

**University of Idaho
2008-2009 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA
Meeting #13**

**Tuesday, December 2, 2008, 3:30 p.m.
BRINK HALL FACULTY LOUNGE**

Order of Business

- I. Call to Order.**
- II. Minutes.**
 - Minutes of the 2008-09 Faculty Council Meeting #12, November 18, 2008
- III. Chair's Report.**
- IV. Provost's Report.**
- V. Other Announcements and Communications.**
 - Approval of Fall 2008 Graduates
 - Advising, Assessment, Professional Development (Christiansen)
- VI. Committee Reports.**
- VII. Special Orders.**
- VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.**
 - **Program Prioritization Process**
- IX. New Business.**
- X. Adjournment.**

Professor Karen Guilfoyle, Chair 2008-2009, Faculty Council

Attachments: Minutes of 2008-2009 FC Meeting #12, November 18, 2008

University of Idaho
Faculty Council Meeting Minutes
2008-09 Meeting #12 Tuesday November 18, 2008

Present: Baker (w/o vote), Battaglia, Chandler, Crowley, Eveleth, Fairley, Frey, Guilfoyle (chair), Hill (w/o vote), Holbrook, Huber, Machlis, Miller, Murphy, Oman, Das, Schmeckpeper, Sullivan, Wilson. Liaisons: Budwig (Boise), Newcombe (Coeur d'Alene), Crepeau (Idaho Falls).

Absent: Baird, Fritz, Holthaus, Limbaugh, Schmiede, Williams
Guests 3.

A quorum being present, the chair called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m. in the Brink Hall Faculty Lounge.

Minutes: It was moved and seconded (Murphy, Machlis) to accept the minutes of the November 11 meeting (Meeting #11) of the 2008-2009 Faculty Council as distributed. The motion carried.

Chair's Report: The chair thanked the FAC chair for the work he did in presenting the PD&AE and FC vice-chair for his efforts in bringing the two constitution changes (faculty council to faculty senate and center representation) to the General Faculty meeting held the previous day. The chair thanked those who were able to attend then noted that there was not a quorum, and asked for suggestions from FC members to encourage faculty attendance at General Faculty Meetings.

Calculation of the quorum number and the potential to introduce the notion of off-campus voting was discussed. A quorum requires 1/6th of the Moscow faculty number to be present in the meeting. By tradition and bound to Roberts Rules of Order, those eligible to vote need to be physically present.

The chair moved on to the topic of the president search and noted that there were approximately 40 applicants and the process was moving forward. Brief questions and discussion followed:

Was a professional recruitment firm involved in the process?

Yes. The chair felt comfortable with the integrity of the firm that was engaged.

The chair also noted that she had received feedback from FC members who had been proactive in meeting with their deans to discuss the PPP. The chair encouraged FC members to continue active involvement and looked forward to the discussion items that would ensue in up-coming FC meetings.

Provost's Report: The provost wished to provide further clarification on budget reallocations and process as discussed in the recent General Faculty Meeting. Last summer UI instituted a budget reallocation in the amount of \$6.2M to focus funds to strategic priorities. In the fall, the governor forewarned of a possible state hold-back of 1% of state funds and recommended to also hold an additional 1.5%. With the national fiscal meltdown, this number may now be revised to be as high as 5% and will be confirmed this week by the DFM. Questions and discussion followed:

The president had mentioned in the General Faculty Meeting that the total hold-back may be \$20M. Is this the case?

Clarifying, the summer reallocation was \$6.2M. This year (FY09) the total hold-back will be in the range of \$2.5 to \$5M, and in FY10, an additional \$2.5-\$5M. In addition, normal inflationary increases would add a further \$2-\$4M. In this last-mentioned category, the following are included: enrollment workload adjustment, an increase in insurance costs, and planning for an emergency fund reserve. Thus, the \$20

M figure represents a reduction in funding available over two to three years. In the context of the entire institutional annual budget of approximately \$440M, this reduction will be coming from the state allocation of approximately \$96M.

Was it possible for UI to put pressure on the state board to defer the enrollment workload adjustment amount in the present fiscal climate?

The provost noted that the question will be put and discussions with the state board on this issue will be pursued.

Considering the large inflationary costs noted, what are longer-term plans for dealing with these items?

The cost of energy is a moving target. For example last year the \$30M ESCO (energy savings program) was implemented to reduce energy consumption across the board. On the other side of the ledger, some revenues are projected to increase through previous strategic investments.

The question of apportionment of appropriated fund cuts was raised. There are some parts of the university that are more dependent than others on appropriated funds. If an across-the-board cut is made to deal with the short-fall it is in effect, a disproportionate cut to some units. *The question is: should units that have access to funds that aren't appropriated bear a larger proportion of the cuts?*

Yes this factor will be taken into consideration. A model for the process is under development.

As salary lines hold a large proportion of total funds, is it feasible to continue the position hire pause?

The deans have already held back positions. This has been under discussion in Provost's Council and deans will be coming forward with a subset of priority hires. The great majority of new hires over the last year have been consistent with the SAP.

How far into the future will the negative effects of the enrollment workload adjustment persist?

Being on a three year rolling average, student numbers are up this year so this will take a further two years to take effect on the EWA.

What is the return and when will we see further returns on the recent strategic investment?

The most immediate effect was seen in a 24% increase in graduate enrollment. There will be lag effects with the other categories for example investment in advancement and in the research office.

Many faculty are very concerned about the future of the institution following the President's comments on the budget holdbacks.

It is a very serious situation but we are well-placed to deal with it and it does not mean the end of the university. We have to plan carefully. We are well into the PPP and RFI. The deans continue to meet twice weekly to explore options on program reduction and what is viable. It is very important to consider our decisions and avoid unintended negative effects such as effects on enrollment and also look to improve synergies and partnerships. How we restructure and what we want to look like are all packaged into this PPP.

There is a lot of discussion on restructure on the academic side. What of the non-academic aspects of UI?

One example is work on process engineering. Finance and Administration is doing a self-study and actively working through this process now. It is noteworthy that for UI statistics such as administrative intensity, the number of administrators per faculty or per student, the number is approximately 50% of our peers. Thus, numbers of administrators are very thin.

A further question arose because of the recent change in approach to the PPP. Staying with the coarse review at unit level would have involved faculty input by this time. The change to Provost's Council working down to program level has delayed faculty involvement and many faculty are very concerned about this issue.

Because of the complexity of the data that came out of the coarse review – some strong units with weaker programs, some weak units with a stronger element, the change in strategy seemed to be the best way forward. However, it will be essential to get faculty involvement as soon as possible and the process is working towards that point.

The chair noted that it was important to keep the process highly transparent.

It was also noted that it would be very important to get more detailed information out to faculty by very early in the spring.

University Budget and Finance Committee. The chair moved the discussion to the budget report noting that the Intercollegiate Athletics By-Laws required further discussion with the director of athletics before being further discussed at FC.

The UBFC chair distributed a one-page university-wide budget summary for FY09. He noted the following points:

1. Budget issues presented a moving target and in the present national fiscal situation, budgets were being revised regularly. The UBFC was meeting with F&A every two weeks and the UBFC chair was meeting with F&A leadership weekly.

2. Salary and Promotion: Money for CEC is not likely. Money for promotion increment is unthreatened for now although the source is not apparent.

3. Benefits: Health Care program renewal is open until November 28. There is an error on the summary page for Plan H. There is a new change to eliminate the embedded deductible for employees who enroll in Plan H - family coverage. Instead of an individual deductible of \$1150, the family must meet a deductible of \$2300 before the 70/30 co-pay begins. Furthermore there is a glitch in the CY08 plan where the individual deductible was misapplied by Blue Cross. We have been using \$1500 as the individual deductible but IRS regulations require us to use a \$2200 deductible per individual when enrolled in Plan H – family coverage. For those employees who began to receive the 70/30 co-pay after reaching \$1500, they must now pay an additional \$700 out of pocket before the 70/30 co-pay begins again. In some cases, individuals may have a tax problem at the end of the year, primarily those who received the benefit of a \$1500 deductible but will not reach a total of \$2200 in qualifying expenses. For example, if someone has had \$2000 in qualifying medical expenses so far this year and will not have any more medical expenses for the rest of this benefit year, they will have received the 70/30 co-pay benefit on \$500 of expenses. This is not compliant with IRS regulations. It is not clear what the IRS will do to someone in this case.

4. Reallocation of funds: Cuts will not be permanent until 2012 at earliest; an enrollment increase of 12% with a fee increase of 5% would generate \$6M. We have yet to see a business plan for reinvestment of money, although we know that COGS was given \$425K in this process, \$221K for new

