

Faculty Senate and Committee Chair Retreat
August 16, 2016
Brink

Senate members present: Adekanmbi, Anderson (Miranda), Barbour, Brandt, Boschetti, Brewick, Brown, Cannon (Boise), Caplan, Chung, Crowley, Dallas, Donohoe, Fisher, Folwell, Foster, Godfrey (Coeur d'Alene), Hiromoto, Hrdlicka, Johnson, Markuson, Morrison, Nicotra, Panttaja, Payant, Pregitzer, Sixtos, Vella, Wiencek. **Committee Chairs present:** Metlen, Kitzrow, Sanders, Neuhaus, Agidius, Woolley, Marshall, Enloe, Henrich, Ellison, Sammaruca, de Pedro, He, Turner-Rahman, Sharma, Jung, Reineke, Campbell, Yang, Williams, Dodge, Perry, Coats, Haltinner, Deringer, Wilhelmsen, Prorak, Hart, Dorschel, McGowan, Unlu, Kuhl, Stoll

Senate Chair Brandt welcomed senators, committee chairs, and Provost Wiencek to the retreat.

Chair Brandt thanked everyone who have volunteered to serve on committees. The Senate and its committees provide the grease to keep faculty governance functioning. She is very appreciative of the contributions made by all those participating in the faculty governance process. She gave a special thanks to Ann Thompson and IT for working on setting up the interactive video for this meeting. This technology makes it possible for our distance colleagues to participate. Chair Brandt also introduced this year's Senate Leadership Team. Patrick Hrdlicka, Professor of Chemistry, is the new Vice Chair. Don Crowley and our organizational maven Ann Thompson continue from the Faculty Secretary's Office. Our first item on the agenda is to hear from Provost Wiencek who will make comments on the coming year.

Provost Wiencek thanked those on the Faculty Senate and its committee's for participating in the important task of faculty governance. He noted that last year was a productive year. We had some disagreements, but we also got a lot of work done. We all have our hearts and minds in the same place, trying to advance the mission and distinctiveness of the University. He wanted to take this opportunity to reflect on what we did last year and what we might need to have more conversations about this year. Provost Wiencek emphasized that these are his thoughts and are not intended as directives, which would be inappropriate since the Faculty Senate is an independent body. The governing charter of the University speaks to the fact that the University's governance should be led by the faculty and the President. The Faculty Senate is crucial to the governance of the University. Provost Wiencek noted that he thought last year's discussions about the proper role of faculty vis-a-vis the President's role in governance was important and should be continued this year.

The Provost reviewed many of the most important developments from last year. In particular, he noted:

- FFF Results and Next Steps. Early last year he reviewed with the Senate the results from the FFF process. He felt that we had reached a consensus that future prioritization processes needed to be more automated and more transparent.
- Spread-Pay. He recognized that the resolution to the spread-pay process probably left a lot of people unsatisfied. The result of seeking to move us away from spread-pay while maintaining it for existing employees is not perfect but probably in the best interests of the institution.
- Faculty Evaluation & Position Description Pilot's. Last year's Senate Chair was very interested in pursuing these changes. He believes this a good direction, although we need to make sure that we move towards making sure our policies reflect the new forms. We can't stay in permanent pilot mode.
- Leave Policies. The Provost thanked the Senate Leadership for its patience last year in working towards the positive changes in leave policy for parents.

- Compensation and HR policies. The President is committed to bringing staff and faculty up to market levels. The goal is to get our average to the average of the market. We still face the difficult task of making this happen.
- Workplace Morale. We have been working to use surveys (HERI and Great Colleges to Work For) to better understand morale issues. He will be making a report on the results of these surveys.
- Revitalized University Budget & Finance Committee (UBFC). UBFC was engaged to make recommendations on funding priorities. Many of the recommendations from this committee were funded. We are working to make the budgeting process and decision-making transparent.
- Student Code of Conduct. Changes were made by the Senate last year and we need to continue working on this policy.
- Discussions on UI governance. The Provost was part of philosophical discussions with the Senate Leadership and the President in clarifying UI governance. We should continue to improve this communication and consider policies that might help guide us.
- Student Evaluation of Teaching. While we did make some changes on the evaluation form, he does not think this is sufficient. We need to have a more comprehensive way to evaluate teaching.

The Provost then turned his remarks towards those things he encourages the Faculty Senate to consider in the coming year. These included:

- Program prioritization. Continued program prioritization is mandated by the State Board. They are looking for us to identify our priorities. This encourages conversations about how we can help programs that are doing well to become prestigious programs, while also considering what we might do about programs that are struggling. Ultimately this will mean that resources will move around the University.
- Evaluation and Position Description form changes. We need to change the *Faculty-Staff Handbook* (FSH) to fit the new process.
- Changes to UBFC process. The UBFC process was a great success; but, we might want to consider how to make the process easier for those submitting proposals and how we might give better feedback.
- Compensation. We want to move on this aggressively. In order to get to market levels, we have to match the inflation rate, plus gain ground. There is a task force working on a market-based compensation system.
- Survey Results. The results are not surprising. He will be providing a report soon. In general, staff were more positive than faculty. He particularly noted the need to create a more positive teaching/learning climate.
- Student Code of Conduct Revisions. In discussions with the Dean of Students, he believes we will need to pay close attention to our compliance challenges. He also wondered whether the FSH was the proper place for specific processes. The *Administrative Procedures Manual* (APM) might be a more flexible place to contain the specific processes, while the FSH provides general oversight. We might consider outsourcing this to the professionals who know how to do it. This area should be a high priority.
- Teaching Center. Formation and implementation of a new center supporting excellence in teaching.

Next, Provost Wiencek discussed areas where we might engage in more thought, some might not be ready for prime time.

- Do more research on additional adjustments to the leave policy. We began this discussion last year, although there were some disagreements about how to proceed. There will be a new person in General Counsel's Office specializing in employment law. When this person arrives we might engage this person in a discussion on the costs and risks associated with certain expansions of leave policy.
- Promotions and Tenure Standards. Having gone through this for the first time, Provost Wiencek stated that he is concerned about the disparate standards across the University. We might want to look at the FSH standards which set the floor and see if it is sufficient.
- Total rewrite of FSH. We might be past due to look at a total rewrite.
- Faculty Career Tracks. Many universities have utilized multiple career tracks. A research-track, a teaching-track, a tenure-track. We already have extension faculty and clinical faculty. We might look at considering various career-tracks.
- Academic Integrity Policy. We might need a Student Honor Code asking students to self-police.
- Evaluation of Academic Administrators. Last year he was concerned when evaluating administrators that he couldn't account for staff views and could only look at faculty. This is something we might consider.

Major Events to Consider:

- Jazz Festival: There are changes being planned for the Jazz Festival. Years ago the Jazz Festival brought in many students for competitions. There will be a push to get us back to our roots in this regard. This could create a challenge in terms of classroom utilization.
- Cascaded Plans: This is part of our strategic plan process. Each unit will need to develop its own strategic plan that fits into the general plan. The goal is to get these cascaded plans done before the end of the semester so they will be available for the UBFC process.
- Program Prioritization to generate resources for UBFC process. We will need to develop the rules and assure transparency for this process.
- Completion of Re-organization of Provost Office. The search for a Vice Provost of Strategic Enrollment Management is near completion. He will talk about this reorganization with the Faculty Senate early in the semester.
- Incentive based budget models. The State Board is considering moving towards "outcomes based funding". This involves everyone's base remaining the same while new funds flow towards units meeting certain goals.
- Better Financial Management. We will redo how we organize financial management within Banner. This is probably a two year project which will help us have a better understanding of how our funds are distributed.
- New Deans. The College of Science will have an interim Dean and we will launch a national search for a new dean. The College of Art & Architecture will be having discussions about the future direction of the college.

Work Plan for Fiscal Year 2017

- Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Committee. This committee will be charged with the overall implementation of integrated planning, programming and budget. The first task of this committee will be to make sure the program prioritization model is more transparent.
- Cascaded Strategic Plans. We will need to develop unit level goals and metrics.
- Incentive Based Funding Model to help grow enrollment.
- Program Prioritization Improvements. We should make this less labor intensive, more quantifiable, and the linkage to resource allocation more transparent. Not all information

relevant to this process will be quantifiable. . Any position that comes open will be evaluated to determine if the position should be filled. This should apply to both academic and non-academic programs. If a unit is in the top quintile, the position will be filled. If they are not in the top quintile, they will have to provide a plan as to why the position should be filled to UBFC which will determine the position's fate.

Provost Wiencek concluded his remarks on things to look for in the coming year and invited questions from the participants in the retreat. The first question asked about faculty salaries and the move towards market based compensation. The Provost commented that the plan was to get salaries up to 100% of market. He elaborated that there would need to be further discussions about how to determine what the market rate is and we would also have to take other things into consideration such as years and quality of service.

The Provost was asked about his vision and strategy for distance education. He noted his priority this year for any funds he has available in the Provost Office was to promote a teaching/learning center. After that he would like to promote distance education. He is concerned about whether he has the available funds to do both this coming year. He further noted that we needed some help in determining where the markets in distance education are and how we can encourage colleges to offer new programs that address market demands. They are looking at a vendor who might be able to offer the type of services we need.

A question was asked about the possibility of increasing TA/RA stipends. The Provost responded that he hadn't addressed this in part because he tried to focus on issues that the faculty senate hasn't addressed. The issue of tuition waivers for TA's was brought forward in the UBFC process last year and was highly rated. The resources did not exist to fully fund that proposal. This proposal needs to come back this year. In order to obtain the resources to fund proposals of this nature we need to increase enrollment. He is optimistic that new student enrollment will be up this year. Part of the short term problem is that we are still suffering from a smaller size of the incoming classes over the last several years.

The Provost was asked whether he saw the Faculty Appeals Hearing Board as independent since he stated that the Senate was an independent body. He stated that as a senate committee the Faculty Appeals Hearing Board was independent. The Provost further commented that while appeals boards were independent, in our governance structure the President does have the authority to reverse the decisions of appeals boards.

A question was asked about why our enrollment had gone down in previous years. The Provost stated that previous decisions to eliminate WUE scholarships had affected enrollment even though this was reasonable at the time to reduce our structural deficit. This affected our ability to attract out-of-state students. We have now reached a more stable budget environment and we can look at the possibility of adding some WUE scholarships. We still need to be careful to not open this up too much since it could put us back to where we were before. A related question was asked about the potential impact of increasing enrollment. The Provost noted that once we have an increase in enrollment it will generate the resources to deal with some of the problems that might occur. He further commented that at one point we did have around 14,000 students with essentially the same number of faculty and classroom space. Once we begin to increase enrollment, we will have to be flexible in dealing with the problems. This would be a good problem to have. The Provost was also asked whether attention was being paid to committing more resources to freshman level courses. He commented that if we have to offer additional

sections we will. Our biggest opportunity to increase revenue with enrollment is through retention. If we can increase retention from its current level into the 85% range it will significantly aid our resource problems.

A final concern was raised over whether there have been discussions about decreasing expenses. Could we make strategic cuts? Provost Wiencek reminded everyone of the attempt to try RCM (responsibility centered management) which resulted in the decentralization of many services. There is an opportunity to centralize some services like IT where we could gain some cost efficiencies.

Provost Wiencek thanked everyone for their time and stated he looked forward to the continued partnership. Chair Brandt thanked the Provost and commented that last year we had very good communication with the Provost Office and appreciated his attention to the issues raised by the Senate.

Chair Brandt made some comments before we took a break. She emphasized that the faculty senate and its committee fulfill multiple roles on campus.

- Our governance roles are described in the FSH. These include a wide array of responsibilities.
- Faculty Senate oversees more than 30 committees. Most policy work is developed in the committees.
- It is important to keep the lines of communication between the committees and the Senate. Senate Chairs might consider making interim reports. Circulating drafts for comment is especially helpful with very complex or controversial matters.
- Committee's should let Ann Thompson know if they want to get on the agenda. Please don't wait until the end of the year rush.
- Senators should recognize that our job is to review, but not to re-do the work of the committees.
- Senators should be informed about what their constituents are thinking and report regularly to them.
- One of our jobs is to provide advice and assistance to the President and Provost. The Senate is an important venue for Senators to communicate issues that are arising to the Provost. The Provost also relies on the Senate as a way to get information out to the larger campus. Another reason for Senators to report back to their constituents.

Chair Brandt thanked everyone for their participation and noted that she was looking forward to the year. After a short break the committee chairs would gather in another room and the Senate would remain in Brink for a brainstorming session.

Brainstorm Session

Morale:

- Business systems, how do we get things done
- Need report on HERI & other climate surveys

Salary

- Faculty Taskforce on Market Salaries
- Compensation form - FAC
- How do performance evaluations fit in here, especially with the new evaluation pilot form
- If not linked, how will merit be determined
- Ask new HR Director Wes Matthews

Enrollment

- How will \$ follow this, what is the patch
- UBFC Report
- Enrollment strategy for other campuses, how does it fit

TAs

- Comprehensive report on TA's
- how used
- salary
- numbers
- allocation amount of current tuition waivers

+/- Grading system

- look at Teaching & Advising Report

Student Evaluation of Teaching

- current pilot 2 forms will run

Faculty Performance Evaluation – Faculty Affairs (FAC)

- Evaluation Form – FAC
- How is teaching evaluated
- PD Form – FAC

Student Code of Conduct

- FSH vs. APM

Video Conferencing/Distance Education

- Tech Support for
- Leadership's view on Distance Learning
- Registration for Distance Learning – tracking
- Lots of mystery
- Committee (connect to Provost & to DEE & Registrar)

Report on New Teaching Center

Respectfully prepared by Don Crowley, Faculty Secretary
and Secretary to the Faculty Senate