University of Idaho
2018-2019 FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting 11

3:30 p.m. - Tuesday, October 30, 2018
Paul Joyce Faculty-Staff Lounge & Zoom

Order of Business

I. Call to Order.

II. Minutes.
   - Minutes of the 2018-19 Faculty Senate Meeting #10, October 23, 2018 (vote)

III. Consent Agenda.

IV. Chair’s Report.

V. Provost’s Report.

VI. Other Announcements and Communications.
   - Establishing Institutes & Centers (Brad Ritts, Vice President of Research & Faculty Development)

VII. Committee Reports.

VIII. Special Orders.

IX. Unfinished Business and General Orders.
   - University Finances cont. (Foisy)

X. New Business.

XI. Adjournment.

Professor Aaron Johnson, Chair 2018-2019, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2018-2019 FS Meeting #10
Instituting Institutes PowerPoint
UI Finances PowerPoint
University of Idaho
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
2018-2019 Meeting #10, Tuesday, October 23, 2018

Present: Benedum, Brandt (w/o vote), Bridges, Cannon (Boise), Caplan, Chopin, DeAngelis, Dezzani, Ellison, Foster, Grieb, Howard (for Tibbals, w/o vote), Jeffrey, Johnson, Kern (Coeur d’Alene), Kirchmeier, Laggis, Lambeth, Lawrence (for Wiencek, w/o vote), Lee, Lee-Painter, Luckhart, McKellar (Idaho Falls), Morgan, Schwarzlaender, Seamon, Vella, Watson. Absent: Keim, Tibbals, Raja, Wiencek. Guests: 11

Call to Order and Minutes. Chair Johnson was delayed in arriving at the meeting due to his participation in a meeting of the presidential screening committee. In his absence the meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Grieb at 3:32 p.m.

A motion to approve the minutes (Lee-Painter/DeAngelis) passed unanimously.

Chair’s Report:

- Former Secretary of Homeland Security Michael Chertoff will be giving the Bellwood Lecture on Wednesday, October 24 at 4:00 pm PDT in the International Ballroom at the Pitman Center. The Lecture is entitled “Solving the Immigration Crisis.” Chertoff is participating in a number of campus events associated with the lecture.
- University Level Promotion Committee (ULPC) nominations are due to the Provost Office by Friday, November 2, 2019. A letter from the Provost soliciting nominations and the nomination form were circulated to senators with the meeting agenda. The nominations create a pool from which the Provost appoints members of the committee.

In answer to a question from Vice Chair Grieb, the faculty secretary explained that senators must nominate a full complement of individuals from their colleges, even if they know that one of the prior nominees from their college will be continuing on the committee for a second year. She explained that generally appointment to the committee is for a one year term. However, each year 1/3 of the members are asked to continue for a second term. A full complement of nominations is needed in case a committee member must withdraw after appointment or otherwise cannot serve. The secretary stressed that the right to nominate belongs to the senator, but that when making nominations senators should consult with colleagues and administrators in their college and with the other senators from the same college. A senator asked whether the representative should also make nominations from the center faculty? Brandt responded that service on the ULPC is based on colleges and the number of faculty within a college. Nomination responsibility lies with college representatives. She encouraged college representatives to consult with their center colleagues in making nominations. In answer to another question, Brandt indicated that the Provost Office would be making available to senators a list of individuals who have served on the ULPC for the past five years.

Provost Report: Vice Provost for Faculty Torrey Lawrence attended the meeting for Provost Wiencek. He did not have a report.

Presidential Search Firm. At this point Chair Johnson arrived at the meeting with Alberto Pimentel, of the search firm Storbeck/Pimentel & Associates. Johnson apologized for being late and thanked Vice Chair Grieb. Johnson continued the meeting. He first asked the members of the screening committee of which he also is a member, to introduce themselves. The screening committee will be chaired by State Board of Education (SBOE) member Emma Atchley. Atchley is an alumna of UI and has long been active in efforts to support the university. She has been a member of the SBOE for 10 years and expressed her commitment to leading a successful search. Don Soltman, also a member of the SBOE, is originally from Grangeville and currently lives in Twin Lakes. Stephen Parrot is a 2012 graduate of UI with a degree in Agri-Business and is a former president of The Associated Students of the University of Idaho (ASUI). Linda Davidson is a member of the University of Idaho
Foundation Board of Directors. Her father and husband are past members of the UI faculty. She recently returned to Idaho from the University of Tennessee and is currently living in Coeur d’Alene.

The chair next introduced Alberto Pimentel of the firm, Storbeck/Pimentel & Assoc. Pimentel will be leading the UI search. Pimentel discussed his process for moving the presidential search forward. He has been on campus for the past two days and has been leading listening sessions with as many campus groups as possible to develop his familiarity with UI. As part of that process, he has asked members of the UI community to respond to four questions:

- Based on your experience at UI, what do you see as the short-term (immediate) and long-term (three to five years) challenges and opportunities facing the next president?
- Given the opportunities and challenges you have described, what professional experiences and qualifications must the successful candidate possess? What personal qualities must the new president have to be a good cultural fit?
- What current ongoing initiatives must the president be informed about and be ready to guide to completion?
- What are the key positive attributes and most attractive features of UI and how might those be used to attract the right candidates?

Pimentel encouraged members of the UI community who did not have an opportunity to attend one of the listening sessions to participate in a surveymonkey poll to provide input on these questions.

Pimentel stated that the characteristics of a strong leader depend on institutional needs. For this reason, the search firm must develop a deep understanding of institutional context. Based on all the information gathered at the listening sessions, and from the screening committee, Pimentel will develop a Position Profile (PP) for the UI presidency. The PP is similar to a position description, but contains more nuanced and depth regarding what the university is looking for in a president. This document will be reviewed by the screening committee and then used as part of the recruitment of candidates for the presidency. The PP will be broadly shared across campus and beyond campus. Once the PP is completed, Pimentel will start an aggressive recruiting cycle. He elaborated that he has already begun the process of contacting individuals of whom he is aware to determine their potential availability and interest in the UI presidential position. The PP will provide more direction and focus for his continuing recruitment efforts. For example, the PP should provide direction about whether the new president should be a person already working within the academy or whether non-academic candidates should be considered. Outside the academy we must determine whether a range of individuals would be qualified such as former university presidents, high level federal agency personnel, national laboratory personnel, non-profit foundation directors, etc. He believes based on the listening tour that there may be some interest on campus in considering non-academic candidates. The timing is that he will be aggressively recruiting candidates of the next 4-5 weeks before the Thanksgiving break and then for the first two weeks in December. He believes that he will have the equivalent of 6 weeks of recruitment time prior to the winter break during which he will be able to actively recruit candidates.

The plan is that the screening committee will meet again the first half of December and discuss the candidates identified by Pimentel and the challenges he is experiencing in the marketplace. The committee will then assess whether Pimentel should continue recruitment and what the focus of his further efforts should be. The committee will meet again in January to review candidates. If the committee is satisfied with the pool of candidates at that time, it will begin preliminary interviews with candidates. If the committee has reservations about the pool, Pimentel will continue his recruitment efforts. Realistically, however, Pimentel believes the screening interviews should be completed in February and a pool of prospective final candidates forwarded to the SBOE. Once the SBOE has identified the final candidates, they will be announced publically and will visit campus. Pimentel’s goal is that final candidates will visit campus in March. However, that timing will depend on the pool and how quickly the recruitment process progresses. Pimentel stressed that high level candidates do not stay long on the market. Even if they have not considered looking for a presidential position prior to his contact, once they decide to become part of the UI search, they most likely will become part of other searches.
It is in the university’s best interest to move quickly. Even if the screening committee rejects the candidates, quick action means he can continue to move forward with further recruitment efforts.

A senator asked what would be the advantage of considering non-academic candidates. Pimentel responded that he was not pursuing such candidates based on the belief that they would be more advantageous for the university than academic candidates. In looking at such candidates, the question would be whether their skills are transferrable to higher education. He commented that if you look at the top 100 research universities, there are approximately 12 presidents who might be considered non-traditional. Each of those individuals had a specific fit with the institution they lead. He also cautioned against “zeroing in” on such non-traditional candidates at the beginning of the search. The best strategy is to look broadly and then consider the qualities of a broad range of candidates. He returned to the original question and concluded that there is no sense at this time that a non-traditional candidate would be superior, but rather a sense that the university is interested in considering whether such a candidate would fit our needs.

A senator asked whether candidates who have changed universities frequently would be evaluated more negatively. Pimentel responded that he is concerned when he sees people in leadership positions who have left quickly. It takes a lot of time to learn an institution. Leaders can put many things in play during a short tenure, but the “acid test” of leadership is whether the person can carry out their plans and priorities. If they aren’t there long enough to know whether plans work and can demonstrate necessary changes, they have not been a successful leader. The key to the best administrators is not that they started brilliant initiatives, but rather that they had the talent to make the moves and changes necessary to carry initiatives through to completion or change what didn’t work.

Another senator questioned whether the desire to finish the search by March would result in UI compromising on an uninspired final candidate. Pimentel responded that we need to take the time necessary to have a successful search. However, he cautioned that the longer the search takes, the more pressure there will be to take the candidate we can get. Pimentel explained that he would not be involved in the process of an interim president, if the search is not concluded in the spring. He also explained that the reality is that there are external pressures to move the search quickly including competition and the needs of the candidates. If a search drags out, it can reach a point at which a candidate says “if I waited this long, why not wait for a better position next year.” He urged that we should not be frivolous with time, but we should take the time necessary. He concluded stating the only failed search is one in which the university ends up with a candidate we didn’t want. The momentum of the search can’t be the driving factor.

Screening Committee Chair Atchley added that the SBOE is committed to getting the best presidential candidate possible for the university.

Chair Johnson asked how can senators make nominations and provide input in the search. Pimentel responded that the most important activity for senators, and faculty and staff in general, is to think creatively about who could take on this role. He urged senators to consider individuals we have encountered in our work who might be great leaders and to submit those names to the committee. The best recommendations and nominations in most searches come from the faculty and staff at the institution. He also stated that faculty and staff should refrain from nixing a candidate in advance, because we think they aren’t on the market or won’t come to the UI. The university needs to recruit such individuals. The future UI president is most likely not thinking of UI today, but they may be recruited in any case. He suggested that in the short term, nominations should be forwarded to the chair of senate [NB: forward nominations to facsec@uidaho.edu]. There is no need for fancy nomination letters – rather just state the candidates name, institution and title, and include a short sentence about who they are. Storbeck/Pimentel has a research team that will follow up on nominations. Very shortly a survey will be created for input and will have an email address to which nominations also may be directed.

A senator commented that the best way for faculty to engage in process is to put forth a positive view of the university. Pimentel commented that faculty and staff may receive phone calls from interested candidates. He
encouraged us to be honest and not sugar-coat our comments, but he also encouraged faculty to focus on the university’s potential and the reasons we are all here. He also stated that once candidates’ names are public, faculty and staff do not have to ask permission to contact colleagues outside the UI who might know the candidate. He encouraged faculty and staff to do so and to forward feedback and comments to the screening committee. He urged faculty and staff to make the time to visit the candidates and ask the hard questions when they are on campus – determine for ourselves whether the candidate fits UI’s needs and to provide our input to the committee. Finally, when the PP is available, he urged faculty and staff to circulate it to as many people as possible and to ask our colleagues around the country to make nominations.

A senator asked whether the screening committee had discussed the prospective candidate views on Greek life. Pimentel responded that the topic of Greek life had come up, but had not yet been discussed.

The Chair thanked Pimentel for his presentation.

**Financial Update.** The chair introduced Vice President for Finance and Administration Brian Foisy and commented that earlier in the day Foisy lead a report and discussion of enrollment and budget issues at the President’s Leadership Breakfast.

Foisy began by affirming his goal to improve transparency regarding institutional budgeting and finances particularly with respect to general education funds. He explained that general education funds, which come from state appropriations and tuition revenues, are the largest part of UI’s budget. Other parts of the budget come from research funding, course fees, among other sources. He explained that the appropriated portion of the budget is very reliable – UI can count on the amount the state appropriates. This predictability is not true with student tuition revenue because the Budget Office must predict likely student enrollment levels as part of the process. Because tuition revenue is such a large portion of our budget, variability in enrollment has a significant impact on the budget.

Foisy utilized what he termed the “enrollment-revenue timeline” to demonstrate the steps in the budgeting process. Student tuition is due on the first day of class. The vast majority of students are able to pay tuition on that day. The tenth day of class is the last day students can get a complete refund of tuition. Foisy explained that UI does not have a tiered refund policy that refunds differing amounts of tuition depending on when a student withdraws. The next important date is approximately September 18 when tuition waivers begin posting in the accounting system. Under our current system we do not generally have data on tuition waivers until they begin posting to student accounts. On October 15 the UI’s official enrollment census is due to the SBOE. That census is calculated based on SBOE directives. At this point in mid-October the institution has reasonable certainty regarding the revenue from tuition.

Foisy next discussed the fall 2018 enrollment numbers. He pointed out that the total enrollment number is not useful from a budget perspective, because not all students contribute equally to the revenue from tuition. There are a number of different groups of student for tuition purposes. The first group is the largest and is critical to UI’s mission – resident undergraduate students. This mission critical group of students pays one of the lowest tuition rates – approximately $5,778/year.

The next group of students is resident graduate students including law students. Enrollment increased slightly in this group of students although the long term trend is decreased enrollment in this group.

The next group of students for tuition purposes is non-resident undergraduate students. This group includes international students, as well as students participating in the Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE). This is the second largest group of students. Although international student enrollment is up this year, the trend in enrollment of students in this group is down. This is a “revenue critical” group of students because they pay a higher amount of tuition -- $23,414. Foisy explained that enrollment of students in the WUE group went down significantly in the past when the UI withdrew from the program. However, in the past three years, as the UI
returned to limited and then full participation in WUE, the number of students in this group has grown. Foisy explained that WUE students participate in a program sponsored by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) that enables them to attend participating schools for 150% of the in-state tuition.

Other groups of students include non-resident graduate students for whom enrollment has been level over the past several years. Enrollment of Washington, Wyoming, Alaska, Montana, Idaho (WWAMI) medical students has increased because more seats in the program were authorized. International student enrollment (which overlaps non-resident undergraduate enrollment) was up this year in part due to UI’s participation in the Navitas pathways program. Enrollment of dual credit students was down.

Because each group of students pays a different tuition rate, changes in enrollment of each group impacts revenue differently. Foisy also pointed out that tuition from some programs does not become part of the general fund. These include self-supporting programs such as dual credit, WWAMI, Athletic Training and the EMBA program.

When the Budget Office projects tuition revenue, it starts by estimating “gross tuition.” Gross tuition is the number of paying students times the rate we charge. However, the university does not collect the full amount of tuition charged from every student as when we offer tuition waivers to students. Tuition waivers are different from scholarships and other types of financial aid. The institution’s general fund benefits from scholarships and other types of non-tuition waivers such as financial aid, because funds are transferred from the source of the aid to the general fund. With tuition waivers, tuition is simply not collected. No funds are transferred to the general fund. When a student receives a waiver, the institution essentially is saying that a student is charged X amount, but is only required to pay Y amount. The difference between gross tuition and the amount of tuition waivers is the UI’s net tuition revenue.

In addition to estimating the amount of tuition revenue, the budget office also estimates the progress in collecting tuition. This is done by comparing tuition collections as of a designated point in time with collection of tuition at the same point in time in prior years. The Budget Office can determine the net tuition shortfall for the year based on the budgeted vs. projected numbers for gross tuition and net tuition. For 8 of the last 9 years projections of tuition revenue have fallen short of the budget. This has happened again this year. The shortfall in gross tuition is approximately $2,974,985. One bright spot is that the tuition waivers were also lower than budgeted by $1,916,603. This resulted in a net tuition shortfall of approximately $1,058,383. In the past, the UI has covered the shortfall through central reserves. These reserves are no longer available.

Foisy will return to a future meeting to continue his presentation. A senator thanked Foisy for a very informative presentation and expressed his desire that Foisy return as soon as possible.

The time for the meeting having elapsed, a motion (Watson/Jeffrey) to adjourn passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 4:57 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Liz Brandt, Faculty Secretary &
Secretary to the Faculty Senate
INTRODUCE MYSELF

- Exploration geologist with Chevron right out of graduate school
- First faculty job at Utah State as Assistant Professor of Geology
- Academic research on frontier geology of Asia
- Returned to career in exploration geology and management with Chevron, based in California and Singapore
- Last 3+ years at Stanford starting and leading the Stanford Natural Gas Initiative
- Excited to be at U Idaho and looking for best opportunities to help
MY ROLE AND GOALS IN ORED

1. Help grow the scale and impact of the research enterprise
   - Research and Faculty Development (Carly Cummings), Office of Technology Transfer (Jeremy Tamsen), Economic Development (Jana Jones)
   - Northwest Knowledge Network (Luke Sheneman); Key link to other research entities and centers
   - Private sector interaction and involvement (working with faculty and University Advancement)

2. Ensure smooth operations and effectiveness of ORED
   - Support the VPR and provide a trusted link across the university to VPRED and ORED
RESEARCH ENTITIES

Organizational framework for transdisciplinary research efforts

Mechanism to increase visibility and signal areas of research concentration and strength within the university

Research entities provide

- Prestige and institutional recognition of existing or emerging scholarship competencies
- Resources and focus
- Thoughtful, dedicated leadership and administrative support

- New processes instituted by Faculty Research Council last year and published on ORED website; implementing this year

https://www.uidaho.edu/research/entities/establishing-institutes
RESEARCH ENTITIES

All entities are reviewed on:

Mission and vision linked to university strategic plan
Active involvement and scholarly activity
Existing or emerging scholarship expertise and reputation
Extramural funding support and financial sustainability

Level I – usually within single college, reports to dept. head
Level II – “Centers”, led by a director reporting to a dean
Level III – “Institutes”, led by tenured faculty member reporting to VPRED
RESEARCH ENTITY PROCESSES

https://www.uidaho.edu/research/entities/establishing-institutes

Creation. Research entities are established by two-phase proposal and review process with approval and concurrence provided by deans, VPRED, and EVP/Provost

Annual Report. Research entities should provide annual reports to ORED

Periodic Review. Research entities must undergo periodic review at least every five years (conducted by the cognizant administrator, dean, or ORED) with continuation approval and concurrent provided by deans, VPRED, and EVP/Provost
SAS RESEARCH TALKS

SHORT AND SWEET RESEARCH SPEAKER SERIES

GLOBAL REACH EDITION

TUESDAY
DECEMBER 4
4:00 - 7:00 PM
IRIC BUILDING ATRIUM

Gary Austin, Architecture
Ryan Long, Fish & Wildlife Sciences
Leontina Hormel, Sociology and Anthropology
Carol Padgham Albrecht, Oboe and Music History
Chyr Pyng (Jim) Liou, Civil and Environmental Engineering
Shelley McGuire, Family and Consumer Sciences
Bal Krishna Sharma, English and Linguistics
Florian Justwan, Political Science
Lisette Waits, Fish and Wildlife Sciences

University of Idaho
### FY19 Central Tuition Waivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount (in $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>97,230,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Programs</td>
<td>8,323,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Education</td>
<td>2,396,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Education</td>
<td>1,894,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>1,126,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching, Research</td>
<td>4,455,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116,212,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FY19 Central Gross Tuition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount (in $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>97,230,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Programs</td>
<td>8,323,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Education</td>
<td>2,396,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Education</td>
<td>1,894,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>1,126,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching, Research</td>
<td>4,455,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116,212,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Definitions

- **Central Tuition Waivers**: Amounts excluded from the calculation of gross tuition.
- **Central Gross Tuition**: Total tuition excluding waivers, calculated as the sum of regular tuition fees.

### Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount (in $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Instructional</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Research</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Research</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Senate 2018-19 - Meeting #11 - October 30, 2018 - Page 20

Faculty Strategic Hiring Plan

Meet our mission as Idaho's land-grant institution.

Eliminate or reduce constraints on our funding decisions.

Maximize all available financial resources within academic affairs.

Accelerate our progress towards the goals of the strategic plan.

Faculty Strategic Hiring Plan

Faculty Strategic Hiring Plan

FORWARD PLAN - A WAY FORWARD

University of Idaho
Faculty Senate 2018-19 - Meeting #11 - October 30, 2018

Questions

University of Idaho

Next Steps

- Enrollment falls to meet targets
- Value of enrollment contingent (prevents current year cuts)
- Elimination of librarians under new budget model
- Development of building principles for a new budget model (finance)
- Strategic hiring plan is not a hiring freeze (all vacancies will be)
- Develop draft strategic hiring plan to match faculty initiative (details)