

University of Idaho  
**FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES**

**2004-2005 Meeting #23, Tuesday, May 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2005**

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

**Absent:** Farnen, Reese

**Observers:** 6

**Call to Order:** A quorum being present, Faculty Council Chair Bailey called the meeting to order at 3:50 p.m. (The usual meeting time was postponed so that the council might interview the provost candidate who was on campus for an interview today.)

**Minutes:** The minutes of the April 26<sup>th</sup> meeting were approved as distributed. (It was noted that while Gunter and Hammel were indeed absent from council last week, they had been with chair Bailey and councilor Young at the all-day budget presentations in official capacities.)

**Chair's Report:** The chair commented on the provost search interviews, noting that the list of questions handed out at the interview this afternoon were the questions that had been asked of the first candidate. While questions asked of each candidate would naturally differ somewhat, given their different backgrounds, the distributed list of questions was an aid to comparability of interviews. Comments concerning the provost candidates should be sent to Dean Burnett.

**Provost's Report:** The provost distributed a written statement which she then read and asked that it be put in the minutes:

“Rather than give you a Provost report today, I would like to take the opportunity to thank each of you for serving on the Faculty Council this year and to discuss the last few days. My comments today are addressed from my role as a faculty member as well as from my role as the interim Provost, soon to be replaced, I hope, by a permanent Provost. I have been a faculty member at this University for well over 30 years, as have some of you. The University has not only become for me just a place to work, but also it has played a big part of my life...and in a sense it has become my home. This semester, working in two capacities—faculty and administrator—I have made every effort to consider the University as a whole and to do what is “best for the University.” I made that statement when I interviewed for the interim Provost position, and I strongly adhere to that statement today.

This year we have a new leader and that means we have a new way of doing things at the University. President White has repeatedly stated that his administration will function in an “open and transparent” environment. Being open and transparent, means there has to be a strong element of “shared leadership and governance” in any decisions and processes that we engage in over difficult matters arising from ongoing budgetary issues and academic programming. The Phase II-Transforming the University that we have been engaged in over the last month has been a faculty-led process with oversight by me, the interim Provost. While we are aware of the intense process over the last month, it is important to keep in mind that this process actually began last summer with the faculty, staff, and students who developed recommendations outlined in the University’s Vision and Resources Task Force (UVRTF) report. It might be worthwhile to go back to that report, and review the recommendations from time to time. Beginning on page 125 of the UVRTF Report and continuing through page 135, you will find the initial UVRTF recommendation to develop “a program prioritization tool.” On these pages, you will see many of the proposed metrics to measure centrality to mission, quality and economic value. These were used in the Phase II process. The UVRTF’s list of measures for “quality and economic value” was not arbitrarily identified by this group, but the list was generated by thoughtful discussion among the 26 members. Some of these measures are the same as those being proposed by the recent report prepared by the National Commission on Accountability in Higher Education. This recent report is becoming a key

driver for the accreditation standards set by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities. Some of these measures will very likely be required if Idaho Senate Bill 1187 passes.

So this leads us back to the discussion that occurred last Thursday and the concern that the validity and reliability of the program analysis (Phase II, Tool 2) was flawed. As I have repeatedly said, good decisions are made by use of objective measures and the good judgment of those closest to the program. The objective measures indicate where we are now at a point in time and becomes the “starting point for discussion,” but it is the subjective interpretation, good judgment, and open dialogue that will lead us to our future.

I recognize there are changes that need to be made to improve our first attempt at using performance metrics and modeling in a complex higher education system. I agree with the faculty concerns and the President’s directive to not use program rankings that emerged from the model in any of the forthcoming decisions on program changes, this is a far cry from not using the outcomes and data collected on linkages, etc. But, in accordance with the literature on measuring productivity and performance, an organization has to start somewhere. It begins by creating a set of measures that appropriately fit the institution, trying them out, and engaging in a continuous improvement process. This is the Plan-Do-Check-Act actions that are required if we are to make progress in building a workable program assessment model. At the outset of Phase II, I had two goals in mind—to build an ongoing assessment model and to resolve our budget situation. These goals were ambitious for the short time frame, but it was a necessary process to set the University back in motion. We have been in a status quo mode for too long and we cannot continue to be reactive to our environment. We must move forward in a positive way and we must become leaders, not followers.

I realize, and I know you do as well, that this past month we were all working under intense time pressures to capture, analyze, and report the data in an open, transparent environment so that we would have some time to discuss and review the initial college plans. Our urgency was dependent on our need to specifically address the FY06 budget as well as FY07 and beyond. I am tired of dealing with budget problems every year, and I know that many of you are also tired and stressed by this constant discussion. I would encourage us to take action this year so that we can become a University that lives within its means and builds on its strengths. This is a path I believe is essential if we are to attract and retain the best faculty, staff, and students, and if we are to continue to be a competitive land grant, research institution.

So where are we now in Phase II? We are in the process of reviewing “*initial recommendations*” generated at the April 26<sup>th</sup> meeting. This meeting of shared leadership involved the deans, vice presidents, University Budget and Finance Committee, Provost, and the President. Some of these initial recommendations from this meeting do require formal SBOE Notices of Intent (NOIs), while others may be delayed for further discussion if we have insufficient basis for recommending to the President. The NOIs coming forward now are those that will have an effect on our FY’06 budgets. The process of reviewing the NOIs are in a parallel discussion process with the open comment period primarily because we have until May 10<sup>th</sup> to bring them to Faculty Council for consideration. The SBOE will require a review of the NOIs beginning May 17<sup>th</sup> at the latest. Delaying action on the NOIs will only prolong the inevitable, and such a delay will send the wrong message to the SBOE and our external stakeholders about our taking control of our future for the good of Idaho.

As we engage as a university community to review these initial recommendations over the next week or so, our focus should be on doing what is “best for the University.” We need to ask how we can capitalize on our strengths and build academic programs that meet the needs of students, now and in the future.

Let me conclude by saying, I can live with whatever the shared governance process generates as feasible solutions to our budget concerns, but I cannot live with indecisiveness and conduct that erodes the process. I encourage you to look forward in making program changes, not backwards or to remain in a

position of status quo. We have not yet resolved all of our budget problems, and we have to look beyond FY06 in making strategic decisions that affect the University's future. The higher education environment is changing and we must change with it, else lose our status as the State's well-respected flagship land-grant, research institution. As faculty we must work together to do what is best for the University.

My thanks to all of you who have served as faculty leaders on the Faculty Council this year and to all of your faculty colleagues who contributed to the intense effort of Phase II this past month. Let's end this year by agreeing to work together these next 2-3 weeks on one common goal—to strengthen and build the University's future.”

Accompanying the provost's report was a flow chart that detailed the process by which the various proposals growing out of Phase II were being reviewed. She noted that the shaded “boxes” on the chart represented faculty governance input. She urged that any comments be sent to her at [provost@uidaho.edu](mailto:provost@uidaho.edu).

Vice-Chair Zemetra commented on one portion of the provost's report, emphasizing the importance, and the challenge, of the legislature's wanting uniform faculty workload and productivity measures (Senate Bill No. 1187). This is something that we as an institution will need to pay careful attention to. Our recent experience this spring has reinforced for us just how difficult it is to devise a single set of metrics that appropriately measure faculty activity in the various programs of a single diverse university; the task will of course be much greater when the task is extended to all state institutions of higher education with their diverse goals and missions.

**President's Comments:** The president reported on a similar legislative initiative in Oregon. The state developed a set of performance indicator metrics, some common to all institutions, some individual ones. While initially only a small fraction of the general fund budget was distributed in this fashion (i.e. university performance against metric standards), the plan was to increase the fraction, perhaps as high as 10%, of the state appropriation to higher education to be dependent on those performance metrics. Other states have taken similar actions. It is for us to decide what are measures that make sense for us and also have data that are tight, measurable and trackable. There is growing public expectation throughout the nation for such measures and, when done well, provide the institution more confidence in program evaluation as well as good public relations.

The president also had a written report that he distributed; it was the same document that was distributed electronically to the entire university community earlier in the day. He emphasized that of the data gathered in the Phase II process the only portion which was being disregarded was the model for weighting various factors and ranking university academic programs. He further emphasized that such a model would be needed in the future for internal planning and external reporting but before being put into effect the model needed more work and evaluation.

When asked what he would do with the input from Faculty Council and others concerning the proposed program changes, some that require notices of intent. The president replied that he would be using the needs of the state and university as the bases for making decisions and would be looking to understand the academic and financial implications of the decisions for unit and university. Only compelling cases will carry the day; he would not be persuaded by purely parochial concerns. We have spent a lot of time in the last fourteen months planning and working on these issues and we need to seize the moment and make the best decisions we can. He emphasized the seriousness of the issues and the need, not to just criticize proposed changes but to propose well-reasoned alternatives. That would be helpful to him.

He expressed particular praise for Provost Linda Morris in the work she had done with her important interim assignment for the university this spring. He also thanked members of the Council for their leadership during the year, as did Professor Morris.

The provost pointed out that the list of possible notices of intent have been posted to her website; the more detailed proposal would be published as soon as they were available. She noted that any changes that would affect the FY 06 budget needed to go forward now; other proposals might need further discussion and refinement in the fall. Jeff Young, chair of the University Budget and Finance Committee noted that that group was preparing a report on their sense of the proposals presented at last week's budget consideration meeting.

A councilor asked the president whether the proposed changes, once effected, would be sufficient to bring this long series of budget cuts and reallocations to a conclusion. The president replied that from everything we currently know, the current proposals, if effected, should lead to a balanced budget for FY 06. He cautioned that there were certain factors that were not completely known yet. Our income is of course partially dependent on enrollment. Right now our projected fall enrollment is on target to meet our goals. Of course it is also true that we are due to graduate our largest class ever so from the enrollment point of view we are at the juncture of competing forces. The university's income was also partly dependent on grant and contract activity and the exact amounts from this source could only be estimated at this time. It is also the case that the Board of Regents has not officially announced our budget yet. They have had concerns about equity issues and they may decide to make changes in the customary formula on the basis of those issues. The president reported that he had weighed in with what he thought was a compelling case for the university's position on these equity issues but that he was not the decision-maker. In sum, the president was reasonably confident, on the basis of a conservative financial analysis, that we were done with the kind activity that has occupied us for the past month or so.

**Ombudsman's Annual Report:** Professor Charles Morison, faculty ombudsman, distributed the Ombudsman Office's annual report. In this he was lent moral support by Roxanne Schreiber, associate ombudsman. He pointed out that the case-load had already increased this year over last, and that the months of April, May and June were not accounted for in the annual report. More cases were being initiated by e-mail contact than before but that such contacts were immediately switched to more confidential channels. There were also more people self-referring to the office which presumably betokened an increasingly widespread knowledge of the services provided by the office. Employment issues remained number one in terms of referrals while interpersonal issues was second.

The report urged the implementation, long planned, of training for supervisors in such areas as conducting and communicating performance evaluations, mediation, team-building, and managing interpersonal conflicts. It also emphasized the need for civility and respect for all interactions on campus and encouraged colleges and departments to include civility and respectful interactions as part of their bylaws.

**Final Report from Committee on Committees:** The council took up for review a seconded motion from the Committee on Committees of the committee's appointments to Faculty Council committees along with its request that it be granted the customary authority to fill any vacancies in these committees that might arise over the summer. Professor Zemetra, the chair of the Committee on Committees, praised both the GSA and the ASUI for their successful efforts to nominate students for the student positions on these committees. Answering a question as to how one might go about changing the structure of certain committees, e.g., Faculty Affairs and the Intellectual Property, so as to include student members, he said that a recommendation and rationale for those changes should be sent to the Committee on Committees. After this brief discussion the motion to approve carried unanimously.

**Adjournment:** There being no new business it was moved and seconded (Beard, McGuire) to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Q. Adams,  
Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Council