

University of Idaho  
**FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES**

**2004-2005 Meeting #19, Tuesday, March 29<sup>th</sup>, 2005**

**Present:** Adams (w/o vote) Anderson, Bailey, Beard, Bechinski, Cloud, Exon, Greever, McGuire, McMurtry, Morris (w/o vote), Reese, Rinker, Woolston, Young, Zemetra

**Absent:** Baillargeon, Farnen, Gunter, Hammel, McLaughlin, Reid

**Observers:** 3

**Call to Order:** A quorum being present, Faculty Council Chair Bailey called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

**Minutes:** The minutes of March 22<sup>nd</sup> were approved as distributed.

**Chair's Report:** The chair reminded council that the previous day had seen the culmination of Phase I of the process whereby the university was working to get its budget balanced. Phase I most obviously affected the non-academic areas of the university. Some fifty-eight non-faculty and nine faculty positions were eliminated. Twenty-seven of the non-faculty positions were actually filled as of the time of the lay-offs and none of the faculty positions. Those people laid off will continue to work for the university through the end of the fiscal year, June 18<sup>th</sup>. Phase II of this process, that part of the larger process which might lead to program consolidations or eliminations (and possibly proposals for new programs), is still of course on-going and the chair reminded council members of the time line for Phase II decisions published last week on the provost's website. He made particular reference to those dates where Faculty Council would be most directly involved: (1) April 26<sup>th</sup> when the proposals regarding academic programs (in the form of notices of intent) would be publicly available, (2) the May 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting of Faculty Council when it may be possible to review those notices of intent that have already been dealt with by the University Curriculum Committee, and (3) the May 10<sup>th</sup> meeting of Faculty Council when the remainder of the notices of intent will come to council from UCC. Faculty Council would vote on these notices of intent and, in so doing, make recommendations to the provost and president. Any faculty members whose positions were lost through program closures would be employed at least through the end of fiscal (or academic) year 2006.

In other matters, the chair also reminded Faculty Council that there would be a university faculty meeting on Wednesday, May 4<sup>th</sup> and further noted that it was time for constituencies to begin the process of electing replacements for those members of council whose terms were up at the end of this year.

**Provost's report:** Provost Morris also spoke on the Phase II process. She noted that the University Budget and Finance Committee will be involved in the deans' presentations to the administration of their proposals concerning college budget cutting. She also noted that there were some sample program maps posted on the provost's website as well as a précis version of the Phase II tools. She emphasized the notion that changes to academic programs should not just be restricted to consolidations and eliminations but also to reallocations within colleges of resources from lower priority programs to higher priority ones. She noted that notices of intent that involved budgetary changes of \$250,000 or more went to the full board for consideration, those involving lesser amounts went to the board's executive director only. In working through this process the university was discovering that it was not altogether current on longstanding requirements, e.g., the provision that all faculty members have yearly updated vitas. (This discovery on the part of the larger university came as no surprise to the Faculty Secretary's Office.) Finally, she pointed out that in the week of April 26-29 there would be a series of student forms to gather feedback from students on the proposed changes.

Responding to various questions, the provost noted that Phase I reductions had included nine (unfilled) faculty positions (from the colleges of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences, Business and Economics, and Agricultural and Life Sciences). Other colleges had set some (unfilled) faculty lines to zero with the thought that as part of Phase II they might be strategically reallocated. Phase II might well see substantial college-internal reallocations and there was the possibility of pooled, co-operative reallocations between two colleges. All programs will be ranked by quintiles, at both the college level and the university level. Deans will have to justify the retention of programs that fall in the bottom quintile.

Chair Bailey suggested that all colleges might want to set up college meetings between April 26<sup>th</sup> and May 2<sup>nd</sup> to create justifications for proposed program changes to help both the University Curriculum Committee and Faculty Council fully understand their impacts.

Finally on this topic the provost emphasized that the university administration is hoping for useful feedback from all constituencies, particular from students, from UCC, and from Faculty Council and that any program eliminations could not be done all at once but would need to be phased out.

In other news, she announced the appointment of Professor Wesley Chun (PSES) as the new Core Co-ordinator. He will officially begin his new duties in August but will be working closely with the retiring co-ordinator, Professor William Voxman (Math) this spring and summer. David Chichester has also been appointed as interim Financial Vice President and he will officially begin his duties at the end of this week. He is a member of a firm which provides temporary financial administrators to public and private entities and one of the advantages of his hire will be that he has the expertise of the entire firm to draw upon if needed. As has been widely reported he will be making \$20,000 per month while at the university but the provost reminded council members that he received no fringe benefits in addition to that. Because outgoing financial vice president Jay Kenton did not stay with the university for a year, the search firm that was used in his search owes the university a rebate so a new search should be less costly than the last one. The university plans to reactivate the search committee that recommended Jay Kenton and to reactivate the pool of candidates from that search, with possible new additions.

### **Announcements and Communications:**

Vice Chair Zemetra introduced Athletic Director Robert Spear recalling council's questions concerning the disparity in the General and Administrative (G&A) rate paid by the Athletic Department (1%) as opposed to other auxiliary services (6%). Rob Spear spent a few minutes reviewing for council the history of the University of Idaho's conference affiliation: 1894-1921 independent, 1922-1958 Pacific Coast Conference, 1959-1964 independent, 1965-1995 Big Sky Conference, 1996-2000 Big West Conference, 2001-2004 Sun Belt Conference, 2005- Western Athletic Conference. In 1996 the university decided to move to Division I-A status and moved to the Big West but in 1999 Boise State and Nevada announced their intentions to move to the WAC and the Big West dropped football as a competitive sport. We joined the Sun Belt as a temporizing measure though in doing so we played conference rivals which were geographically far from us and that impacted fan support.

In 1996 then President Hoover made the decision that the Athletic Department would not pay the same G&A rate as other auxiliary services and, in Rob Spear's opinion, his rationale for that decision remains relevant today. Particularly important parts of the rationale are the estimated \$26 million dollar impact athletics has on the larger community of Moscow, the \$2.1 million the department pays out in scholarships to the university, and the students it attracts who would not otherwise be part of the student body.

He said that being in the WAC will allow us to compete with geographically appropriate rivals and that should be a major boost to the program, particularly ticket sales. It will, however, be important to field winning teams. We are already fully competitive in many of the required non-revenue sports but need to work on football and men's basketball.

*What were stadium-size requirements?* He said that there was currently no stadium-size requirement imposed by the NCAA. A decade ago there was a requirement that I-A programs have a stadium that seated 30,000. Subsequently there was a requirement that each I-A program sell 20,000 tickets per game (in football). Now the requirement is that I-A programs average 15,000 attendees for every football game. He expected further evolution in these requirements but no changes that he could foresee would be impossible for the university to meet.

*Would we be playing games in WSU's Martin Stadium in the future?* No. While WSU had been generous in billing UI for the use of Martin Stadium when we first were using it, the price had gone up dramatically after we beat them two years in a row and it now costs \$35,000 per game.

*Is there a correlation between giving to athletic programs and giving to the university in general?* Yes, but what the exact correlation was he did not know.

*Could the Athletic Department give more financial support back to the university as a whole?* If the program can become more successful, it could contribute more.

In closing one councilor pointed out that there was precedent for the university's agreeing to "remit" a portion of the university's portion of income from certain research grants as a way of helping a program get a strong start.

However, another councilor pointed out that as long as the Athletic Department and other auxiliary services were treated so differently, there would be a perceptual problem for the Athletic Department.

**Other Announcements:**

The provost reminded council that on April 30<sup>th</sup> the president would be sending to them his “report card” that would address accreditation issues, the Pappas Report, University Vision and Resources Task Force recommendations and Phase II updates.

Councilor McGuire drew council’s attention to a one-page flier that alerted employees of some changes in reimbursement that would be in effect for the new contract year beginning July 1<sup>st</sup>. In response to a question he said that it appeared to him that Human Resources is doing a good job at looking for real savings in the program. He was aware that many employees were concerned about the \$1,000,000 life-time cap on insurance pay outs but noted that removing that cap would triple premiums. Currently in our program there is no one near that cap, the most anyone has yet been paid is something like \$340,000. If someone should approach the \$1,000,000 mark, the plan would be to raise the cap to \$1.5 million.

The provost mentioned that the finalists for those competing to be the university’s marketing agency would be making presentations on campus April 18-22. The provost’s search committee will be narrowing the finalists to three and they would be on campus April 25-29 (a period when we can expect the campus community to be particularly energized).

**Adjournment:** There being no further business and councilor Beard being back in his accustomed seat, he moved that council adjourn and the motion carried unanimously at 4:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Q. Adams  
Faculty Secretary and Secretary of the Faculty Council

