.

FS-17-069 (UCC-17-036a) CNR: Environmental Education and Science Communication (name change). Chair Brandt introduced Professor Lee Vierling to discuss this proposed change. This proposal renames a graduate certificate program offered in McCall. The previous name was Environmental Education. After adding a new faculty member in McCall, the program has been expanded into science communication. This program appeals to teachers as well as those interested in natural resource communication. The proposal passed without objection.

FS-17-070 (UCC-17-036a) CNR: New MNR Option. Chair Brandt introduced Professor Karla Eitel from McCall to join Professor Vierling. In addition to the certificate program (discussed above) they are also proposing a Masters in Natural Resources to be offered in McCall. The program is designed to be completed within a year. A Senator asked what might happen if a student failed a course. Professor Vierling stated that they would consider offering a student an option, or they would have to retake the course the next year. A Senator asked about the student fees. Professor Vierling stated that the McCall program was fully self-supporting and the fees applied to this program. If a student added courses outside
the program, they would need to pay the additional cost. Asked if they had considered courses outside the program (like through distance), Professor Vierling stated that this is probably something they should consider, especially as an option if someone could not complete a course. This proposal passed unanimously.

**FS-17-071 (UCC-17-038) CNR: Discontinue Restoration Ecology Certificate.** Chair Brant introduced Professor Karen Launchbaugh to discuss the discontinuation of this graduate certificate. Professor Launchbaugh explained that the certificate was being discontinued due to small student enrollment and because one of the primary faculty members in the program had retired. There are also other options that students within the program can consider as a replacement. The proposal passed unanimously.

**FS-17-073 (UCC-17-042) Regulation J-3.** These were minor additions to the Humanities and Senior Experience courses in general education. The proposal passed unanimously.

**Athletics:** Chair Brandt invited Vice President for Finance Brian Foisy to discuss the UI’s request to the SBOE regarding the deficit in the Athletic Department. Trina Mahoney from the Budget Office joined Mr. Foisy.

Vice President Foisy stated that he wanted to be clear that he was at Senate to explain the request to the SBOE, not to defend the role of athletics on campus.

Mr. Foisy explained that the UI can expend unrestricted funds on any program on campus except for athletics. For athletics, the amount of unrestricted funds that can be expended is capped by the SBOE. This cap is currently at $950,000. Since the Athletic Department was going to run a deficit of approximately $1 million, it is necessary to request the Board to raise the cap. Originally, the proposal was to raise the cap for the next four years. Mr. Foisy stated that the current athletic budget was around $15 million. The Athletic Department met about 50% of this budget through program revenue, the other half coming from general education funds and student fees. Vice President Foisy emphasized that the Athletic Department was not unique in being subsidized by general education funds. This was typical of virtually all programs on campus. The purpose of the request to the SBOE was to give the Athletic Department time to correct its budget while it adjusted to the change to FCS (Football Championship Sub-division). The only way to avoid a deficit is to ask the Board for a waiver of the cap.

Chair Brandt thanked Vice President Foisy for being candid about the Athletic Department funding. She added that part of the frustration he might have sensed in the room was because in the past the Athletic Department had not been transparent about its budget. She stated that in previous discussions the Athletic Department had insisted that they were profitable and now they are asking for a bail-out. A Senator asked if the proposal to the SBOE provided a plan that showed how we would be doing things in a different manner. Mr. Foisy acknowledged that the Athletic Department would have to do things differently. Some budgetary items were unknown, since the UI had not yet entered FCS. Would ticket sales go up or down? Although travel costs would probably go down from playing a more regional schedule we would lose revenue from some high-profile football games.

The Faculty Secretary asked for a clarification of whether the request to raise the cap by a million was for each of the next four years. Mr. Foisy explained that the request had been for four years, but he would not be surprised if the SBOE was uncomfortable with a four-year request.

The Vice-Chair wondered why, if only a small number of schools could make a profit from athletics, did universities offer athletics? Are there market analyses that suggest there is a value in the public relations
that athletics provides? Vice-President Foisy stated that he thought there were reasons to believe that it was a reasonable investment. He felt that athletics could have a positive effect in both student enrollment and in donations to the University. A student athlete brings other students with them. Several Senators wondered if this was different than students in other programs. Mr. Foisy suggested that it probably wasn’t, but these other programs were also being subsidized. He also said he would not use the term profitable to describe athletics or any of our programs.

A Senator thanked V.P. Foisy for bringing transparency to the athletic budget. However, he suggested that there was a good reason why the SBOE treated the Athletic Department differently in terms of the use of unrestricted funds. This, he suggested, was because the athletics wasn’t covered under the Morrill Act. Entertainment is not like other programs of higher education. Beyond this, the Senator felt that the Athletic Department wasn’t always treated like other departments. Requests for coaching vacancies are automatically filled, which is not the same as in other programs. The Senator asked if the Athletic Department would be going through the Prioritization Program? If it does he suggested that athletics should be ranked low since it is not central to our mission and its return on investment is not high. Vice President Foisy responded that he hoped the athletic program would go through the prioritization process. He did not intend to treat the athletic program differently in terms of staffing requests.

A Senator asked where the money to cover the deficit in the Athletic Department would come from if the Board agreed to grant the waiver. Do we have that much money in reserve? Would the funds be taken from other programs? Vice President Foisy stated that we did have the money in reserve. About 2/3 of the university’s reserves are held by the colleges and the Provost Office. These funds would not be touched for this purpose. He said there was another $14 million held in the central institutional reserve. Central reserve funds are held at the discretion of the President. If the cap on the use of unrestricted funds for athletics is waived by the Board, the funds to cover the deficit will come from this central reserve.

A Senator suggested that the longer we wait to solve this problem, the more our credibility will be harmed. A structural deficit cannot be solved without the infusion of discretionary funds. In order to restore our credibility, we will need to cover the athletic deficit by using our reserves while the structural deficit is being resolved.

**Adjournment:** With the Senate already being past its normal adjournment time, the Chair accepted a motion (Foster/Folwell) to adjourn at 5:10.

Respectfully submitted,

Don Crowley, Faculty Secretary and
Secretary to the Faculty Senate