

University of Idaho
2009-2010
FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Meeting #6

Tuesday, September 29, 2009, 3:30 p.m.
BRINK HALL FACULTY LOUNGE

Order of Business

- I. Call to Order.**
- II. Minutes.**
 - Minutes of the 2009-10 Faculty Senate Meeting #5, September 22, 2009
- III. Chair's Report.**
- IV. Provost's Report.**
- V. Other Announcements and Communications.**
 - Campus Community Hour Proposal (Kelby Wilson, ASUI President)
 - UBAC – Recommendations concerning Y accounts (Jack Morris)
- VI. Committee Reports.**
- VII. Special Orders.**
- VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.**
 - Efficiency Cost Reduction Policy Memo
 1. Department Consolidation & Department Chair Issues
- IX. New Business.**
- X. Adjournment.**

Professor Dan Eveleth, Vice Chair 2009-2010, Faculty Senate

Attachments: Minutes of 2009-2010 FS Meeting #5, September 22, 2009
Campus Community Hour Proposal

University of Idaho
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
2009-10 Meeting #5
Tuesday September 22, 2009

Present: Baillargeon, Baird, Baker (w/o vote), Barlow, Battaglia, Edwards, Eveleth, Fritz, Geist, Graden, Guilfoyle, Hill (w/o vote), Holbrook (temp. student), Huber, Limbaugh, Marshall, Mihelich, Miller (chair), Murphy, Padaghn-Albrecht, Stark, Stearns, Sullivan, Wilson. Off-Campus Senators: Budwig (Boise), Dakins (Idaho Falls), Newcombe (Coeur d'Alene). **Absent:** Williams. **Guests:** 4

A quorum being present, the Chair opened the meeting at 3:31 p.m.

Minutes: During the previous meeting, there were many suggested friendly amendments to a motion. The final wording of the motion had left some confused. An excellent suggestion to provide a projector for such occasions providing clear editing for all members to view, will be implemented. Having clarified the issue, it was moved (Murphy/Guilfoyle) to accept the minutes of the meeting of September 15, 2009, meeting #4 of the 2009-10 Faculty Senate. Approved.

Chair's Report: The Chair reaffirmed the importance of our work over the past three weeks in reviewing the Provost's efficiency/consolidation memo. It is a concern that at the General Faculty Meeting there was a sense that faculty were unaware that the senate was working through these very issues. He encouraged senators to keep their constituents informed of the issues that the senate is working on and about up-coming issues about which input from faculty should be sought in advance.

The Faculty Secretary commented about aspects of the recent General Faculty Meeting, expressing concern at the tenor of the meeting. He reiterated the Chair's point that communication to constituents is very important and that there appeared to be little recognition that the senate had been working through the Provost's memo. He noted that several years ago the Faculty Secretary's Report appeared in the Register every week. The Faculty Secretary's office is working on a plan to re-introduce regular written communication of senate activities to the UI community and welcomed suggestions about appropriate periodicity for publication. He noted the importance of working together to instill positive energy across the UI community and that it is up to the senate to provide leadership in doing so. We have difficult fiscal issues to deal with and solutions will be difficult to find. He called for suggestions about how we might more effectively communicate to faculty to generate a more positive, can do culture. We need to identify mechanisms that will help us all be more constructive.

Provost's Report: The Provost noted that last week the SBOE had requested the UI to model four and six percent budget reductions. These reductions would likely be permanent. He noted that there are few places that can be readily cut once the budgeted year is underway. There was \$3 million in open positions. Another option is to make further cuts in travel. He asked for input on whether a presentation to review options for budget savings would be helpful. Several senators answered that this was done in previous years and that yes, it would be helpful to be presented in several faculty forums.

The Provost noted that during visits to the colleges with the President, this might provide an opportunity to share this information.

It may be helpful to show where cuts have been made in the lead up to the present. Show where cuts have been made across each of the Vice-President areas. It would be helpful to outline cuts to the athletics budget also.

The Provost noted that a winning football team could do a lot to contribute to improved revenues. ESPN has picked up the game of October 3 and the time-slot has been moved to 7:30. TV rights are very good revenue generators.

With respect to the budget, it would be helpful to see how funds expected to be saved are attached to items identified in the efficiency memo. The Provost responded that it may be difficult to model, but is a useful suggestion and will be attempted.

Dean Baird announced the launch of the library workshop series. The first workshop will be held next Wednesday at 11:30 a.m. in the Idaho Commons (Clearwater) and would address the new library catalog. Others include sessions focused on researchers and graduate students, citation management and other tools. The dean also noted that the library now subscribed to the Chronicle of Higher Education that was available on-line.

The discussion went on to address the Provost's efficiency memo.

What were some exceptions to the minimum class sizes under discussion?

The Provost replied that he was in discussions with the deans. He noted that the language about exceptions is included in the memo. He added that there was room to work through many mechanisms such as increasing interaction with WSU. He noted that WSU had also implemented a minimum undergraduate class size of 15 students per section. He added that WSU has used a rolling average number for calculation of the minimum.

Discussion turned to the motion in reference to language of senate recommendations to the Provost of minimum class sizes. It was suggested that there might be a technical amendment to the motion to improve it grammatically.

Thus, it was moved (Edwards/Sullivan) to amend the motion to:

The faculty senate recommends to the Provost that he amend the first bulleted paragraph of his memo to Provost's Council of August 25, 2009, as follows:

Undergraduate sections with fewer than 15 students and graduate classes with fewer than 8 students will be reviewed to determine their strategic importance to UI programs. Exceptions will be made for those courses needed to comply with accreditation requirements, for co-taught courses with Washington State University, for external funding, to satisfy specialized laboratory or studio requirements, for programs' strategically vital courses, and for other good causes shown. Each Dean will develop a report on these exceptions and have it approved by the Provost or Executive Vice President. We need to undertake this exercise in a very serious manner. While these changes will be in place in the Fall of 2010, I ask that each of you begin the implementation of this policy during the current academic year where possible.

Approved, 22 in favor, 1 opposed.

FS-10-006 FSH 3900 Non-Reappointment at the End of Contract of Non-Tenured Faculty and Exempt Staff. It was noted that the change in the language proposed by General Counsel was to bring the policy into alignment with SBOE policy. It was moved (Eveleth/ Fritz) to adopt the changes as proposed.

After clarification of the intent of B-3, it was again reiterated that the changes were to bring our policy into alignment with Regents policy which trumps ours. There being no further discussion, the question was called. Approved.

Provost's Efficiency Memo – Y accounts. The Chair noted that Dean Jack Morris was unavailable to present to the senate as planned. Professor Murphy would present his perspectives.

Some initial background of a perceived problem was that Y accounts at the UI had 5 year average carry over balances totaling \$21 million. This is interpreted by SBOE and others as a budget surplus. In fact, of this amount there is \$8 million in accumulated, consolidated debt. Thus, a more accurate carry forward was \$13 million. The Vision and Resource Taskforce had identified this as an issue about six years ago and at that time the debt was approximately \$16 million. The taskforce had recommended a tax on Y accounts that reduced this amount over several years to approximately \$8 million. The taskforce report is available at the Provost's webpage.

Is part of the problem that it is perceived that UI has a large (\$20 million) surplus and when we make a case for additional state funding, the perception is that we are well positioned and do not need additional funds? Professor Murphy noted that this may have been the case at one time, but this is changing.

The Provost added that the issue is more complex. There are funds in large amounts that are being used for real programmatic purposes. However, these funds have not been built into a budget structure. For example, we need to keep research farms going as we harvest crops and receive income that is then used to fund planting crops, for fertilizer, and to maintain equipment. The intent is to develop a process that budgets these activities so accounting is complete and commitment of funds is documented.

Professor Murphy noted that UI is now a \$442 million enterprise, but Y accounts are not included in those expenditures. Several years ago the Pappas report noted that UI had approximately \$20 million in non-budgeted funds across hundreds of accounts, while most similarly budgeted institutions would have fewer than 20 such accounts.

It was noted that for accounts that carried return on overhead, these funds became available some time after the funds that originally generated the overhead. This could create a kind of cash-flow problem for some programs.

It was suggested that if faculty had questions, that senators could forward them in writing to Dean Morris and he would be able to answer these next week. These could be forwarded directly to the dean or through the Senate Chair or the Faculty Secretary's office.

Some were concerned that a dean might "sweep" accounts inappropriately and this would result in a disincentive to faculty who would otherwise be generating such funds.

It was further noted that some faculty were presently making new arrangements such that resources were not directed to Y accounts and were being directed into other account types such as gift accounts.

The Provost responded that these accounts are managed, budgeted and accounted correctly.

It was noted that this issue had caused a lot of stress, angst and was a blow to faculty morale.

The Provost noted that the wording of the memo could have been crafted better but his intent was to better manage the accounts and that there is now an opportunity to provide clearer explanation.

It was noted that it appears that deans would now have direct access to faculty-generated Y funds and that the parallel situation would be access to externally funded research funds. Another view was that this puts another layer of administration over these funds that would lead to inefficiencies and delays in receiving approvals for needed expenditures.

It was argued that accounts that retained small amounts for emergency use such as to fund repairs of essential program equipment were different in context from the large Y accounts held in some sectors.

The Provost noted that for large emergencies, it was highly appropriate to have these funds in a single reserve fund.

Professor Murphy added that there was a similar excess in X accounts (\$12.5 million) that also needed to be more effectively budgeted.

Will the change in structure of y accounts result in a change in the way that return on overhead is calculated? The Provost replied that this was not the intention.

Provost's Efficiency Memo – Department Consolidation and Department Chair Issues: The Chair noted that the meeting had not addressed the issues of Department Consolidation and Department Chair issues and requested that in the remaining time, senate might wish to address these.

It was suggested that changing the chair appointment to 9 months would be a disincentive for faculty to consider taking on the role of Department Chair.

Another concern expressed was that this would encourage more internal searches especially those who may be in need of additional remuneration.

It was noted that chairs dealt with many important tasks in the summer and how would they be compensated?

The Provost replied that he expected that this would be discussed between deans and chairs. It was desired that people would be paid equitably for their work in the summer.

There was concern expressed that many faculty and middle administrators were committed and "on-call" 365/24/7.

Clarification was sought. *Would the recalculation of remuneration to chairs be calculated on their base salary or also include their administrative stipend?* The Provost replied that this detail should be worked out between deans and department chairs.

Discussion of department consolidation will be taken up again next week with Vice Chair Eveleth presiding since Chair Miller will be traveling on university business.

Adjournment: It was moved (Sullivan/Murphy) to adjourn at 4:57 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Rodney A. Hill, Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Senate.

Proposal for a University of Idaho Campus Community Hour

Statement of Purpose: A community hour is designed to provide a common time, free from academic instruction, to build community at the University of Idaho.

Support to our Strategic Action Plan:

Goal 1: Teaching and Learning

Provide opportunities beyond the classroom for interactions between students, faculty, staff, and outside guests to educate and learn from each other

Emphasize that learning happens both inside and outside classroom walls

Goal 2: Scholarly and Creative Activity

Encourage focus groups and think tanks to get together and develop initiatives to support interdisciplinary ways of thinking.

Goal 3: Outreach and Engagement

Invite youth from the local community and involve them in activities that are taking place on campus

Reach out to local, state and national leaders who greatly impact life here

Bring world-class guest lectures and speakers to engage our community

Goal 4: Organization, Culture and Climate

Improve the University of Idaho as a whole by fostering an open, inclusive, and connected culture and climate

Create an increase in overall institutional pride and spirit

Connect with centers and extensions across the state

Support of our Learning Outcomes:

- Learn and Integrate
- Think and Create
- Communicate
- Clarify purpose and perspective
- Practice citizenship

A Campus Community Hour would support all five Learning Outcomes through the same initiatives that support our Strategic Action Plan (see above).

Additional Uses and Advantages:

- All faculty, staff, student or campus meetings
- Departmental meetings or trainings
- Special events (guest speaker series, award ceremonies, POW/MIA, pep rallies, rare events like inaugurations, etc.)
- Faculty and Staff Professional Development and Learning
- Student life initiatives

Potential Impact

- Overall boost in community at the University of Idaho
- Lost of a 50 minute lecture time on Monday would be partially mitigated with the addition of a 75 minute lecture on Wednesday and Friday