University of Idaho  
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
2017-2018 Meeting #24, Tuesday, April 10, 2018

Present: Anderson (Mike), Anderson (Miranda), Arowojolu, Brandt (w/o vote), Brown, Cannon (Boise), Caplan, De Angelis, Ellison, Grieb, Hrdlicka, Jeffrey, Johnson, Leonor, Kern (Coeur d’Alene), Mahoney, Morgan, Morrison, Nicotra, Pantaja, Seamon, Tibbals, Vella, Wienczek (w/o vote). Absent: Baird, Foster, Howard, Schwarzlaender, Watson, Zhao (Idaho Falls). Guests: 11

Call to Order and Minutes: The chair called the meeting to order at 3:30. A motion (Morrison/Arowojolu) to approve the minutes was made. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Consent Agenda. The chair inquired whether any senator wished to remove the Spring 2018 Graduates from the consent agenda. No request having been made, the matter on the consent agenda is deemed approved.

The chair proposed a change in the order of business so the Provost could report on developments regarding the athletics program while Vice President for Finance and Administration was able to be present at the meeting.

Provost’s Report:

- Athletics Update. The provost reported that, after a year of studying, a plan has been developed for the reorganization of athletics in light of the change of football from the Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) to the Football Championship Subdivision (FCS). He reminded senators that the State Board of Education (SBOE) imposes a cap on how much general education funds can be spent on athletics. The purpose of the cap is to ensure that the amount of general education funds are not inappropriately diverted to support athletics. Last spring, the university asked the SBOE for permission to spend an additional $1 million above the cap on athletics in order to support the changes in football and the transition to a new conference. At the time, the SBOE indicated it would only support the additional general education expenditures, if the UI had a plan for the transition that would “right size” the athletics budget. Since then, a small group of administrators has been working on the development of this plan.

- Initially, the belief was that the university would have to eliminate sports in order to address the budget shortfall. Because the Big Sky Conference requires the institution to have 13 specified sports, the only sports available to cut were women’s swimming, men’s golf and women’s soccer. President Staben and others were reluctant to consider this option because of its impact on UI’s Title IX compliance efforts and on university enrollment. Analysis shows that the majority of student athletes come to the UI because of the opportunity to play Division I sports. These students would likely go elsewhere if the university does not offer that opportunity. When general enrollment is taken into consideration, it appears the UI could strategically add more sports that take advantage of overlapping scholarship opportunities (such as WUE) and do not involve substantial support costs. If additional sports are added, the university can avoid eliminating sports by covering the expenditure of general education funds through increased tuition income from athletics. Given this possibility, the determination was made to obtain a preliminary assessment of the SBOE support for increasing the number of sports by presenting two scenarios to the Business Affairs and Human Resources (BAHR) Committee of the SBOE. Under the first, and preferred scenario, the university proposes to retain all of its existing sports and add three new sports. The three most likely new sports are triathlon, rifle and men’s swimming. These were identified because the UI already has coaching resources for each of these sports, these sports do not have high equipment costs, and the balance of men to women participants in these sports supports the university’s compliance with Title IX. The second, and less preferred, scenario is to eliminate three sports. Under this less desirable scenario, only sports not
required by the Big Sky could be eliminated including women’s swimming, men’s golf and women’s soccer but would have to add sand volleyball and triathlon for Title IX purposes.

- The university’s preferred proposal was well received by the BAHR Committee and will be presented to the full SBOE at the April meeting next week. The provost cautioned that if the SBOE is supportive, it will not likely give a full “go-ahead” to the plan as it must first update its policies regarding the cap on athletic expenditures. The provost and VP Foisy are optimistic that the proposal will result in an evolution of board policy that allows the university to add additional sports. The provost also stressed the urgency of the proposal. If we do not receive the support of the SBOE, we must let the student athletes who will be impacted by the elimination of sports, know of the decision immediately. Finally, the provost addressed concerns that student athletes were not comfortable expressing their views publicly. While their hesitation is understandable, he encouraged senators to support student athletes appropriately so these athletes feel comfortable voicing their concerns.

- Vice President Foisy elaborated on several of the provost’s comments. He stressed that cutting sports to solve the deficit problem in athletics is not a “deficit elimination strategy.” Rather he characterized cutting sports as a “deficit transfer strategy.” If the university is forced to cut sports, 60 students are likely to decide not to attend the UI and the university’s general education fund will lose the tuition resources those students would have generated. He pointed out that Auxiliary Services will also lose the income from room, board and books that would have been generated by these students. As a result, the elimination of sports merely transfers the athletics’ deficit to the general fund. Foisy believes that the university must convince the SBOE to view the budget issue with athletics from a more holistic perspective.

- Foisy estimates that if the university receives permission to add three additional sports, $6.5 million dollars of combined general fund and auxiliary revenues (i.e. tuition, fees, room, board and books) would be generated. This is more than the university proposes to spend from general education funds in support of the athletics program. Foisy stressed that the preferred university proposal requires that the SBOE abandon the old concept of an athletics spending cap and instead examine whether the university will cover its expenditure of general education funds with increased revenue from athletics. Given the off-setting income, Foisy emphasized that the university is not proposing to spend more net revenue on athletics. Finally, Foisy agreed with the provost that if the SBOE does not support the university’s preferred approach, three sports will have to be cut to balance the budget in the immediate future.

- A senator asked whether we have the facilities to add a sport such as men’s swimming? Foisy responded that the current women’s swimming coach is willing to coach both men’s and women’s teams. It appears our current facility is adequate. The senator followed up asking whether scheduling both teams in the current facility would lead to conflicts and result in a request for capital expansion of the current facility. Foisy acknowledged that there will be complications, one of which is that additional teams will put pressure on a range of support resources. We will need to work through these complications. The senator followed up asking how long it would take for the proposed new teams to reach a “steady state level.” Foisy did not know the specific answer to this question. He took the opportunity to add some additional information related to the institutional finance aspects of adding new teams. He stressed that the university is not asking the SBOE to overlook the deficit. Rather, we are advocating for time to deal with the deficit in a responsible and pro-active manner. He emphasized that we know we will have savings in the future. For example, football scholarships will decrease from 85 scholarships to 63 scholarships. This will result in savings of approximately $400,000/year beginning in FY19. The travel and operating budget for football is expected to decrease by approximately $290,000. This reduction is primarily the result of savings in travel costs. Finally, we expect that over time, the costs of coaching contracts will decrease because market salary levels for coaches at the FCS level are lower than at the FBS level. These savings will occur only as current coaches transition from the university. Because these savings are realized over time, the university’s advocacy for a slower transition process is not “a bridge to nowhere.” The current SBOE policies allow the university only two years to address the athletics’ budget needs. We are hoping to convince the
board to allow the university to manage the transition in athletics the same way we would manage transitions in other units of the institution.

- **A senator asked whether current scholarship athletes would be supported if we are forced to cut existing sports.** Foisy stated his belief is that if the university has any flexibility at all, the president will not cut off the support of current student athletes. Part of the crunch to make a presentation to the board is so that the university can get firm answers to existing students.

- **A senator asked what would be the best way to encourage current students and others to speak up on their concerns.** She indicated that the university soccer program provides coaching and support for the Moscow United Soccer Club. Members of the club have been discussing how to lobby for the continuation of UI soccer. They plan to directly lobby the SBOE. The provost responded that current student athletes and groups such as the Moscow club – may opt to use whatever approaches people normally use to get their views to the board. He pointed out that some sports’ groups have been active on social media and have sponsored letter campaigns on these issues.

- **Faculty Compensation.** The Faculty Compensation Task Force (F-CTF) met with the deans to discuss how the upcoming change in employee compensation (CEC) will be allocated. Based on input from the task force and the deans, this joint group recommended that 50% of CEC will be allocated to keep up with increases in the market salaries with the goal of maintaining current target salaries reflected in the longevity tables previously developed. The market salary for most academic disciplines has increased during the past year. Even where market compensation has declined, faculty salaries will not decrease. However, some faculty are appointed in disciplines where the market salary has not gone up in the last year and, thus, will not receive an increase in salary related to market salary growth. All faculty will be considered for performance-based salary adjustments, however. 25% of CEC will be dedicated to performance raises for faculty who were identified for their exceptional performance during the annual evaluation process. Performance increases will be awarded to no more than 1/3 of faculty within a given college. Finally, 25% of CEC will be allocated within the discretion of colleges to address college-specific issues such as inversion and/or compression, addressing needs of clinical faculty, or providing additional compensation based on longevity and/or performance. Deans have been tasked to develop a plan for the allocation of these college-specific CEC funds in advance of the finalization of raises. The provost will approve all plans and assure that they are abiding with the market-based compensation philosophy adopted by the university. The provost reported that some deans are dedicating the college specific portion of CEC to further address market increases, some are dedicating the entire amount to augmenting performance increases, and other deans plan to address more specific issues. The taskforce and deans also began discussions of how to address promotion increases in the future. Attaching a salary increase to promotion is a long-standing practice at the university. The F-CTF is looking at the practices at peer institutions and is examining other considerations. The taskforce will consider whether to make changes in this practice by next fall.

- **Electronic Faculty Contracts.** Faculty contracts will be fully electronic for the upcoming year. Faculty will receive email notifications when contracts are ready to be signed. These notifications may come later than normal because of the launch of the electronic system. Faculty may need to continue checking email after the end of the spring semester.

- A senator asked whether exempt staff also would be part of the new electronic contract system. The provost indicated he would have to follow up with an answer to this question. *[N.B. All employees, faculty, exempt, and classified, will now be done electronically.]*

- **Pending Searches.** The provost indicated that several searches are pending: the Vice Provost for Faculty, the new dean of the College of Natural Resources (CNR), and three interim deans in CNR, the Library and the College of Letters Arts and Social Sciences.

- **Program Prioritization.** Finally, the provost reported that Dean Carr-Chellman is chairing a new group looking at Program Prioritization. The provost reminded senators that last year’s program prioritization process focused on three criteria – centrality to mission, contribution to the strategic plan, and institutional investment. The Institutional Planning and Efficiency Committee (IPEC) has recommended that the second criteria be re-worked to focus on progress toward the university’s strategic plan as demonstrated through cascaded plans. The new committee is working on how to
evaluate the cascaded plans. In addition, the SBOE has made clear in policy that the university must continue to engage in this process. The new committee will also address the specific university goals for the process.

**Chair’s Report:**

- The University Faculty Meeting (UFM) will be on Wednesday April 25 at 3:30 in the following locations: Moscow - Vandal Ballroom, Bruce Pitman Center; Boise - IWC 162; Coeur d’Alene - 241; Idaho Falls - 350 - Twin Falls - B-66.
- The University Awards for Excellence Banquet will follow the UFM in Moscow at 6:00 pm.
- The chair reported on the Title IX Overview provided at the President’s Leadership Breakfast on April 10. The overview focused on reporting and handling of incidents of sexual assault, harassment and gender discrimination. The key takeaway emphasized by the chair is that all university employees are required to report incidents of sexual assault and sexual harassment within 24 hours of learning of them with the narrow exception of those specifically designated as semi-confidential or confidential reporters. Reports should be made to the Office of Civil Rights & Investigations (OCRI). Our obligation as employees is to assess the immediate health and safety of the student, to inform the student that we are obligated to report the incident, to refer the student to supportive services, and support the student in accessing such services. We do not have any responsibility for investigating the reported incident. The Women’s Center and OCRI will be sponsoring a training on “How to Respond to Disclosures of Sexual Assault” on Tuesday, April 17th, at 9:00 in the Clearwater room.
- The deadline for letting the Faculty Secretary’s Office know the names of new senators for the 2018-19 senate is April 15.

**FS-18-050: Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) Report—Proposed revisions to FSH 3050 - Position Description Policy & Form and FSH 3320 - Annual Evaluation Policy.** The chair of FAC, Prof. Marty Ytreberg gave the report of the committee. This matter was discussed at two prior senate meetings on March 27, 2018 and on April 3, 2018. The proposed revisions to the faculty position description policy simplify the position description and provide that faculty position descriptions need only be revised when a faculty member has a substantial change in responsibilities. The position description form will be online. Finally, the proposed revisions to the faculty annual evaluation policy encourage faculty and unit administrators to discuss goals during the annual evaluation. This discussion would previously have taken place as part of the position description process. Ytreberg pointed out that the supportive documents provided for the meeting reflect revisions either requested or made by motion at the prior two meetings.

A senator reported that she had received feedback from faculty members regarding how leave would be reflected in the new electronic form. Ytreberg indicated that the new form would include a check box enabling a faculty member to indicate that she or he is on full time leave and has no responsibilities in any of the categories. Otherwise, Ytreberg pointed out that the university policy is that faculty members who are not on full time leave from all responsibilities should still complete a position description showing how their work time will be allocated. The percentages in the position description must add up to 100%, even if a faculty member is not working full time. For example, if a faculty member is on a half-time leave, the position description would cover 100% of the faculty member’s half-time commitment to the university. In addition, the faculty member can include comments documenting the leave in the comment box on the form.

Another senator asked whether the forms would be archived. The faculty secretary responded that they would be archived. At present, it is not clear whether individual faculty will have direct access to the archived forms. However, faculty will be able to request the archived forms. The provost added that there
may be additional software solutions for archiving the forms. Finally, a senator commented on language in the policy that indicates that the position description would be “provided to” the faculty member by the unit administrator. She commented that this language seemed to indicate that the faculty member does not have the same level of input on the position description as previously. Ytreberg responded that the language identified by the senator only applies to the very first position description for a new faculty member. This document will be generated electronically based on the position announcement and hiring proposal. However, it will not become final until the faculty member approves the description. The proposed changes as amended passed unanimously.

FS-18-054: Faculty Appeals Hearing Board Report – Proposed Revisions to FSH 3840 Procedures for Faculty Appeals and 1640.43 Faculty Appeals Hearing Board. The chair of the committee, Prof. Francesca Sammarruca gave the report of the committee. The proposed revisions move the grounds for appeal from FSH 1640.43 where the committee’s structure is described, to FSH 3840 where procedures for faculty appeals are described. The committee believes that including the grounds for appeal in the FAHB procedural policy is more logical and will make it easier for faculty filing an appeal to find the grounds for appeal. The proposed revisions also clarify that communication between faculty filing appeals and members of an appeals panel should be in writing and should include all members of the panel. Finally, the revisions provide that the detailed procedures of the committee are linked to the online policy for ease of access. In response to a question from senate, Sammarruca clarified that in the view of the committee, the proposed revisions do not change any substantive provisions for faculty appeals. The proposed revisions passed unanimously.

FS-18-055: Safety and Loss-Control Committee (SLCC) Report – Proposed Revisions to FSH 1640.76 Safety and Loss-Control Committee. The chair of the committee, Prof. Richard Seamon, was present to give the committee report. Also present was Samir Shahat, Director of Environmental Health and Safety. The committee proposes to add four additional members from Information Technology Services, University Support Services, the University Library, and the Office of Research and Economic Development. It also proposes to make the executive Director of Public Safety, or designee, an ex officio, non-voting member of the committee. Seamon explained that the committee is quite large, because it must reach a broad constituency in order to further the university’s culture of safety. Director Shahat elaborated that the added members represent several constituencies that were not previously represented on the committee. Miranda Anderson, Chair of the Committee on Committees (ConC) and Vice Chair of Faculty Senate, explained that the proposed revisions have been circulating between the SLCC and the ConC for some time. The ConC had expressed concern about earlier a proposal for a more complex committee structure. The SLCC addressed the concerns and the proposed revisions have been approved by the ConC. A senator asked why the Director of Public Safety was not a voting member of the committee. Shahat responded that the committee is primarily a faculty committee. His role is to provide support and information to the committee. The faculty secretary elaborated that a consistent approach to voting by ex officio members across university committees is generally left to the judgment of the committee and the ConC. The proposed revisions passed unanimously.

FS-18-056: Staff Compensation Task Force Report – Revision to FSH 1640 proposing the creation of the University Staff Compensation Committee. Lisa Miller, co-chair of the task force presented the report. Miller explained that the task force was originally created in 2015 by the faculty senate to address problems with the recently revised classification system for staff. As a result of changes in university administration, the task force quickly changed its focus to implementation of a new market compensation system for staff. The task force members believe there will be an ongoing need for oversight and policy development as the market compensation system is fully implemented. For this reason they proposed the creation of a university level committee. The provost suggested that the proposal might be premature and that a unified faculty/staff compensation group might be more appropriate. A senator suggested that
the reference in the proposal to the CUPA-HR database was too specific and should be eliminated. It was moved (De Angelis/Tibbals) that the phrase “based on College and University Professional Association (CUPA) and the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS)” be deleted from sub-section A-1 of the proposal. A senator expressed concern that if revisions are made to the policy at faculty senate, it should be returned to Staff Council for review. The faculty secretary pointed out that if the proposal is not approved at the meeting it could not be included on the agenda of the University Faculty Meeting and would not become effective until next winter. After discussion the motion was withdrawn by the mover and seconder. The original seconded motion was approved 14-4.

The time for meeting having expired, a motion to adjourn (Seamon/Panttaja) was approved. The meeting was adjourned at 4:59 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Liz Brandt, Faculty Secretary &
Secretary to the Faculty Senate