I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes (vote)
   • Minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 6 (September 24, 2019) Attach. #1

III. Consent Agenda
   • Committee on Committees Nominations Attach #2

IV. Chair’s Report

V. Provost’s Report
   • Response to Senator Morgan’s memo on Administration Size Attach. #3 and #4

VI. Committee Reports

VII. Other Announcements and Communications
   • UI Policy - Creation and Changes Presentation
     o (Diane Whitney, Policy Coordinator & Compliance Officer) Attach. # 5

VIII. Special Orders

IX. New Business

X. Adjournment

Attachments:

- Attach. #1 Minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 6 (September 24, 2019)
- Attach. #2 Committee on Committees Nominations
- Attach. #3 Senator Morgan Memo re Admin Size
- Attach. #4 Response to Senator Memo sent to FSL
- Attach. #5 UI Policy - Creation and Changes Presentation
I. Call to Order
   • Chair Grieb called the meeting to order at 3:35 PM.

II. Approval of Minutes (vote)
   • Minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 6 (September 24, 2019)
     o A motion to approve the minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 6 (Lee-Painter/ Tabbals) passed unanimously.
     o Secretary Sammarruca proposed an amendment.
       ▪ Statement "Out of pocket cost would be $3,000" should be changed to "The increase to out of pocket cost would be $3,000"
       ▪ Motion to approve the minutes as amended carried unanimously.

III. Consent Agenda (vote)
   • Committee Nominations from Committee on Committees
     o A motion to approve the Committee Nominations from the Committee on Committees passed unanimously.

IV. Chair’s Report
The Athena Mentorship Program is now accepting applications for mentors and mentees for the 2020 cohort. This program, sponsored by the president's office, promotes the professional growth of female staff and faculty working at U of I. Applications are due by Friday, Oct. 11.

Link: https://www.uidaho.edu/diversity/edu/womens-center/athena/mentorship?utm_source=University+of+Idaho&utm_campaign=1c8848535d-daily_register_042219_COPY_01&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_18a9cb4835-1c8848535d-86347341&utm_source=University+of+Idaho&utm_campaign=4dee7363a7-daily_register_042219_COPY_01&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_18a9cb4835-4dee7363a7-77923641

Members of ASUI, Faculty Senate, Staff Council, GPSA and the Student Bar Association are invited and encouraged to join us for an important meeting with Dr. Sonny Ramaswamy, President of the NWCCU, on Oct. 24 from 11:00-12:30pm, in the Panorama Room, Commons/ISUB building. The meeting will provide an opportunity for our university community to learn more about NWCCU and the new accreditation standards. There will be ample time for discussion and Q&A following the presentation. This meeting is open to all faculty, staff and students; please share this communication and encourage your team members and colleagues to attend this open forum as is appropriate. For those who ask why they should care about accreditation, the answer is short. A degree from an accredited school is valuable. One from an unaccredited school is not. All federal funding (both scholarship and research) goes to accredited schools only. Being accredited means we have gone through a rigorous evaluation, have met the required accreditation standards and are qualified to teach students the programs we offer. Being accredited gives students access to financial aid, supports quality research, and assures students that their University of Idaho degree is legitimate and will be recognized by employers, institutions and others. It also ensures that the credits students receive from us are transferable to another school. Successfully achieving accreditation is perhaps the most important thing we do.

Peer/Benchmark recommendations will be distributed by end-of-day Oct. 2nd. Please comment by Thursday Oct. 10th.

Big changes are coming to health insurance this year, including increased costs and changes in benefits. An email was sent from HR on Sept. 4th to highlight some of the issues. Open enrollment is scheduled for Oct. 21 to Nov. 5th. Staff Council Leadership and Faculty Senate Leadership are in communication with HR regarding an open forum prior to start of open enrollment. Possible topics for the open forum, if there is one, may include:

1. Why are rates going up, and how much will they be going up?
2. Specifics on plan changes (deductibles, copays, etc.)
3. What to expect during open enrollment?
4. Update on moving to the state’s insurance plan (future of UI benefits)
5. Retiree benefits (will they be going away)?

Chair Grieb invited feedback from the Senators.

Some discussion started about whether the topics at the open forum should include reasons to join the state plan.

A Senator commented that the topics are great, but timing is the real issue. This Senator asked for clarifications on the open enrollment period.

Provost Wiencek commented that the open forum should help people understand why rates are going up. Bringing the state plan into the discussion at the open forum may not be a good idea.
VP Foisy (invited to comment by Chair Grieb) said that, after open enrollment, there will be a broad and robust conversation addressing specifically UI joining state insurance as well as retiree benefits. At the moment, all we can do is to acknowledge that retiree health insurance has a significant impact on the net position of the university. We should focus on the task before us now.

A senator felt that the reasons for moving to state insurance need to be communicated clearly before the open forum.

V. Provost’s Report

- Response to Senator Morgan’s memo on administration size
  - The Provost provided a brief history of the conversation initiated with a memo from 03/19/2019 by former Senator Penny Morgan (attach. #3 in the binder of Meeting #7, 10/01/2019).
  - A concern among the faculty is that the university administration is growing more rapidly than the colleges. Provost Wiencek argued that Penny Morgan’s analysis compared the general education budgets allocated to the Colleges to all other budgets, collectively attributed to the “UI Administration.” The Provost proposed that a more accurate view comes from a different definition of what is meant by “UI Administration.” The Provost explained that faculty or college funding is primarily represented by instructional expenses whereas administration funding should include the sum of academic and institutional support. The Provost referred to graphs (contained in the memo which he had provided, attach. #4 in the binder of Meeting #7, 10/01/2019), showing that, due to recent program prioritization and market-based compensation efforts, there has been an intentional decrease in administrative expense and increase in instructional expense. Both are near our peer averages. However, instruction expenses appear to be above the average of our peers while administrative costs are below the average of our peers.
  - In summary, the Provost said that the data does not reveal that the administration has grown more than the colleges. On the contrary, the areas receiving more resources (as measured as either increases in total funding or as a fraction of our total budget) include instruction, academic support, and student services.

- The Provost solicited questions.
  - A senator asked (making reference to p.6 and onward of the Provost’s memo) why the institutional support places UI so much above the average of peer institutions.
  - Provost Wiencek answered that budgets were assigned in the distant past and given functional code types are not been revisited or audited on a routine basis. There has been a lot of decentralization as we went through budget cuts. For instance, funds may have moved down from the center to the colleges and/or vice versa.
  - Referring to his previous question, the same Senator asked whether it would be possible to focus on this particular category and break it down, as he anticipated this to be a recurrent question.
  - Provost Wiencek said that our combined administrative cost is the sum of academic support (which is the Deans’ level of administrative oversight) and institutional support. Although the sum of the two has the right size, one item is too low and the other is too high. He and VP Foisy have discussed and came up with the conclusion that some items may not be coded correctly. Provost Wiencek and VP Foisy will investigate to make sure there are no inaccuracies.
VP Foisy: A likely source of differences [with peer institutions] is Facility Services and Facility Management, which include items from electric bills to landscaping to building, and more. The physical conditions (for instance, the age of buildings) could be among the sources of differences. The entire division of Finance and Administration is by far the biggest component of institutional support.

In reference to the Institutional Support Expense Graph, Chair Grieb asked whether Vandalstar, Chrome River, software investments, Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM), University Communication and Marketing (UCM) are included there.

VP Foisy answered that institutional support covers the President Office, the Provost Office, most of Information and Technology (IT), and most operations under Finance and Administration.

Provost Wiencek followed up observing that SEM is under Student Services. The Provost reiterated that definitions of fund types were given as narrative above the graphs in the appendix. However, it doesn’t happen very often that people go back and audit whether a fund type is still where it started. It is reasonable that, over time, funds may have moved around [with regard to their type].

A Senator wondered what Penny Morgan’s question actually was, and what prompted the question and the perception of more resources going to administration as compared to academics. Are there better ways to address the original question? A similar perception started in her college, exactly at the time of the economic downturn.

Provost Wiencek answered that Morgan’s question was prompted by severe budget cuts (5 millions hold backs) in CNR.

A senator said that Morgan’s question was explicitly stated. Namely: do we have the right size for the administration at this university? Looking at averages may not be the best approach. We are looking across universities whose administrations may not have the right size. A better approach may be to look at peer institutions and how the administration functions in each of them. This would require much time and effort. The Senator asked whether the data are accessible.

Provost Wiencek and VP Foisy replied that the data is public. It can be found in the UI Financial Statement and is subject to yearly audit.

The Senator went on stating that the present analysis does a good job with averages, but we should be asking a different question, namely, what is the right administration size for UI.

To the Provost’s question as to whether one can answer this question objectively, the Senator replied that it is possible, but not with this data.

The Provost was supportive of pursuing further analyses.

The Senator thanked the Provost for his attention to this matter.

A Senator stated that he has been at several large public research universities and it is a common believe among faculty that the administration is bloated at the expenses of the academic budgets. In his experience, this may be a myth. It is not a terribly productive use of time to continue to seek a restructuring and dismantling of administrative functions that are currently functional.

The Senator agreed that the better question to ask is what is right for us and what makes us distinct and unique.

B. Foisy asked to make a last comment. He said that his responsibility is to minimize the money which is spent on items other than instruction or research. As alternative ways are investigated to face the current budget challenges, he asked everyone to be open to those alternative ways. He hopes we can do more to increase returns on investments.
VI. Committee Reports
   • There were no Committee Reports.

VII. Other Announcements and Communications
   • UI Policy - Creation and Changes Presentation - Diane Whitney, University Policy Coordinator & Compliance Officer
     o Chair Grieb introduced Diane Whitney and her role.
     o D. Whitney delivered a presentation (attach. #5 in the binder of Meeting #7, 10/01/2019) starting with her role as the new Policy Coordinator (51% of her position) and a brief history of the newly established position. She then described the process of making and changing policy, for both the Faculty Staff Handbook and the Administrative Procedure Manual. She emphasized the advantages of involving the Policy Coordinator early in the process of making/revising policy.
     o Chair Grieb thanked Diane for her presentation and the addition of her expertise to the university.

VIII. Special Orders
   • There were no Special Orders.

IX. New Business
   • There were no New Business.

X. Adjournment
   • Motion to adjourn (Lee-Painter/Dezzani) passed unanimously.
     o Meeting adjourned at 4:51PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francesca Sammarruca
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate
Present: Bacon, Bridges, Caplan, Chapman, Cosens, De Angelis, Dezzani, Grieb (Chair), Hill, Jeffery, Keim, Kirchmeier (Vice-Chair), Lee-Painter, Lockhart, Paul, Raja, Sammarruca (w/o vote), Schab, Schwarzaender, A. Smith, Tibbals, Wiencek (w/o vote).
Present via Zoom: Kern, McKellar, Tenuto, Sears.
Absent: Chopin, Foster, Luckhart, R. Smith.
Guests: 9.
Guest Speaker: Brian Foisy (Vice President for Finance).

I. Call to Order
- Chair Grieb called the meeting to order at 3:33 PM.

II. Approval of Minutes (vote)
- Minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 5 (September 17, 2019)
  - A motion to approve the minutes of the 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Meeting # 5 (Dezzani/ A. Smith) passed unanimously.

III. Consent Agenda (vote)
- Committee Nominations from Committee on Committees (seconded motion)
  - The committee nominations from the Committee on Committees were approved unanimously.

IV. Chair’s Report
- The Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning has announced their fall workshop series and their Faculty Spotlight Series. Complete lists can be found at https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/cetl/workshops/
- The Office of Workforce Diversity has launched an Online Search Committee Training. It is designed with hiring managers and search committees in mind but is available to everyone. https://www.uidaho.edu/news/news-articles/faculty-staff-news/2019-september/092319-onlineuofisearchcommitteetraining?utm_source=University+of+Idaho&utm_campaign=1c8848535d-daily_register_042219_COPY
- Jacob Lockhart was welcomed as the New ASUI Representative at the Senate. Jacob is replacing Jack Hanigan.
- Chair Grieb said he was very happy that Chandra Zenner Ford visited last week to discuss the Sustainable Financial Working Group. He said that communication between the faculty and the Working Groups is very important. Chair Grieb sent an email to Chandra to advocate for an early start of a two-way communication. He suggested an open forum, hopefully by the end of October. He will invite Chandra again to one of the Senate meetings and suggested her to consider a similar visit with the Associate Deans Group and Staff Council. He advocated for a
formalization of the communication process with the campus community. Chair Grieb remarked that there are 5 top goals for diversity and inclusion on campus. It is important to have a working group which addresses how to reflect those goals in the policy. The Sustainable Financial Working Group will have their first meetings on October 3 and 4, 2019.

V. Provost’s Report

- September is Katy Benoit Campus Safety Awareness Month.
  - Stalking Prevention Lecture, Vandal Ballroom, Bruce Pitman Center, September 24, 2019 at 7pm.
  - Katy’s parents are on campus this week. The Provost will meet them later in the evening. He encouraged everyone to attend the Stalking Prevention Lecture to show our commitment to safety.
- He solicited questions or comments. There were none.

VI. Committee Reports

- There were no Committee Reports.

VII. Other Announcements and Communications

- University Other Eligible Benefit (OEA) Issues – B. Foisy
  - Chair Grieb explained that this is not a seconded motion from a committee and called for a motion from the floor.
  - The following motion was made and seconded:
    I move to accept the recommendation of the Benefits Advisory Group brought to the Faculty Senate through the Vice President of Finance and Administration and to remove FSH 3705 from the Faculty Staff Handbook effective the date of approval by the President.
    (Tibbals/Dezzani)
  - Chair Grieb recognized B. Foisy to speak as the sponsor of the motion.
  - B. Foisy: He wanted to clarify the meaning of him being the sponsor. He said that he is not personally an opponent or a proponent of the OEA or the BAG recommendation. He said that President Green wants Faculty Senate to have the final decision which, either way, the President will adopt. Some points surfaced during the recent discussions:
    1. There are currently no same-sex couples using OEA coverage.
    2. The cost to retain OEA coverage will not be on a sliding scale; the range of impact is between $39 and $109 based on the selected level of coverage.
    3. He recalled that the State does not cover OEA, thus moving to a State plan means we will need to have this conversation again.
  - Chair Grieb displayed a power point slide to clarify what we will be voting on.
    - YES (FSH 3705 removed from FSH, OEA coverage not offered, no additional costs for covering OEAs).
    - NO (FSH 3705 stays in FSH; OEA coverage will be offered at the additional annual cost as specified on the slide).
Chair Grieb opened the floor to discussion:

- A Senator argued that there are data which we have not seen, such as the costs to those who are on the OEA insurance. This Senator reached out to several staff in his college. One was able to provide information (possibly this is the worst-case scenario). The best that they can afford is a plan that does not include dental or vision and comes with 5 times the current deductible. Out of pocket cost would be $3,000. The additional cost for these people will be $1,300 per month. They wonder whether they should remain at UI or separate and go on Medicaid. The Senator asked the senate to join him in retaining FSH 3705.

- B. Foisy asked Brandi Terwilliger to find the comparable COBRA cost. Brandi said they are $1,569 to $1,344 per month for PPO and HDHP respectively (employee and family coverage for 2019) for the same coverage these people currently have.

- A Senator remarked that COBRA is just for a limited amount of time.

- A Senator referred to the recent letter to the Faculty Senate from faculty member Kenton Bird. Kenton argues in his letter that the intent of the FSH 3705 was not just about same-gender couples, but also the 28 couples who would be impacted. The Senator reiterated her support for keeping FSH 3705.

- A Senator said that he comes from a country were this discussion would not take place. Repealing FSH 3705 should never have come before us.

- A Senator said that she has feedback from her constituency (20 faculty and staff) and they are split down in the middle. She does not know how to vote.

- Chair Grieb said that we do not normally call for abstentions. But this time he will.

- A Senator said that the majority of his constituency is in favor on keeping FSH 3705, but there is also considerable support for repealing it. Referring to a previous comment, he said that it is not fair to vilify people for raising the issue.

- B. Foisy said that it is hard to say, “I don’t want to pay for someone else”, whereas it is easier to stand for the common good. He added that there are human aspects on both sides.

- A Senator said that in his college about 50 out of 70 members are in favor of keeping FSH 3705. There may be a small sample bias, though.

- The representative of the Graduate Student Association announced that he will abstain, because this is mostly a Faculty and Staff issue.

- A Senator said that she did not have a lot of responses but many of those were in favor to keeping FSH 3705. She said that it is ok to do the right thing collectively. What we do sends a message about who we are as an institution.

- Chair Grieb invited comments from the Staff Council perspective.

- A Senator responded that Staff Council voted 12 versus 10 for keeping FSH 3705.

- The ASUI representative reported that there were 5 YES and 5 NO in his constituency.

- A Senator reported that in his constituency 10 voted in favor and 1 against keeping FSH 3705. But he remarked that he did not ask everyone. He stated that he wants to work in a place where we take care on everyone and one another.

- A Senator commented that Faculty are privileged in terms of salary, and he understands why some people do not want to pay to endorse someone else’s lifestyle choices. But we do not know the circumstances around their lifestyle choices, so the common good is to keep FSH 3705.

- Chair Grieb asked if there were more comments or questions from the Senators and there were none.
Chair Grieb called for a vote on the motion to repeal FSH 3705. The count was as follows:

- **YES** (remove FSH 3705 and no longer offer the OEA): 1
- **NO** (continue FSH 3705 and continue to offer the OEA): 18
- Abstention: 4

The decision is to keep the FSH 3705 and continue offering the OEA coverage.

Chair Grieb requested Human Resources to amend this year’s plan to reflect the vote.

- A proxy for an absent Senator said that the absent Senator thought that a “NO” vote would not go far enough. We should write a statement to reaffirm our commitment to diversity and inclusion.
  - Chair Grieb: Comment noted.
- Chair Grieb said we should think about our experience with the OEA issue for a couple of weeks and consider what we can take away from this experience. A subsequent report will be provided for discussion and consideration.

**VIII. Special Orders**

- There were no Special Orders.

**IX. New Business**

- There was no New Business.

**X. Adjournment**

- Adjournment at 4:17 PM
  - Motion: Tibbals
  - Seconded: Jeffery

Respectfully Submitted,

Francesca Sammarruca
Secretary of the University Faculty & Secretary to Faculty Senate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Appeals Hearing Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scott Metlen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Dixon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19 March 2019

TO: Provost Wiencek  
FROM: Penny Morgan  
SUBJECT: How are we judging effectiveness and “right size”?  

What is “right size” for UI? What will make us most effective?

### Growth at the University of Idaho, FY2019 relative to FY2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Gen Ed Budget</th>
<th>Total FTE</th>
<th>Total Gen Ed Salaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UI Colleges</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI Administration</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based upon FY 2014-2019 General Education Budget information available to the public through UI Budget Office, March 2019

These numbers confirm the sense shared by many UI faculty and staff: Mid-level administration has grown much more than the colleges. There are some good reasons for this, such as more compliance and other requirements, but not enough to justify this central growth relative to colleges. In his recent article in the Spokesman Review, Shawn Vestal highlighted similar trends: in the last 30 years, WSU enrollment grew by 61% while administration grew by 861%. We cannot simply justify our imbalance by comparing to other institutions; instead we need to know we are “right-sized” to be effective here at UI.

We have much to celebrate here at UI, and I appreciate our strategic plan. I applaud you for having upper administration share in the recent budget cuts.

As we move forward together here at the University of Idaho, please help us ensure that we support our faculty and staff as they seek to serve the students we have, to recruit and retain new students, and to accomplish our desired outcomes while serving the needs of our state, region, nation and world. Our college staffs, in particular, are so lean that we endanger our effective teaching, research, and outreach. Our faculty and staff are the ones who are on the “frontlines” working with our students.

I thank you for coming to CNR yesterday for an open discussion with faculty and staff. And you have tried to be more transparent in decisions. More of the same will help improve the climate on campus.
September 12, 2019

To: Faculty Senate
From: John Wiencek, Provost and Executive Vice President
Re: Response to memo from Senator dated March 19, 2019 (attached)

Towards the end of the semester last year, a Faculty Senator supplied a memo with some analysis at one of the faculty senate meetings and invited a response. I appreciate the work invested and understand the sentiment that is shared in the memo. I provided a preliminary response a few weeks later but I now provide a more formalized response for Faculty Senate’s consideration.

There is a significant concern among the faculty that the university “administration” is growing more rapidly than “the colleges.” The Senator’s analysis compared the general education budgets allocated to the Colleges to all other budgets, thus defining all of those other constitutes as the “UI Administration.” If one accepts that definition as reasonable and correct, then the memo makes some valid conclusions. However, there are other more commonly accepted definitions that are used by the Federal government to define the oversight or administrative functions of the university. I believe we can get a more precise view the use of our institutional resources if we adopt a refined definition of what we mean by “UI Administration.”

The larger question posed by the Senator is how do we best use our resources at the university to fulfill our mission. I concur that this question is something we must address together. These are always difficult conversations to have, especially in times of decreasing resources, since it implies a discussion of stopping certain functions or activities. Such conversations will be necessary in the coming year.

Getting back to the memo, I want to note two areas where the analysis could be improved. First, the analysis should include all sources of funding, not simply general education funding. Other sources of funding support both administrative functions as well as instructional functions. Indeed, some units do not have access to any general education funding, so it is not appropriate to focus on just general education funding since such an approach ignores large swaths of our university efforts that run on student fees, auxiliary income (meal plans, residence halls, event services etc.) or special fund types (WWAMI, FUR, Ag Research & Extension) to name a few. Second, there is no recognized accounting standard or definition for a functional expense/budget item that is called simply “administration.” The suggested approach by the attached memo is broad and ends up commingling many functional areas such as research, student affairs, the library, the physical plant and other matters with what many consider to be the “administration.” Stated simply, the faculty may not like that the downsizing of the “administration” if that means downsizing important support units like the Library, the Dean of Students or the Research office for example.

I suggest utilizing definitions that are more solidly embedded in higher education financial reporting. The relevant standards for public higher education are defined by NACUBO and GASB. The accepted functional areas for expenditure in higher education include: instruction, research, public service, academic support, libraries, student services, institutional support, plant operations, scholarships/fellowships and auxiliary enterprises. “Administrative offices” such as the Provost and President will fall under institutional support (central functions) and academic support (college functions like Dean’s office). So, one may choose to define administration as the sum of these two expenditure categories. Faculty support and salaries are reflected in the instructional functional expense area. The
data graphs in the appendix have a more detailed definition for each of these functional expense categories.

Such data are publically available from two sources: our annual financial statements and the national database utilized by the Federal government (IPEDS). The IPEDS data definitions change periodically so the data is not available for all of the functional areas above but the most relevant areas (instructional expense, institutional support expense and academic support expense) are available over many years for all institutions receiving Federal financial aid. Libraries, Plant Operations and Scholarships/Fellowships are not consistently available through IPEDS however. This data is useful in addressing a key questions that Senators have raised about long term trends and whether we are rightsizing the budget expenditures. By benchmarking our expenditures to other universities nationally, we can assess if we have gone astray at the University of Idaho.

IPEDS data was gathered for the University of Idaho and peer institutions over 2009-2017. In addition, the 2018 data for the University of Idaho is included as well but we do not have such data for our peers at this time. This data is presented in the attached graphs for each of the NACUBO functional expense categories reported to IPEDS. The data from our current institutional peers and other Idaho universities is included for comparison. The comparison universities include: Boise State University, Clemson University, Colorado State University-Fort Collins, Idaho State University, Iowa State University, Kansas State University, Lewis-Clark State College, Michigan State University, Montana State University, New Mexico State University, North Dakota State University, Oregon State University, University of Arkansas, University of Nebraska, University of New Hampshire, University of Wyoming, Utah State University, Virginia Tech, and Washington State University.

Faculty or college funding is primarily represented by instructional expense whereas “administration” is best represented by the sum of academic and institutional support. A graph of this data (see below) shows that, due to recent program prioritization and market-based compensation efforts, there has been an intentional decrease in administrative expense and increase in instructional expense. Both expenditures levels are near our peer averages; although, instruction expense seems to have now reach levels above the average of our peers while administrative costs are below the average of our peers.
As we look at the various graphs in the appendix, instructional support and student services are the two areas that have a positive trend in funding. Other areas are flat or declining in terms of the funding as a percentage of total expenditures.

We also report this data in our annual financial statements. These reports include all of the NACUBO functional expense categories in contrast to the IPEDS data source. The two most recent years are copied below in total dollars. The subsequent table provides a few calculations. The first calculation looks at the net increase in expenditure from fiscal year 2017 to 2018. The following calculations are the percentage of the total university expenditures in a particular functional area for the fiscal years 2017 and 2018. The final calculation is a trend indicator of our institutional spending – which items are seeing increases in spending as a fraction of total spending.

All expenditures increased from fiscal year 2017 to 2018 except scholarship/fellowship and auxiliary enterprises. These increases are mainly driven by the annual CEC process and salaries. By far, the largest increases are in the areas of instruction, academic support and student services. In contrast to the Senator’s analysis, this data suggests our biggest increases in expenditure are for faculty and collegiate support functions. This is not surprising given that most of the revenue increases (from State appropriation and tuition rate increases) have been directed to raises given during CEC, and most of our salaries are tied to the academic and student support functions.
### Functional Classification with Functional Classification

The following table shows the University’s operating expenses by natural classifications within their functional classifications for the years ending June 30, 2018 and 2017:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Expense</th>
<th>FY17 Total</th>
<th>FY18 Total</th>
<th>Change from FY17 to FY18 (%)</th>
<th>Portion of total expenditure in FY18 (%)</th>
<th>Portion of total expenditure in FY17 (%)</th>
<th>Change in portion of total spending (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>65,052,100</td>
<td>81,369,044</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>+2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>41,556,400</td>
<td>13,149,756</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>+0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>10,274,559</td>
<td>6,685,943</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>9,488,520</td>
<td>5,260,699</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>2,699,986</td>
<td>3,617,446</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>9,648,724</td>
<td>4,326,621</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>+0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>19,120,658</td>
<td>18,102,846</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Operations</td>
<td>5,116,544</td>
<td>10,222,560</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships/Fellowships</td>
<td>10,314,354</td>
<td>3,469,021</td>
<td>-22.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>18,570,925</td>
<td>71,569,907</td>
<td>-29.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $189,570,255

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Expense</th>
<th>FY17 Total</th>
<th>FY18 Total</th>
<th>Change from FY17 to FY18 (%)</th>
<th>Portion of total expenditure in FY18 (%)</th>
<th>Portion of total expenditure in FY17 (%)</th>
<th>Change in portion of total spending (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>63,770,099</td>
<td>61,369,044</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>+2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>40,752,678</td>
<td>40,369,044</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>+0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>10,900,817</td>
<td>8,268,562</td>
<td>-25.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>8,675,324</td>
<td>7,268,562</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>2,639,231</td>
<td>2,639,231</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>8,700,767</td>
<td>8,975,465</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>+0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>17,375,597</td>
<td>17,937,597</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Operations</td>
<td>7,936,714</td>
<td>8,592,521</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships/Fellowships</td>
<td>690,468</td>
<td>690,468</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>10,322,529</td>
<td>18,570,925</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>+0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $177,760,031
One additional clarification is that the legislative process does not give us discretion on where general education funding is placed. For example, the CCI initiative that the State Board implemented in 2014 and 2015 augmented our budgets with a few faculty but mainly with student affairs professionals in career services, advising and mental health counseling. Our option was to take funding for student affairs personnel or to not accept any funding. There was not discretion to simply hire faculty. If we were growing enrollment, we would have discretion over the investment of new tuition revenue. Although we have stabilized the enrollment in the past three years, there has not been an appreciable growth in this revenue stream.

The data does not support the statement that the “administration” has grown more than “the colleges.” In fact, the areas receiving more resources (as measured as either increases in total funding or as a fraction of our total budget) include instruction, academic support (both of which are the bulk of collegiate budgets) as well as student services.

I appreciate the opportunity to present some of my thoughts on a rather complex subject. I encourage additional discussion as we continue to build a vibrant university in service to the State of Idaho and humanity writ large. We have an important mission and we are in this quest together.
**Auxiliary Enterprises Expense**

Expenditures for essentially self-supporting operations of the institution that exist to furnish a service to students, faculty, or staff, and that charge a fee that is directly related to, although not necessarily equal to, the cost of the service. Examples are residence halls, food services, student health services, intercollegiate athletics (only if essentially self-supporting), college unions, college stores, faculty and staff parking, and faculty housing. Institutions include actual or allocated costs for operation and maintenance of plant, interest and depreciation.

![Graph of Auxiliary Expense](image)

**Academic Support**

A functional expense category that includes expenses of activities and services that support the institution's primary missions of instruction, research, and public service. It includes the retention, preservation, and display of educational materials (for example, libraries, museums, and galleries); organized activities that provide support services to the academic functions of the institution (such as a demonstration school associated with a college of education or veterinary and dental clinics if their primary purpose is to support the instructional program); media such as audiovisual services; academic administration (including academic deans but not department chairs/presidents); and formally organized and separately budgeted academic personnel development and course and curriculum development expenses. Also included are information technology expenses related to academic support activities. If an institution does not separately budget and expense information technology resources, the costs associated with the three primary programs will be applied to this function and the remainder to Institutional Support. Institutions include actual or allocated costs for operation and maintenance of plant, interest, and depreciation.

![Graph of Academic Support Expense](image)
Institutional Support Expense
A functional expense category that includes expenses for the day-to-day operational support of the institution. Includes expenses for general administrative services, central executive-level activities concerned with management and long range planning, legal and fiscal operations, space management, employee personnel and records, logistical services such as purchasing and printing, and public relations and development. Also includes information technology expenses related to institutional support activities. If an institution does not separately budget and expense information technology resources, the IT costs associated with student services and operation and maintenance of plant will also be applied to this function.

Instructional Expense
A functional expense category that includes expenses of the colleges, schools, departments, and other instructional divisions of the institution and expenses for departmental research and public service that are not separately budgeted. Includes general academic instruction, occupational and vocational instruction, community education, preparatory and adult basic education, and regular, special, and extension sessions. Also includes expenses for both credit and non-credit activities. Excludes expenses for academic administration where the primary function is administration (e.g., academic deans). Information technology expenses related to instructional activities if the institution separately budgets and expenses information technology resources are included (otherwise these expenses are included in academic support). Institutions include actual or allocated costs for operation and maintenance of plant, interest, and depreciation.
Public Service Expense

A functional expense category that includes expenses for activities established primarily to provide non-instructional services beneficial to individuals and groups external to the institution. Examples are conferences, institutes, general advisory service, reference bureaus, and similar services provided to particular sectors of the community. This function includes expenses for community services, cooperative extension services, and public broadcasting services. Also included are information technology expenses related to the public service activities if the institution separately budgets and expenses information technology resources (otherwise these expenses are included in academic support). Institutions include actual or allocated costs for operation and maintenance of plant, interest, and depreciation.

Research Expense

A functional expense category that includes expenses for activities specifically organized to produce research outcomes and commissioned by an agency either external to the institution or separately budgeted by an organizational unit within the institution. The category includes institutes and research centers, and individual and project research. This function does not include non-research sponsored programs (e.g., training programs). Also included are information technology expenses related to research activities if the institution separately budgets and expenses information technology resources (otherwise these expenses are included in academic support). Institutions include actual or allocated costs for operation and maintenance of plant, interest, and depreciation.
Scholarship and Fellowship Expense
Outright grants-in-aid, trainee stipends, tuition and fee waivers, and prizes awarded to students by the institution, including Pell Grants. Awards to undergraduate students are most commonly referred to as "scholarships" and those to graduate students as "fellowships." These awards do not require the performance of services while a student (such as teaching) or subsequently as a result of the scholarship or fellowship. The term does not include loans to students (subject to repayment), College Work-Study Program (CWS), or awards granted to a parent of a student because of the parent's faculty or staff status. Also not included are awards to students where the selection of the student recipient is not made by the institution.

Student Services Expense
A functional expense category that includes expenses for admissions, registrar activities, and activities whose primary purpose is to contribute to students' emotional and physical wellbeing and to their intellectual, cultural, and social development outside the context of the formal instructional program. Examples include student activities, cultural events, student newspapers, intramural athletics, student organizations, supplemental instruction outside the normal administration, and student records. Intercollegiate athletics and student health services may also be included except when operated as self-supporting auxiliary enterprises. Also may include information technology expenses related to student service activities if the institution separately budgets and expenses information technology resources (otherwise these expenses are included in institutional support.) Institutions include actual or allocated costs for operation and maintenance of plant, interest, and depreciation.
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TO: Provost Wiencek
FROM: Penny Morgan
SUBJECT: How are we judging effectiveness and “right size”?

What is “right size” for UI? What will make us most effective?

Growth at the University of Idaho, FY2019 relative to FY2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Gen Ed Budget</th>
<th>Total FTE</th>
<th>Total Gen Ed Salaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UI Colleges</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UI Administration</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based upon FY 2014-2019 General Education Budget information available to the public through UI Budget Office, March 2019

These numbers confirm the sense shared by many UI faculty and staff: Mid-level administration has grown much more than the colleges. There are some good reasons for this, such as more compliance and other requirements, but not enough to justify this central growth relative to colleges. In his recent article in the Spokesman Review, Shawn Vestal highlighted similar trends: in the last 30 years, WSU enrollment grew by 61% while administration grew by 861%. We cannot simply justify our imbalance by comparing to other institutions; instead we need to know we are “right-sized” to be effective here at UI.

We have much to celebrate here at UI, and I appreciate our strategic plan. I applaud you for having upper administration share in the recent budget cuts.

As we move forward together here at the University of Idaho, please help us ensure that we support our faculty and staff as they seek to serve the students we have, to recruit and retain new students, and to accomplish our desired outcomes while serving the needs of our state, region, nation and world. Our college staffs, in particular, are so lean that we endanger our effective teaching, research, and outreach. Our faculty and staff are the ones who are on the “frontlines” working with our students.

I thank you for coming to CNR yesterday for an open discussion with faculty and staff. And you have tried to be more transparent in decisions. More of the same will help improve the climate on campus.
UI Policy:
Creation and Change
The Role of the Policy Coordinator

- IS to facilitate policy development
- Is NOT to act as an advocate
Benefits of Early Consultation

- Spot potential legal issues
- Identify conflicts with other policies
- Find the best home for your policy
- Get help with drafting
1. Notify the Policy Coordinator of Your Plan

The Policy Coordinator can help with

- Early input and advice
- Drafting
- Ensuring all policies are reviewed by appropriate constituencies
2. Request the official document of an existing policy

- Ensures that
  - You are not unknowingly working on a policy at the same time as another party.
  - You are working with the most recent version of the policy.
  - The Policy Coordinator is able to
    - Track the progress of your policy,
    - Keep the process transparent, and
    - Manage the policy workflow.
Drafting Tips

1. Read the Policy Manual!
2. See #1.
3. Once Your Committee Has Approved the Policy

Email the policy and cover sheet to the Policy Coordinator. The Policy Coordinator will

- Review the draft policy for ambiguities, errors, and conflicts with other policies
- Send a copy to General Counsel for legal review

If either the Policy Coordinator or General Counsel have questions or spot problems, the policy will be returned for explanations or changes.

This step can take four weeks or more. Plan ahead!
The Approval Process: Faculty Staff Handbook

- The policy will be scheduled for a Faculty Senate meeting. If approved, then
- The policy will be added to the agenda of the next University Faculty Meeting (UFM). If approved, then
- It will be forwarded to the President for approval or veto
- Some policies must then be sent to the State Board of Education for approval
- After final approval, it will be sent back to Policy Coordinator for publication
# 2019-2020 FSH Deadlines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 22</td>
<td>October 22: Last date to submit an FSH policy for review if inclusion on Fall UFM agenda is desired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 19</td>
<td>November 19: Last Senate meeting to approve FSH policy for inclusion on Fall UFM agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 11</td>
<td>December 11: Fall UFM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 24</td>
<td>March 24: Last date to submit an FSH policy for review if inclusion on Spring UFM agenda is desired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21</td>
<td>April 21: Last Senate meeting to approve FSH policy for inclusion on Spring UFM agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 6</td>
<td>May 6: Spring UFM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APM vs. FSH

- APMs are mostly developed by administrative units across campus.
- APMs do not involve issues of shared governance.
- Broadly speaking, APMs are for procedures. They should not merely describe UI operations.
- Communication with Faculty Senate and Staff Council is required, but approval is not.
- APMs do have to be approved by
  - The Vice President in charge of the administrative unit,
  - General Counsel, and
  - The President.
The APM will be scheduled for informational discussion at Faculty Senate and Staff Council meetings. Comments will be forwarded to the proposers for consideration.

APMs sometimes go to the University Faculty Meeting for the purpose of widely communicating changes, but they do not need UFM approval.

Once approved by the General Counsel and VP, the APM goes to the President for approval or veto.

After final approval, the APM is returned to the Policy Coordinator for publication.
Questions?

Diane Whitney, J.D.
University Policy and Compliance Coordinator
Office of the Provost/Office of General Counsel
Uofi-policy@uidaho.edu
208-885-6151