

**University of Idaho**  
**2009-2010**  
**FACULTY SENATE AGENDA**

**Meeting #7**

**Tuesday, October 6, 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 #6, September 29, 2009
- III. Chair's Report.**
- IV. Provost's Report.**
- V. Other Announcements and Communications.**
  - Where There is a Will, There is a Way: Diversity Considerations in How We Hire Our Own (Carmen Suarez)
- VI. Committee Reports.**
- VII. Special Orders.**
- VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.**
  - Efficiency Cost Reduction Policy Memo
    1. Senate's proposed recommendations concerning Y account management
    2. Department consolidation & department chair Issues
    3. Travel freeze
    4. Open/vacant faculty/staff lines
- IX. New Business.**
- X. Adjournment.**

**Professor Jack Miller, Chair 2009-2010, Faculty Senate**

Attachments: Minutes of 2009-2010 FS Meeting #6, September 29, 2009

**University of Idaho**  
**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**2009-10 Meeting #6**  
**Tuesday September 29, 2009**

**Present:** Baillargeon, Baird, Baker (w/o vote), Barlow, Battaglia, Edwards, Eveleth, Fritz, Geist, Graden, Guilfoyle, Hill (w/o vote), Holbrook (temp. student), Huber, Marshall, Mihelich, Murphy, Padagham-Albrecht, Stark, Stearns, Sullivan, Williams, Wilson. Off-Campus Senators: Budwig (Boise), Dakins (Idaho Falls), Newcombe (Coeur d'Alene). **Absent:** Limbaugh, Miller (chair) **Guests: 5**

A quorum being present, the Chair opened the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

**Minutes:** It was moved (Murphy/Battaglia) to accept the minutes of the meeting of September 22, 2009, meeting #5 of the 2009-10 Faculty Senate. Approved.

**Chair's Report:** Senate Vice-Chair, Professor Eveleth, chaired the meeting as Professor Miller was in Washington, D.C. on university business. He noted that being part of the leadership team for the first time this year, he was very impressed with the quality of the interactions between the faculty leadership and the President and Provost. The executives were generous with their time and proactive in engaging faculty leadership in regular meetings. He further noted that earlier today faculty leadership had met with the President who wished to discuss the six percent state budget rescission. The President requested input at two levels: (a) dealing with the short-term realities of the rescission, and (b) taking back control providing longer-term vision and ideas for innovative ways to grow revenue. Input is sought from the UI community and requested that it be channeled through senate leadership. Short-term, one-off solutions may involve a combination of several budget pieces such as open lines, reserves, travel, travel, furloughs, etc. The President is very interested in ideas for short-term revenue increases; for example, can we retain and attract students more effectively than we typically would when transitioning from the fall to the spring semesters.

The Faculty Secretary added that he was in agreement with Professor Eveleth. The President is very open to dialog and input from faculty. From day one of his appointment he has actively listened to faculty and constituents across the state and is very genuinely interested in capturing the ideas and input that we can provide. The President has a positive, can-do philosophy in looking at the ways we can increase revenue (as he says thinking about the glass half-full rather than half-empty). He has come to lead the university during a very difficult fiscal period. It is also up to the senate to provide leadership in culturally emphasizing the "glass half-full". We can be very well positioned to move into a much stronger and forward looking university when the economy does turn. In the interim, we have some significant challenges, but the genuine interest of the leadership in seeking faculty input is buoying in looking to a stronger future.

**Provost's Report:** The Provost noted that there were solutions to improving revenues. For example, if we could improve retention to our peer institution levels (up about five percentage points) the result would be an increase of 500 students. This number when multiplied by tuition (roughly \$4,000) would provide a \$2M increase in revenue, enhancing our outlook.

He suggested that student retention might be helped through simple actions such as faculty having coffee with a group of students, or turning in mid-term grades, things we can do to help our students. If faculty observe a student who is struggling, reach out to them. He also noted that such actions should be driven by a real concern for student well-being, and retention was a benefit of this concern. He

noted that especially where there was room in programs for additional students, we should be looking to ways to find students to fill those places.

The Vice-Chair noted that in looking to increase mid-year enrollments perhaps by making it easier for students to work through the process, there might be ways that staff could provide helpful input.

The Provost noted on the expenditure reduction side that there was only a little that might be cut from travel and suggested that minor capital outlay might be curtailed (for example new computers for faculty). There was some scope in open lines but there were some positions that must be filled to meet our mission. He further noted that furloughs might be considered and suggested that a tiered system would be appropriate with the heaviest burden being carried by those with higher incomes. The flexibility in drawing down reserves was limited. The potential effects on university credit rating may lead to the university paying higher interest rates on borrowed funds, clearly a counter-productive outcome.

*Is the allocation for the proposed dairy/environmental center included in the six percent rescission?* The Provost provided a brief explanation giving the context of the jointly funded (State/ UI/industry) center proposed for southern Idaho, noting that Idaho is now the third largest dairy state. Yes, the \$10M in state funds reserved for that project would be taxed.

*Had the alternatives for expenditure reductions been prioritized?* Not yet, but these alternatives needed to be modeled to inform decisions. The Provost's preference was to put furloughs at the lower end of the list of alternatives.

The Provost noted that on a positive note the glass was indeed "82% full". We have low fees and provide great value for quality education. Next year WSU fees/tuition will be \$9,200 and at UI they are only \$4,900 this year. He noted that there were many activities on campus this week. This evening the Athena group function will run from 4:30- 9:00 in the Commons. Also, there will be a presentation by Patrick Cousey sponsored by the Professional Ethics Program. Dean Aiken will Chair the evening. There is also a nice workshop tomorrow with lunch, for faculty interested in how they might do a better job of teaching ethics in the classroom.

Professor Eveleth introduced ASUI President Kelby Wilson to present a discussion item – Campus Community Hour proposal. Mr. Wilson noted that it was documented that retention improved as a result of increased student-faculty informal interaction. He provided several examples of other universities at which this practice had been adopted. The present proposal was to schedule a community hour from 12:30-1:30 p.m. on Mondays.

The implications for the potential impact on scheduled class periods were discussed by several senators. Many indicated their support for the concept. One suggestion was to introduce the community hour on a trial basis. There was an interactive forum coordinated by Professors O'Rourke and Buckvich, the University Interdisciplinary Colloquium, that might provide a potential interface for this activity. The potential positive benefit on student retention was a strong point for support of the idea. The potential for the activity to disrupt class schedules, for example the run-on effect on scheduling on Wednesdays and Fridays (replacement of a regular teaching period with 75 minute blocks may be disruptive to some programs) was a concern and such a potential issue needed to be addressed.

Professor Eveleth then introduced Dean Jack Morris to address the senate. Dean Morris also serves as the Chair of the University Budget Advisory Committee (UBAC) and the committee was in the process of

reviewing budgetary issues and making recommendations to President Nellis. A range of issues are in review including the most appropriate budgeting model to consider for adoption and a review of accounts including X, Y and N accounts many of which were not budgeted in the overall university budgeting process. A further issue was to establish a formal system to replenish university reserves, suggested to a level that would provide a buffer in the event of up to a 3% state budget rescission.

Dean Morris provided some brief background on the formation and committee member demographics. There were twelve committee members which includes two deans, two administrators from major centers, three faculty, three staff, one student and the athletic director. The committee met throughout the summer, holding a retreat each Wednesday.

The recommendation on the budget reserve was that it should be built using 5% of appropriated funds from three different sources: 25% from salary savings, 5% from F&A (already budgeted to central administration and, a 2% G&A tax. Based on past experience this would annually replenish the reserve in the region of \$2M-\$3M. Once this reserve was stably formed the same budgeting mechanisms would be used to build a Strategic Initiative Fund.

The next recommendation being formulated by the committee is to use an “All Funds” model of budgeting as a best-practice. This led to a recommendation to review all X, Y and N accounts. There were approximately 1800 Y accounts held across the university with very little of these funds being formally budgeted. The intention would be for all Y accounts to be budgeted on a three year budgeting cycle. Faculty who obtained revenues into Y accounts would need to establish budgeted incomes and expenditures for these accounts. Variance should also be estimated. For accounts in which there was significant variance over or below the budgeted amount (established between the faculty member and the department head and at the next level between the department head and the dean) justification at year’s end would need to be established. On-going unbudgeted funds would be subject to reallocation at the college level.

*If the reserve provides a buffer of up to a 3% rescission level, what are the strategies for dealing with rescissions greater than 3%?* This question was being worked on by the UBAC at present.

*There are many different reasons for Y accounts to exist. How many of these accounts are special purpose accounts holding course fees?* About 25% of the Y accounts are of this type.

*What is the number of these accounts that hold return on overhead (F & A) and what total funds are held in these accounts?* The number of these types of accounts is presently unknown. The funds of this type can be calculated from the formula for return on F & A.

*When accounts are centralized to the dean’s office, faculty who have raised those funds get nervous.* The UBAC recommendation is only to roll funds to the dean’s office in the cases where there are unbudgeted surplus funds. This would only occur after faculty and department heads had done end-of-year review, and the surplus funds were identified.

*Would faculty have the ability to develop budgets for these accounts without interference from administrators?* Yes. The intention is that it is up to faculty to develop their budgets and to have expenditure authority on the budgeted funds. When variances from budgets are large, justification for the variance is needed otherwise the amount of funds remaining in the account will be moved to the dean’s authority.

*It was noted that there are different levels of trust in different colleges. There may be some faculty in colleges in which trust level is lower who will feel at a disadvantage.* Dean Morris acknowledged that building trust was a very important issue that had been discussed at length in the committee.

*Does UBAC provide a regular report?* The assignment for UBAC is to develop a complete report for the President with recommendations on budgeting all of the revenues and expenditures of the university. After review by the President, it can be expected that the recommendations will be published.

*Did UBAC study various budgeting models, for example the resource center management (RCM) model?* The RCM model is very decentralized. Costs and revenues are attributed at the center (unit) level. Best practice examples using this model are Ohio State University and the University of New Hampshire. This model can work well until it is necessary to work with rescissions. The committee reviewed aspects of this model at length. Larry Goldstein provided advice about good aspects of the RCM model to be considered.

The chair thanked Dean Morris for reporting the recommendations under development by UBAC to the senate.

**Adjournment:** It was moved (Wilson/Baillargeon) to adjourn at 5:00 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

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