University of Idaho  
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
2017-2018 Meeting #19, Tuesday, February 20, 2018

Present: Anderson (Mike), Anderson (Miranda), Arowojolu, Baird, Brandt (w/o vote), Brown, Cannon (Boise), Caplan, De Angelis, Foster, Ellison, Grieb, Howard, Hrdlicka, Jeffrey, Johnson, Kern (Coeur d’Alene), Leonor, Mahoney, Morgan, Morrison, Nicotra, Panttaja, Schwarzlaender, Seamon, Stevenson (for Wiencek w/o vote), Tibbals, Vella, Watson, Zhao (Idaho Falls). Absent: Wiencek, Guests: 9

Call to Order and Minutes: The chair called the meeting to order at 3:30. A motion (Morrison/Mahoney) to approve the minutes was made. An editorial correction to the minutes was pointed out by a senator. The corrected minutes were approved with 2 abstentions.

Before the business for the meeting began, a senator pointed out the crowded seating arrangement and asked senate leadership to address the shortage of seating. The chair agreed to look into creating additional seating.

Chair’s Report:

- The chair reminded senators that the Lionel Hampton Jazz Festival will be underway on campus on February 23 and 24. Information is available on the Jazz Festival website.
- General Curriculum Report #292 is available. Petitions seeking further review of curriculum changes covered by the report are due to the Chair of Faculty Senate, hrdlicka@uidaho.edu, by March 1, 2018.
- General Policy Report # 66 is available. Petitions seeking further review of policy changes covered by the report are due to the Chair of Faculty Senate, hrdlicka@uidaho.edu, by March 6, 2018.

Provost Report: Vice Provost Jeanne Stevenson attended the meeting on behalf of Provost Wiencek, who was at a conference. She did not have any announcements or communications. Before moving to the business of the meeting, a number of senators had questions for Vice Provost Stevenson.

A senator urged that the faculty senate seek to be included in the discussion about reorganization of colleges and departments. Secretary Brandt informed the senate that the provost had asked the faculty secretary’s office to determine what university policy requires regarding college and departmental reorganizations and how such matters had been treated in the past. The university does not have written policies governing such reorganizations. It is not clear whether the senate was consulted the last time the university underwent college reorganizations. The chair added that his understanding is that the provost plans to involve senate and key faculty leaders from the affected colleges in the conversation. A senator commented on some of the discussion in her college and stated that certain combinations would create very large colleges that might swamp other colleges on campus. She believes that such mergers would endanger faculty morale and that faculty would leave the university. She encouraged the administration to approach the issues strategically. Another senator commented that reorganizations would not only affect faculty, but also would affect staff. He urged that staff be consulted as part of the process.

The chair reminded senators that, at this point, the issue has been delegated to the deans. They have been charged with examining the possibilities and developing proposals. To date, the deans have not reported on any possible proposals and no decisions have been made. Another senator asked whether it would be appropriate to propose policy setting forth the process for faculty consultation, and whether the provost would support such a policy. Brandt commented that she believes the provost would welcome a resolution urging faculty input. She expressed doubt that the process for such considerations had been worked out enough to articulate a formal policy at this time.

A senator asked for accurate information on the goals of the reorganization. Is the university considering college reorganizations to address the current budget gap? If so, he wondered whether such reorganization
would result in cost savings. He urged the provost to articulate the goals of the process more clearly. Vice Provost Stevenson commented that the vice presidents believe the budget shortfall must be addressed so that the university can move forward to accomplish its strategic goals. Chair Hrdlicka stated that Vice President Foisy will be presenting to senate on February 27.

The consensus of senators seemed to be that faculty are nervous, some are upset, and that rumors are rampant. They urged that senate become involved in the reorganization process. Brandt encouraged senators to stay engaged, but to be careful not to fuel rumors.

On a different matter, a senator asked whether the Office of Public Safety was being eliminated. Stevenson did not have information on this office. Brandt replied that senate leadership plans to ask the provost about the status of the office at our meeting on Thursday.

**Faculty Compensation Taskforce Report:** Chair Hrdlicka, who also co-chairs the taskforce, gave the report. He summarized the activities and recommendations of the taskforce, and the administrative implementation of the new market-based compensation process for the recent mid-year salary adjustments. He pointed out that the adjustments had resulted in a distribution of ~$700k, bringing UI faculty closer to market levels (from 89.6% to 90.8% of market).

Hrdlicka stated that the taskforce has received input that the starting target salary for full professor of 83% of market is too low and that 17 years in rank is too long to reach 100% of market. He explained that the longevity schedule was informed by data. The longevity range for full professors at the University of Idaho is from 0 to more than 35 years. On average, full professors have been in this rank for ~16 years. The approach implemented means that the target salary of full professors who meet expectations, will be 100% of market halfway through their time in rank, based purely on longevity factors. Hrdlicka indicated that he had advocated for the range for full professors to start slightly higher and reach 100% of market rate slightly faster, but this recommendation was not implemented.

Hrdlicka next stated that the taskforce had received several comments regarding the market rate definition for non-tenure track faculty such as instructors, senior instructors, clinical faculty and research faculty. A significant impediment to market rate determination for these faculty is that there is an insufficient number (or even lack of) data points for these ranks in the CUPA-HR and Oklahoma State databases, from which national market data are obtained.

As a stop-gap measure, to enable these faculty members to be considered for mid-year salary increases, the decision was made to define market rates for these ranks as follows: instructors - 65% of the market rate for an associate professor in the corresponding discipline (CIP); senior instructors - 70% of the market rate for an associate professor in the corresponding discipline (CIP); and clinical and research professors - 85% of the market rate for the corresponding tenure-track faculty member in the discipline (CIP). These selections are data-informed and based on current UI practices. Hrdlicka acknowledged that there is concern that these one-size fit all market rate definitions are not sufficiently nuanced and, in some cases, de-motivating. However, he pointed out that the choice confronting the university at the time was to make a data-informed decision, or to exclude non-tenure track faculty from the mid-year salary adjustment process. He also explained that another aspect of the difficulty confronting the taskforce was that the university’s standards for clinical and research faculty are ambiguous and faculty in these ranks have a wide range of responsibilities. The suggestion has been made to give discretion to chairs and deans to define where on the spectrum of responsibilities individual non-tenure track faculty fall. The compensation taskforce has added non-tenure track faculty and is in the process of addressing these issues of non-tenure track faculty. Finally, Vice Chair Anderson pointed out that Faculty Senate, Faculty Affairs Committee, and the Provost Office are convening a taskforce to review university policies and definitions for non-tenure track faculty.
Finally, Hrdlicka stated that the current version of the market compensation model does not include a merit component. The mid-year salary adjustment process did not allow for consideration of merit-based salary increases. In consultation with the provost, the taskforce has decided not to parameterize merit within the compensation model (i.e., develop a formula that quantifies merit). However, merit will be a prominent component of future salary considerations. Current deliberations focus on how future available funding dollars are to be allocated between longevity and merit considerations. Prior to the mid-year salary adjustments, faculty salaries were approximately $10M behind market levels and ~$5M behind individual targets which only include longevity factors. One proposal is, therefore, to allocate ~50% of future funds toward merit and ~50% to longevity. However, Hrdlicka pointed out that deans and chairs might prefer a different allocation mix and reminded the senate that the taskforce only is an advisory body to the provost.

A senator commented that he appreciated the efforts of the president and provost to address salary issues and that he recognized the difficulties involved in the process. He was concerned that if full professors only start at 83% of market, the university would not be able to hire qualified mid-career faculty members. Hrdlicka explained that the market salary encompasses faculty who have just been promoted to the applicable rank and those that have been in the rank for over 30 years. It is unclear how prescriptive the longevity schedule will be for recruitment of new faculty members, but Hrdlicka reminded the senate that new hires potentially could be brought in above their target salaries on merit grounds.

The senator followed up stating that some faculty were not assigned appropriate CIP codes. His experience was that CIP codes were averaged and some of the codes that were included in the average were not justified. He commented that this is a problem for faculty working in interdisciplinary areas, or in joint appointments. He suggested that CIP codes should be tied to activities and not to degrees. Hrdlicka responded that the question of how to treat faculty who might fall into several different CIP codes is difficult. Department chairs raised equity concerns about having faculty in the same department with different market rates, making substantially different salaries because they were assigned disparate CIP codes. The senator further followed up arguing that the taskforce should have used a publicly accessible database such as Oklahoma State instead of relying primarily on a licensed database such as CUPA-HR. Hrdlicka responded that interested faculty may obtain CUPA-HR reports from the Executive Director of HR, Wes Matthews. Hrdlicka further noted that the provost likely would state that faculty should be assigned the CIP code that a replacement would fall under, if a department was to rehire for the position. Brandt suggested that the problems of appropriate CIP codes should be raised with chairs and deans who often make the initial assignments. In addition, she suggested that moving forward, a process would need to be developed to raise and evaluate these types of issues.

Another senator thanked the taskforce for taking on a difficult process. Although he did not think the process was perfect, he appreciated the work and transparency of the taskforce and of the provost. He also commented that the documents provided to senate were helpful in understanding the process. He expressed the view that more needed to be done to address the issue of compression. He interpreted the data to mean that some faculty were actually worse off than before the mid-year compensation increase was implemented because of problems with compression. Hrdlicka responded that no faculty members were worse off than before. He moreover pointed out that faculty members who were further away from their target salary received a larger salary increase and that faculty members who already were above 100% of their market rate. Those faculty at 100% or more of their market rate were not eligible for a mid-year salary increase. There only is a compression in the sense that fewer faculty members are very far off their (longevity) target salaries. He also pointed out that the longevity schedule was constructed to minimize compression between ranks in a discipline.

Another senator expressed the view that faculty should not focus on salary to the exclusion of other resources to support faculty work such as increasing the number of high quality graduate teaching assistants. Hrdlicka pointed out that the UBFC process had identified employee compensation as a top priority along with TA compensation. He went on to praise the university’s new TA compensation system as a big achievement for the institution that will facilitate the recruitment of high quality graduate students. Several senators verbally
agreed while others strongly nodded in agreement. He also indicated that UBFC proposals soliciting funds to increase the number of TA’s likely are forthcoming from COGS Dean Jerry McMurtry.

A senator commented that the market compensation system, for both faculty and staff, is very complex and that focused attention must be paid to fully understand how it works. The chair asked for a show of hands on how many senators had previously seen the F-CTF documents before the senate packet distribution? Noting the few hands raised seemed to suggest that this information was not shared/distributed as broadly as it should have been. Hrdlicka commented that the taskforce had not had the opportunity yet to hold an open forum. The disappointing show of hands indicates that communication could have been better.

**Benefits Advisory Group Report.** Faculty Secretary Brandt, who is a member of the Benefits Advisory Group, gave the report. Brandt reported that Human Resources is working on expanding the voluntary benefits program. Through this program, university employees would have the option to participate in a large group sponsored by one of the institution’s benefits contractors and thereby be able to elect a number of additional benefits. Such benefits could include long-term care insurance, pet insurance, legal benefits, large purchase insurance and identity theft insurance. This program would have a single log in for employees. If the program is successful, the existing voluntary benefits program offered through AFLAC may be combined with the new program for common administration. Finally, Brandt reported that the university has been conducting a series of benefits audits. In the coming months, it will be embarking on an audit of eligibility under our health insurance program. Employees may be required to provide more information than normal about family relationships as part of this audit.

**Adjournment:** The business of the meeting having been completed the meeting was adjourned (Morrison/Tibbals) at 4:55.

Respectfully Submitted,

Liz Brandt, Faculty Secretary &
Secretary to the Faculty Senate