University of Idaho
2019 – 2020 Faculty Senate Agenda
Meeting # 11
Tuesday, November 5, 2019 at 3:30 pm
Paul Joyce Faculty- Staff Lounge & Zoom

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes (vote)
   • Minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 10 (October 22, 2019) Attach. #1

III. Consent Agenda

IV. Chair’s Report

V. Provost’s Report

VI. Committee Reports

VII. Other Announcements and Communications
   • Budget and Financial Planning
     Scott Green (President of the University of Idaho)
     John Wiencek (Provost and Executive Vice-President)
     Terry Grieb (Chair Faculty Senate)
     Chad Neilson (Chair Staff Council)

VIII. Special Orders

IX. New Business
   • Committee on Committees Appointments Survey Attach. # 2
     Barbara Kirchmeier (Vice-Chair Faculty Senate & Chair of Committee on Committees)

X. Adjournment

Attachments:
   • Attach. #1 Minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 10 (October 22, 2019)
   • Attach. #2 Committee on Committees Appointments Survey
University of Idaho

2019 – 2020 Faculty Senate – Approved

Meeting # 11

Tuesday, November 5th, 2019 at 3:30 pm

Paul Joyce Faculty- Staff Lounge & Zoom

Present: Bacon, Bridges, Caplan, Chapman, Chopin, Cosens, DeAngelis, Dezzani, Fairley, Grieb (Chair), Hill, Jeffery, Keim, Kirchmeier (Vice- Chair), Lee-Painter, Luckhart, Paul, Raja, Sammarruca (w/o vote), Schab, Schwarzaender, A. Smith, R. Smith, Tibbals, Wiencek (w/o vote). Amin Mirkouei (Proxy for Michael McKellar).

Present via Zoom: Kern, Tenuto, Sears.

Absent: Lockhart, McKellar.

Guests: 16.

Speakers/Discussion Leaders: Scott Green (President of the University of Idaho)
                                          John Wiencek (Provost and Executive Vice-President
                                          Terry Grieb (Faculty Senate, Chair)
                                          Chad Neilson (Staff Council, Chair)

I. Call to Order: Chair Grieb called the meeting to order at 3:31 PM.

II. Approval of Minutes (vote): There was a motion to approve the minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 10 (October 22, 2019) (Dezzani/Tibbals). The motion to approve the minutes passed unanimously.

III. Consent Agenda: There was none.

IV. Chair’s Report

   • Nominations for University Level Promotion Committee are due Friday, Nov. 8th. Please see email from last week and earlier today. Contact Mary Stout for more information and for submitting requests.
   • The ISUB and TLC remain closed until further notice due to flooding in the basement. Updates on re-opening and rescheduling are available at the ISUB updates website.
   • The budget open forum is scheduled for 3pm Thursday, Nov. 7th in the International Ballroom of the Pitman Center. Note the new location due to temporary closure of the ISUB.

   Chair Grieb asked if there were any questions. Hearing none, he moved to the next item on the agenda.

V. Provost’s Report: Unless there are specific questions for him, Provost Wiencek said he will not make a report, in consideration of the fact that President Green has another engagement at 4:30pm.
VI. **Committee Reports:** There were none.

VII. **Other Announcements and Communications:** Budget and Financial Planning.
Scott Green (President of the University of Idaho), John Wieneck (Provost and Executive Vice-President), Terry Grieb (Faculty Senate, Chair), and Chad Neilson (Staff Council, Chair).

Chair Grieb welcomed the President. In turn, President Green thanked the Senate for the invitation. He also acknowledged the support received for the organization of Leadership Weekend. The Envision event was a success thanks to the help of many. Alumni visited from all over the country. President Green thanked Sodexo for their services.

President Green referred to the memo that was sent out campus-wide last week, October 30, 2019. He reminded everyone of the open forum on Thursday, November 7, 2019. He proceeded to say that there is not much specific to report yet, other than the process that’s being set up. This is the beginning of a broader conversation. There will be frequent communication, more memos, and more open forums. The President said he welcomes any opportunity to communicate with the Senators and their constituencies. After the memo went out, considerable feedback was received, also from students, who were concerned about the potential closure of programs. To put their minds at ease, the President’s Office called the Argonaut and responded very quickly to the students’ concerns. He continues to be open to questions and comments.

A Senator asked the President to clarify the best way to provide input into the process. Should one provide, for instance, written comments to the various committees? President Green referred to the Budget Update Talking Points from October 29, 2019. He emphasized that we need to be institutionally mindful, as a whole. Chair Grieb displayed the flow chart contained in the presentation attached to the meeting binder and started to explain the role of the various committees. During the past couple of weeks, the President, Provost, Faculty Senate Leadership, and Staff Council have been talking about developing “structures” to help with the decision-making process as we move forward. The Policy Review Committee will focus on the policy part including FSH, APM, and any SBOE-mandated policies. This group will work with the Policy Coordinator to ensure compliance from the start. The Tools Ranking Taskforce will review the (8) strategies listed in the President’s memo as well as identify additional tools to be used in the reallocation process. Those tools will be placed in “bins”, ranked from “desirable” to “least desirable”. This group will consist of 3 senators and 3 staff members from the Moscow campus, 1 senator from outside Moscow and 1 staff member from outside Moscow. The Tools Ranking Taskforce and the Policy Review Committee (the two “ovals” on top of the flow chart), are charged by Senate and will work during the Fall Semester. The Faculty Senate and UI Leadership will act as “check-in” points. The two components on the lower part of the flow chart, next to the two-way arrows and question marks, are the Sustainable Financial Model Working Group (SFMWG) and the Administration components of the process. The SFMWG will meet again next week and will deliver their final work in January. As this semester’s work wraps up, the administrative work will proceed in the Spring. The academic and non-academic components of the Program Prioritization Committee will be charged by and will report to IPEC.

A Senator suggested that one Dean should be included in the Taskforce. There was positive feedback concerning this suggestion, since Deans are already engaged in similar “binning” processes. Different efforts should be coordinated as much as possible.
Another Senator inquired about the timeframe for the Tools Ranking Taskforce. Looking at the items in the Budget Update Talking Points, she noticed some overlap among those strategies. She wondered whether more information will be provided to better define those items, which are certainly very important categories for the “bins”. Provost Wiencek replied that we are in a fluid situation and we still need to figure out all the details of a path forward.

A Senator asked the meaning of IPEC. Chair Grieb responded that it stands for Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Committee (IPEC). Provost Wiencek clarified that IPEC is essentially a Program Prioritization Committee.

A Senator inquired about the origin of the cost-reducing strategies currently listed. President Green replied that they originate partially from the Cabinet. He added that he will be happy to extend the list and consider additional strategies. Suggestions are welcome.

A Senator remarked that we need more information to make intelligent choices. President Green concurred. The estimated shortfall is $22 million, including $14 million in budget reductions which are already in progress and $8 million in anticipated additional cuts. When more information is available about where the cuts are going to be, that information will be passed on to the Deans who will then be expected to take appropriate actions.

Provost Wiencek added that a complete plan is not going to be revealed all at once. Information will come in smaller chunks. There will be some kind of final announcement, but first one needs to know, for instance, how many people may leave voluntarily.

Another Senator brought up the issue of the “right size” of the Administration as was discussed earlier in the Senate. It would help the morale if talks of streamlining the Administration, for instance, VPs, were also on the table. President Green replied that they will be looking at all options. However, there are some things he will not consider, such as, for instance, combining colleges in order to save deans’ salaries.

The conversation moved again to the Policy Review Group. It was clarified that the available tools would be different under the policy of financial exigency. The President reiterated that the financial exigency is currently not on the table.

The focus shifted to the timeline for the process. A Senator wondered whether we are rushing into decisions which will impact the institution for a long time. He asked whether we will continue talking while we make progress. President Green cited as an example the Sustainable Financial Model Working Group. They will complete their task by January, but their recommendations will not have a major impact until 2021. Early retirements will also happen over a period of time. Our cash reserves are low, and we must act now. A big unknown is that the Governor can ask to hold money back. This is something that the President cannot control. If we wait too long, we may get ourselves “deeper into the hole”.

A Senator asked about whether the Sustainable Financial Model Working Group (SFMWG) reports to the President or to Senate (like the Fiscal Emergency Committee did formerly). Chair Grieb went back to the flow chart and pointed that the first two committees are charged by the Senate whereas IPEC is charged by the Administration. The SFMWG also reports to the President.
President Green reiterated that everything from the Sustainable Financial Model Working Group will be transparent. Representatives from this group will come and speak to the Senate.

In conjunction with the Fiscal Emergency Committee, a Senator mentioned the Financial Exigency Policy and Staff-Reduction Procedures in FSH 3970. Another Senator argued that FSH 3970 is not related to the functions of a Fiscal Emergency Committee. In his understanding, the SFMWG is a strategic body, involved with the revenue generating part of the institution.

Chair Grieb said that IPEC needs to identify metrics to reallocate resources. The Sustainable Financial Model Group is in charge of a long-term model, namely how we will operate year to year forward. To come up with a clear set of rules that everybody understands and follows, and which colleges and units will keep over time. President Green added that Program Prioritization is SBOE-mandated. We need to refresh the process, but our accreditors require that we go through it. Therefore, we do need a Program Prioritization process to guide the closure of programs.

A Senator inquired about the best channel to provide ideas and feedback. It was replied that any feedback should be forwarded to the Provost, Senate Chair Grieb, or Staff Council Chair Neilson.

The discussion moved to IPEC and whether it will work differently than in the past. President Green welcome the idea of more faculty on the committee but did not think that too large a committee would be helpful. Provost Wiencek mentioned that he is committed to work closely with Faculty Senate Leadership and Staff Council. There will be strong representation of faculty and staff. Deans will be included as well. Previously there were 8 faculty and 4 staff members on the committee. The non-academic part included Centrally Provided Services, Students and Faculty Support Services, Research Centers and Institutes. The academic sector will be addressed first, in anticipation of program closures.

A Senator expressed concerns about timelines for decisions not to grant tenure or to let faculty go, which can place them in a very difficult position. Provost Wiencek replied that there are some protection mechanisms for second-year faculty. If they do not get a notice by July 15, they will have another year. He noted that there is no desire to lay off faculty on short-notice. University General Counsel Kent Nelson pointed out that, if a program is closed, tenured faculty can also be let go.

A Senator pointed out that we are now being judged according to a new standard. This makes it difficult to plan in a stable way. President Green said that is precisely the goal of the SFMWG, namely, to develop a reliable and stable model for the future.

A Senator asked about the impact on the plan to have U of I move to an R1-level university. President Green replied that we cannot execute an R1 strategy at the moment. However, they are looking into strategic investments towards financial stability of our resources. Chair Grieb recalled that Janet Nelson wishes to come to Senate soon and talk about R1 strategies.

Chair Grieb invited Staff Council Chair Chad Neilson to speak. Neilson said he is pleased with how things are going so far. He thinks that good communication and good shared-governance work are going on. Although there is anxiety among people, he is hopeful.
Chair Grieb went back to the “committee flow-chart” to clarify the meaning of the question marks at the bottom of the chart: they refer to what IPEC and SFMWG will be doing, and how the various “pieces of the puzzle” need to come together and fit into one holistic piece. The question mark on the right refers to communication between Senate and Administration.

Provost Wiencek emphasized that we are on this journey together. It will be necessary to hand-in some non-renewals in January/February to move forward. There will be a shared discussion, although not in a public setting. There will be a series of iterations. Voluntary separations and early retirements will be “at the top”. Next, the process will have to get more specific, with more local conversations. During the process, we will need to ensure that our students continue to be served well. It is important to realize that all policies which are being considered apply to both faculty and staff in a holistic way.

Making reference to the recent memo of October 31, 2019, from VP Brian Foisy about outsourcing, the Provost noted that, while outsourcing may be a strategy for some non-academic areas, they would not consider outsourcing academics. Addressing a question by Chair Grieb about SBOE potentially requiring centralization of some processes, the Provost said that all presidents of the Idaho higher ed institutions have a unified front and that they do not see a benefit to the proposed centralization. He also commented that communications from the presidents group is helping maintain a positive and collaborative relation with SBOE.

The Provost said that an opportunity to streamline may exist if the ratio of reports to supervisors (namely, how many people report to a supervisor) increased. In business, a value of 10 to 1 is standard. In higher education, it is more like 3 or 4 to 1. This raises the question of, possibly, too many middle-level managers in administration and reconnects with an earlier comment by a Senator about reducing the size of the administration as a possible cost-saving strategy.

The issue of UI moving to R1 level was raised again by a Senator, in the context of how Scott Green (and others, such as Deans, the College of Graduate Studies, and the Library) had felt strongly about it. Another Senator pointed out that R1 and undergraduate research are not separated. 60% of our undergraduate students are involved in research, and the research we do is important to the state. At this time, we need to worry about tuition revenues. That is something we have some control on. As Janet Nelson will explain, there is more than one path to R1.

The discussion moved to the issue of Athletics. It does not make money, in fact we put money into it. On the other hand, many students would not come here if it wasn’t for athletic scholarships. Athletics is an important part of our campus life, and it is important for our Alumni, but it does not generate money.

Chair Grieb moved to the next item on the agenda.

VIII. **Special Orders:** There were none.

IX. **New Business:** Committee on Committees Appointment Survey.
Barbara Kirchmeier (Vice-Chair Faculty Senate & Chair of Committee on Committees)
The Committee on Committees Appointment Survey went live on Monday (November 4, 2019). There were some changes made in the survey that are self-explanatory. Vice-Chair Kirchmeier reminded everyone that, when faculty fill up and return the survey, they are making a commitment to serve on a committee. The appointments will be announced at the end of the Spring semester.

A Senator asked whether it is possible to sign up a second time for a particular committee. Vice-Chair Kirchmeier responded that FSH 1640 does not prohibit it.

X. **Adjournment**: A motion to adjourn (A. Smith/ DeAngelis) passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 4:59 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francesca Sammarruca  
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate
I. Call to Order: Chair Grieb called the meeting to order at 3:30 PM.

II. Approval of Minutes (vote): A motion was made to approve the minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 9 (October 15, 2019) (A. Smith/Dezzani). Following a call for discussion, an amendment was proposed by Secretary Sammarruca: on p.3, second line from the top, it should read “non-P&T committee compositions” rather than “P&T committee compositions”.

An additional amendment was proposed: in the fourth paragraph of p.4, include the sentence: The Senator requested the addition of the following language: In C-1.b, 3rd line, after "accomplishments," add "or on the timetable for promotion that is typical for the faculty member's academic field."

A motion to approve the amendments was passed unanimously.

The motion to approve the minutes as amended passed unanimously.

III. Consent Agenda: There was no Consent Agenda

IV. Chair's Report

- The tables in the Paul Joyce Lounge have been moved to a new arrangement, similar to the previous U-shape from previous years. It is hoped that this will provide better sound quality for those participating via Zoom.

- The latest version of the revised P&T policy has been distributed to all faculty. Comments can be posted on the web. The conversation is still ongoing. The Faculty Affair Committee will meet and vote next week. The policy revisions will come back before Senate November 12.

- Bellwood Lecture tomorrow, Ken Salazar, former Secretary of the Interior, 3:30, Pitman Center, International Ballroom.
• Sonny Ramaswamy, President of the NWCCU, will host an open forum on Thursday, Oct. 24th, 10:30-12:00 ISUB Horizon. (Note the change of time from 11AM to 10:30AM.)
• Tommy Orange, author of “There There”, the 2019 UI Common Read, will be on campus Nov. 5th, 7pm, International Ballroom.

V. Provost’s Report
• The State Board of Education (SBOE) had its annual meeting in Lewiston last week. Program Prioritization already existed in the Financial Section of the SBOE policy but will be added to the Academic Section as well. The SBOE requires that we go through the process of university-wide program evaluation and rankings at least once every 5 years. They suggest matrix and methods by which we may do it, but there is considerable flexibility.

State Board of Education is also introducing a policy on remedial education. Of interest to our math faculty is MATH 108, a Pre-Algebra remedial course. The Board will allow MATH 108 to be offered but will not allow it to be included within a degree requirement or curriculum. In other words, we cannot mandate students to take it. We must let them in MATH 143 and provide extra instruction as needed. The Math department has expressed concerns about this and is considering options that are responsive to the Board’s new policy.

• Enrollment figures are in (today or tomorrow there should be a press release). Overall, we have an increase of a few percent in first year student enrollment as well as an increase in dual enrollment (high school students taking college courses). The number of continuing students is down. Overall, enrollment is essentially flat.

• The President has shared his thoughts and ideas about the current financial challenges and the path forward with his executive leadership team. Based on this information, I will schedule a meeting with Faculty Senate Leadership soon to jointly develop the needed initiatives. It will be a collaborative effort with the Provost’s office, the Colleges (Deans), Staff Council and Faculty Senate.

A Senator asked how the previous enrollment figures relate to our revenue. Provost Wiencek responded that Brian Foisy would be able to give more details. Our revenue has many components including State appropriations and tuition revenue. Not all students pay the same tuition rate (resident, non-resident and WUE rates for example are different). Our revenue is strongly linked to our undergraduate on-campus full-time enrollment. We have fewer and fewer resident (Idaho) students, while non-resident students are increasing slowly but are not always as financial lucrative as the resident student enrollments. Our expenditures, though, are growing more rapidly than our revenues. The Provost noted that the Argonaut provided good coverage on the matter and addresses this question with more detail.

VI. Committee Reports: Chair Grieb suggested to switch the order of the Committee Reports as on the agenda. There were no objections.

• Presentation on the Final Exam Schedule for Academic Year 2020 – 2021, by Associate Registrar D. Hubbard. It was noted that no final exam begins before 8:00 AM Pacific Time.
response to a question from a Senator, it was reported that final grades next year are due Tuesday, December 22\textsuperscript{nd}, 2020.

The seconded motion from the University Curriculum Committee to approve the Final Exam Schedule as presented to Faculty Senate passed unanimously.

- Presentation by the Information Technology Committee, \textit{Information Technology on Campus}, by Dan Ewart and Brian Cox.  
An update was provided on the status of the IT Best Use initiatives presented to Faculty Senate in October 2018. A timeline was shown, which highlighted recent accomplishments and future plans.

Starting October 2018, annual IT security was implemented (December 2018). In February 2019, the first IT governance and priority process took place, which is a mechanism to collect university IT initiatives and prioritize them. This happened two more times, up to September 2019.

Last year Vice President Ewart came to Faculty Senate to discuss the “IT Best Use Initiative”. The goal of this initiative is to move the university ahead rather than just remaining functional. A Senator asked to clarify the meaning of “moving the university ahead”. It was replied that it means offering new opportunities for teaching and research. At the moment, we are just baseline, with 85\% of the time spent keeping what we have up and going rather than creating new technology.

Brian Cox proceeded to address the Central Device Management Program and the Central End User Technology Procurement. With regard to Central Device Management, UI works with people across the State (Boise, Idaho Falls, CDA) to get visibility. Visibility plays a key role in our understanding of which data can best help in making decisions.

The following updates were provided: Prior to the initiative we had 2,000 devices visible on the network, now we have 5,932, visible and manageable on our network. 34\% of computing devices are laptops. We have 750 printers with 250 different models, 52 operating systems, 25\% of which are outdated. The majority of our devices are from Lenovo. There is a large complexity to deal with in ITS, therefore it is necessary to prioritize. A Senator asked to clarify the meaning of “visibility”. Director Cox responded that visibility gives us insight into the hardware connected to our network.

The discussion moved on to Central End User Technology Procurement. There are three main goals in this area: 1) improve response and resolution time, 2) protection of data, and 3) better financial stewardship for UI. A Senator reported that his college is very unhappy about technology constraints on research. Often times, the equipment which is provided is not useful for the scientific needs of researchers. Researchers need to be able to decide what fits their needs. Support has been substandard or useless, cost is higher than it would be if equipment were bought outside the university. Director Cox replied that they are not setting standards for researchers on campus, who constitute 20\% of the users. Their standards are suitable for 80\% of the users on campus. They are currently in a pilot mode. Researchers should be able to submit a request of what they need. The Senator proceeded to say that, in many cases,
purchasing elsewhere is met with resistance. Director Cox said he would like to see the specific data and examples.

A Senator argued that the IT prices are about 5% to 10% higher as compared to purchasing directly with Lenovo or other vendors. Director Cox repeated that he will like to see the data to compare prices and warranties. They work with a consortium. Researcher should be able to purchase what they want with their purchasing card. One must be careful, though, when comparing prices, because prices may include only the device or other costs. As for delivery time, they hope for 3 to 5 days shipping, but sometimes higher prices are charged for quicker delivery.

In response to a question about support, Director Cox responded that they cannot provide financial support to researchers. The best form of support they can provide is by giving the researchers information so they can plan accordingly with their budgets. In response to another question, Vice President Ewart replied that, when a unit is no longer serviced by IT, it is not necessary removed. There does come a time, though, when it may no longer be possible to support a particular system. At ITS they make choices to ensure long lifetimes of the devices. But it must be kept in mind that, as the device gets older, it becomes more costly to maintain it. Using old equipment causes loss of productivity.

The discussion moved to whether Lenovo is the best choice. A senator pointed out again that research exceptions should be considered. A clarification was asked about “exceptions”. It was clarified that exceptions refer to requesting items other than the IT standards. A Senator reiterated that his college felt left out of the process. Vice President Ewart emphasized that they are in a pilot phase. They are in the process of changing standards to accommodate the needs of 80% of the users. They cannot focus on a single research device. A Senator followed up on the approval time for software, which, in his experience, can be as long as 8-12 weeks. Director Cox said there had been challenges with Adobe, but he hadn’t heard anything in the range of 8-12 weeks. Many vendors are changing their pricing and delivery models. In regard to the issue of the Adobe delivery, Vice President Ewart asked to be forwarded the relevant paperwork. The discussion moved back to warranties. Director Cox responded that is different from vendor to vendor. For laptops it is typically 4 years. If the device breaks down, one must go to the local support person, who will dispatch a Lenovo specialist. The Lenovo person will come and repair the equipment in a proper facility. Laptops have 4-year damage protection. Ultimately, a device can be cheaper but come with less warranty. In response to the question as to why Lenovo is the standard, Director Cox responded that UI has been working with Lenovo for a long time. They had excellent support from them and don’t see a reason to change. Furthermore, Lenovo designs and manufactures all of their products. They test components and software before putting them into devices.

Chair Grieb had a follow up question about the IT Committee. Per FSH, the Committee should provide input and guidance, but this does not seem to be happening. Vice-Chair Kirchmeier confirmed that statement from her experience as a former member of the IT Committee. She suggested that items should be brought to the Committee at an early stage so they can be discussed at the committee level before decisions are made, unlike what she has seen in the past.
A Senator asked about personally purchased computers for UI work. Vice President Ewart said that it is not recommended, for security reasons and because, if not backed up, UI data and records may be lost. He cited APM in that regard.

The discussion continued on the exception process. Vice President Ewart ensured the Senators that information will be distributed broadly as they leave the pilot mode. The discussion ended with a comment that this will be a perfect item for the IT Committee to be involved in. Chair Grieb suggested to continue the discussion in the Spring. Items to be revisited include: the tracking of specific requests, sharing the tracking data with the IT Committee, and checking approval time for software. Chair Grieb said that he will reach out to the IT Committee Chair to invite her and Brian Cox to attend a Senate meeting in the Spring.

VII. **Other Announcements and Communications**: There were none.

VIII. **Special Orders**: There were none.

IX. **New Business**: There was none.

X. **Adjournment**: A motion to adjourn (Jeffery/Schwarzlaender) passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 4:46 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francesca Sammarruca
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate
RESOURCE ALLOCATION COMMITTEES

NOVEMBER 5, 2019
POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE

TOOLS RANKING TASKFORCE

IPEC PROGRAM PRIORITIZATION PROCESS

FACULTY SENATE & UI LEADERSHIP

SUSTAINABLE FINANCIAL MODEL WORK GROUP

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS
POLICY REVIEW GROUP

Whitney, Sammarruca, Kirchmeier, Grieb, Neilson, Espenschade, Lawrence, Wiencek

Review policy related to potential budget strategies

Data: Report provided by Policy Coordinator
TOOLS RANKING TASKFORCE

1. Senate charge. Report to FS and Staff Council required.
2. Review strategies identified in Pres. Green memo and by others.
3. Brainstorm/add new strategies to the list.
4. Rank or “bin” the strategies.
5. MEMBERS: 3 Faculty Senators, 3 Staff Council members, 1 faculty and 1 staff from Centers.
IPEC PROGRAM PRIORITIZATION UPDATES

1. IPEC charge. Will present reports to Faculty Senate and Staff Council before final deliverable submitted.

2. Refine current process and metrics to be applied for decisions on resource reallocations and/or program closures.

3. Taskforce: UBFC “volunteers” and FSL/SCL designees, & others assigned by IPEC.

4. SUPPORT: Provost’s Office, Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation and Division of Finance and Administration.
ADDITIONS?
COMMENTS?
QUESTIONS?
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
ANNUAL APPOINTMENT SURVEY

BARBARA KIRCHMEIER
VICE-CHAIR FACULTY SENATE
CHAIR COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
Survey was sent out yesterday (November 4, 2019)
Survey will remain open until December 6, 2019
Committee on Committees will use the results of the survey to build Committees during the Spring Semester 2020
Faculty will be notified of appointments by May 2020
Faculty will be reminded of appointments in August 2020
CHANGES TO THE SURVEY

- Asking for additional personal information
  - Primary and Secondary College
- We added time commitment
- TEAC possible split
- Administrators selection
  - Only administrator
  - Faculty and Administrator
QUESTIONS