

University of Idaho
FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES

2003-2004 Meeting #17 Tuesday, March 9, 2004

Present: Wagner (Chair), Bailey (Vice-chair), Burnett, Chandler, Cloud, Exon, Gunter, Lillard, McGuire, Morgan, Pikowsky, Hatch (w/o vote), Reese, Rinker, Voxman (w/o vote), Woolston, Zemetra

Absent: Baillargeon, Dockrey, Fairchild, Guenther, Pitcher, Rosholt, Young

Observers: 7

Call to Order. A quorum being present, Faculty Council Chair Wagner, called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m. in the Brink Hall Faculty Lounge.

Minutes. The council accepted the minutes of meeting #16 of the 2003-2004 Faculty Council, held on March 2, 2004 as distributed.

Chair's Report. Chair Wagner announced that, contrary to what was suggested at the last Council meeting, the 2% salary increment will go into base salaries rather than being distributed as one-time payments. It is likely that these funds will be used first to meet promotion increments leaving approximately an average of 1.6-1.7% for faculty merit salary increases.

Committee Reports.

- **Committee on Committees:**

- FC-04-033:** Dismissal Hearings Committee structure and function change to reflect FSH 3910 & 3920

- FC-04-034:** Disability Affairs Committee structure and membership change

- FC-04-035:** Faculty Appeals Hearing Board early and temporary appointments

These items, dealing with some committee appointments and/or relatively minor changes to committee structures, were approved unanimously.

- **Faculty Affairs:**

- FC-04-032:** Academic Unit By-Laws. Following a brief introduction by Jim Murphy of this proposal, the Council deferred action on FC-04-032 until its next meeting. In his remarks, Murphy noted that the proposal ensures that the faculty evaluation process is included in each college's by-laws. Councilor Chandler commented on the timeliness of the proposal, especially in view of the fact that some colleges have yet to develop a set of by-laws.

Unfinished Business and General Orders. FC-04-031: Discussion of UI College Multi-year Plans. The preponderance of the meeting was devoted to presentations by Deans Dangerfield, Parrish, Hammel, and Burnett regarding the multi-year plans of their respective colleges for dealing with budget deficits. Dean Dangerfield, College of Business and Economics, began his presentation by noting that the budget of his college is essentially 96% personnel and 4% operations. Therefore, almost all cuts thus far have been in terms of personnel. He remarked that these cuts have been more opportunistic than strategic since they basically were achieved by not filling random vacancies arising from retirements, involuntary separations and the death of one faculty member. The college has lost five tenure-track positions and will lose approximately 15% of its budget (about \$750,000). The cuts together with the 8.4% growth the college has experienced over the last four years have led to fewer and larger sections, less diversity, loss of summer research money, and elimination of the Center for Business Development and Research. Dangerfield does not foresee additional vertical cuts. He also noted that it is fortunate that many of his faculty are cross-trained, making it easier to smooth out the bumps arising through personnel losses.

John Hammel, Dean of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, said that VSROP had claimed 109 faculty and staff positions. This was both good and bad. It allowed the college to attain much of its budget reduction target by freezing positions, but it also created problems in meeting teaching, research, and outreach demands on and off campus. The VSROP losses were not uniformly distributed and some units lost 75% of their teaching faculty. Faculty and administrators have met to address the budget shortfall and as a result of these meetings and those with advisory groups,

various lists (Tiers) were established that reflected priority rankings for fulfilling college needs. Criteria used in determining priorities included being able to support existing employees to maintain strong, high quality programs; meeting the objectives of the UI and state strategic plans; and filling positions in critical areas. Hammel said that most Tier 1 objectives have been achieved. Outcomes of the budget reducing process include a restructuring and elimination of some programs, development of a Extension “clusters” such as grouping together resources of some counties, and the transfer of some research positions. The college still faces a number of significant problems including the loss of faculty who have strong grants and contracts records. Also, the reduction in programs may lead to reduced stakeholder support. Hammel said that at this juncture, no vertical cuts are anticipated, and additional reductions will most likely be dealt with horizontally. In response to Councilor Zemetra’s question, Hammel said that vacant positions created by poor faculty performance stay within the department. Other vacant positions revert to the college; but, where justified, will go back to the departments from whence they came.

Judy Parrish, Dean of the College of Sciences described the circumstances surrounding her recent appointment. The interim dean had left all decisions regarding budgets and multi-year plans to her, and so at this time the College of Sciences finds its planning progress somewhat behind that of the other colleges. Thus far, cuts have been made primarily across the board with the administration taking on a greater proportion of the reductions (4.5%) than the academic areas (2.5%). The college does not have many programs and none that would merit closure. The college has lost four staff positions, one TA position and 10 faculty FTE’s. Parrish noted that TA salaries are currently much lower than national standards, making it difficult to recruit graduate students. It definitely would not be feasible to reduce compensations for these students. She emphasized the strong, productive nature of her faculty and is cautiously optimistic about the future. Parrish stressed the need to leverage strengths in the college, create more efficiencies, break down walls between disciplines, identify and cultivate potential donors, and establish good relationships with WSU and agencies such as INEEL. Parrish is also encouraging the faculty to determine what it means to be a faculty member at a land grant, research institution. This will help determine what the college can and cannot do.

Councilor Don Burnett, Dean of the College of Law, remarked that vertical cuts in a division having only one program are not particularly feasible. The college has lost two tenure-track faculty positions as well as some staff positions. It has relied significantly on “privatization” to deal with the \$450,000 budget reduction. Student professional fees play a major role in maintaining several functions of the college, including their Legal Aid Clinic, career services, and academic support services. Burnett placed special emphasis on the need to reshape the university and create the requisite focus for the UI to become “high quality and moderate” as opposed to “mediocre and cheap.” He stressed the importance of excellence becoming a hallmark of the university in order to distinguish the UI from other institutions. Burnett added that the university must take a critical look at itself in order to determine what it can do well and what it can no longer afford to do. In response to a councilor’s question of the possibility of other programs’ ability to institute professional fees, it was noted that although Art and Architecture was able to receive SBOE approval to do so, the College of Engineering has been unsuccessful. Councilor Rinker stated that caution must be exercised to ensure that professional fees do not become so costly that students will go elsewhere. Councilor Burnett responded by saying that, though costs are a factor, fees can be used to establish distinctive, high quality programs that will continue to attract students. He said that UI fee policies should not be driven by other institutions’ policies.

Near the conclusion of the meeting Councilor Reese distributed documents pertaining to recent recommendations by Joe Zeller, Dean of CLASS, to meet that college’s budget reduction targets. Councilor Lillard suggested that Dean Zeller be invited to return to discuss his proposals with the Council. Councilor Rinker hoped that Wayland Winstead could also continue his discussions with the Council regarding the FY05 budget situation. Councilor Exon noted that the Council had not yet been apprised of the budget plans of the central administration and said he would welcome more details in this regard. Councilor Gunter would like more “big picture” information. Councilor Burnett commented that this will occur as cuts are made and the university begins to be reshaped. Such cuts will necessitate looking at overall budgets rather than merely incremental changes. With the time notably exceeding the 5:00 hour, Councilor Lillard demonstrated unusual verve in calling for adjournment. This occurred at 5:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Voxman
Interim Secretary of the Faculty Council