

University of Idaho

Faculty Senate

Tools Ranking Taskforce



December 2019

Tools Ranking Taskforce

Executive Summary

The University of Idaho Faculty Senate, in response to fiscal challenges at the university, established the Tools ranking Taskforce in November 2019. The Task Force was given a mandate to:

1. Create a list of cost reduction strategies.
2. Provide a ranking for the strategies.
3. Present a report to Faculty Senate, Staff Council, and the Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Committee (IPEC).

The Tools Ranking Taskforce was tasked with presenting the report to IPEC and to the Sustainable Financial Model Working Group (SFMWG) which, in turn, will provide input to the Program Prioritization process. The Tools Ranking Taskforce was comprised of staff, faculty, and administrators from across the University; selected by Faculty Senate, Staff Council, and the University Administration. They represented multiple colleges, institutional and academic support services, and were able to draw on a wide array of experiences across the institution.

Concurrent with the establishment of this committee, the President of the University of Idaho solicited broad feedback from the University community. All feedback submitted by December 5th was incorporated into the Task Force's discussions. A total of 142 ideas were submitted to The Tools Ranking Taskforce and were broadly placed into the following categories:

- A. General Funds and Expenditures
- B. Programs and Positions
- C. Salaries
- D. Benefits
- E. Student Affairs
- F. Physical Plant - Facilities
- G. Institutional Support - Administration
- H. Research - Grants and Contracts
- I. Miscellaneous
- J. Measures that fall under Financial Exigency

The Taskforce ranked each idea on a scale from 0 (**highly preferable**) to 5 (**not acceptable**). To aid in understanding the rankings, ideas are summarized in tables into distinct colored groups:

A score of 0 to a score of 1.67 are colored in **green** and represent the **most preferable ideas**.
A score of 1.68 to 3.33 are colored in **blue** and represent **neither preferable or not preferable ideas**.
A score of 3.34 to 5 are colored in **orange** and represent the **least preferable ideas**.
Ideas that were not ranked are denoted by **NR**, due to a lack of enough details.
If printing in black and white, the 'colors' vary from **light gray** (most preferable ideas) to **dark gray** (least preferable ideas).

The attached summaries provide the final ranking for each idea per category. Supporting information and data sources are included beside each idea. The Tools Ranking Taskforce also was able to identify several revenue generation ideas that although not in the formal remit of the taskforce are included in this report for completeness. Ideas that have the potential to cut costs are indicated by ↓ and ideas that have potential to create revenue are indicated by ↑.

A General Funds and Expenditures

Ideas Ranked as highly preferable to acceptable (0 to 1.67)

Idea	\$	Rank	Type of Idea	More Information
Lease prime ground-floor spaces in campus buildings to retailers, professional firms, independent nonprofit organizations, and other revenue providers.	↑	0.00	Public Private Partnership.	The committee was very supportive of these ideas to generate revenue. Several other universities lease ground floor space. Examples can include hair dressers, non-academic book stores (apt, given UI will no longer sell books at the VandalStore), etc.
Increase rental revenues by encouraging local entities to use campus recreation areas, music venues, meeting rooms, etc.	↑	0.00	Public Private Partnership.	
Eliminate VIP Funding program	↓	0.00	Reduce costs on internal spending.	The Vandal Ideas Project (VIP) is a competitive university-wide grant program to stimulate bold new ideas that support our strategic plan goals. https://www.uidaho.edu/research/faculty/find-funding/internal-funding/vandal-ideas-project
Eliminate the UBFC funding program	↓	0.00	Reduce costs on internal spending.	The University community submits one-time and permanent requests for funding. https://www.uidaho.edu/finance/budget-finance-committee
Eliminate or reduce food/drinks at events using non-gift funds	↓	0.00	Reduce costs on internal spending.	Committee feels it is hard to justify such costs during a reduction in force climate.
Cancel University wide faculty/staff events (e.g. Christmas reception)	↓	0.00	Reduce costs on internal spending.	Committee feels it is hard to justify such costs during a reduction in force climate.
Evaluate moving cost expenditures across campus to identify best value vendor	↓	0.00	Public Private Partnership.	Committee received information that different units across campus use different vendors to facilitate moving of new employees. A single vendor may provide better value.
Reduce on all discretionary spending (supplies, computers, etc.)	↓	0.00	Reduce costs on internal spending.	
Expand online curriculum to more students, including international students/markets	↑	0.00	Generate revenue by expanding product options.	The University needs to commit serious support to quality online experience (perhaps through increasing support to CETL)
Discontinue printing or mailing paper receipts for all registration receipts.	↓	0.00	Reduce costs on internal spending.	The committee expressed surprise that this isn't being done already given the propensity and ease of digital receipts.
Sell the house that was purchased for Staben	↑	0.00	Generate revenue by selling off assets.	If no longer in use, does not appear a critical use of assets. One option that was brought up beyond selling is to use to generate lease revenue for visiting scientists.

Reduce number of ORED PCNs paid on General Education budgets (move back to F/A)	↓	0.50	Adjust budget model. Set funding more on F/A returns.	2020 General Education budget book contains \$3,616,228 in funding for ORED (pp 195-197): https://www.uidaho.edu/finance/budget-office/budget-books/fy2020-budget-books <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Office of Sponsored Programs PCNs totaling \$1,291,347 - Office of Research Assurances PCNs totaling \$651,212 - Office of Technology Transfer PCNs totaling \$266,042 - Research and Faculty Development PCNs totaling \$304,075 - ORED AVP PCNs totaling \$206,190 - Research Operations / Strategic Initiatives PCNs totaling \$357,122 - VP research/econ develop, assistant, and legal counsel support totaling \$540,238
Reduce travel for Admin Meetings (except essential - SBOE etc.)	↓	1.00	Reduce costs on internal spending.	Ideas included a greater use of Zoom and other remote communication options.
Explore online course 'eat as much as you want options' - flat fee per semester	↑	1.00	Generate revenue by expanding product options.	Further clarification is recommended regarding this idea. Questions included: how it would be monitored, how would students be advised, does this replace/update Independent Study.
Explore not funding Development/Advancement from Generation Education.	↑	1.23	Adjust budget model.	<p>The context for this idea is based on faculty experiences at Ohio State University, where development follows a very different model. Namely, investment gains are initially used to support the development staff, such like 100% of all investment gains in year 1, 75% in year 2, 50% in year 3, 25% in year 4, and zero thereafter. The faculty familiar with that program felt it created a culture where development staff were motivated to meet donor targets.</p> <p>The committee had some concerns on whether donors would feel comfortable with that model (or be put off by it). However, on balance the committee suggests that it should be explored but that a greater look at how other universities nationally tackle funding of development should be considered.</p> <p>In terms of the 2020 budget book, development/advancement appears in two ways. Partially centralized and partially decentralized. The 2020 General Education budget book contains \$4,580,983 in salaries for advancement (pp. 198-201) in terms of PCN (i.e. central plus decentralized unit components): https://www.uidaho.edu/finance/budget-office/budget-books/fy2020-budget-books</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alumni Office PCNs totaling \$617,385 - University Advancement PCNs totaling \$482,660 - Advancement Services PCNs totaling \$942,568 - University Development PCNs totaling \$2,538,369
Renegotiate vendor for central computer hardware	↓	1.50	Public Private Partnership.	Further clarification is recommended regarding this idea. Questions included what software packages this would include and whether costs are already obligated/spent.
Reduce the general education athletic budget	↓	1.63	Reduce costs on internal spending.	Further clarification is recommended regarding this idea. The committee noted inconsistent numbers associated with the General Education portion of the Athletic budget and some concerns were raised regarding unintended consequences on ticket sales, Vandal gear, etc.
2020 General Education budget book contains \$4,476,000 for Intercollegiate Athletics (p.25).				

A General Funds and Expenditures

Ideas Ranked as acceptable (1.68 to 3.33)

Idea	\$	Rank	Type of Idea	More Information
Decentralize computer hardware purchase control back to colleges (i.e. close the ITS depot)	↓	2.00	Adjust budget model.	Further clarification is recommended regarding this idea. Comments included: What are the different needs are in the different departments and colleges? Seems like this would increase efficiency. However it was clarified that the ITS 'depot' is a single University of Idaho employee and not the heavily staffed warehouse that several people imagine.
Reduce travel for external speakers (dept)	↓	2.00	Reduce costs on internal spending.	Reduce but not eliminate to ensure student success.
Reduce on travel for Professional Development	↓	2.00	Reduce costs on internal spending.	
Place hard deadline on start-up funds (e.g. 3 years) and sweep older balances	↓	2.00	Reduce costs on internal spending.	Generally supportive, provided an appeals process was put in place.
Provide awards (small incentives) for faculty to 'Go Paperless' in the classroom to reduce printing costs	-	2.60	Reduce costs on internal spending.	General comments are that this should be done regardless without the need for an incentive.
Given CAFÉ is being built in the Magic Valley, sell UI Dairy and lands behind Moscow Mall and work with WSU Dairy until then.	-	3.20	Generate revenue by selling off assets.	Further clarification is recommended regarding this idea. The committee felt it was unclear whether this would lead to any savings beyond the one-off sale of land.

A General Funds and Expenditures

Ideas Ranked as least preferable to not acceptable (3.34 to 5.0)

Ideas that were not ranked (NR)

Idea	\$	Rank	Type of Idea	More Information
Reduce or close the UI Law School	↓	3.80	Program closure.	The committee felt that it would be unwise to give up disciplines that no other institution in the state compete with us on (Law, CALS, CNR, CAA, etc).
Close Taylor Wilderness Research Station (incl semester in the wild)	↓	4.20	Program closure.	Concerns that this would impact student experience and the core Land Grant Mission.
Close McCall Outdoor Science School and McCall Field Campus and sell lands (MOSS is a self-support program)	-	4.75	Program closure.	Concerns that this would impact the core Land Grant Mission, especially in areas where there is no competition from other state institutions (e.g. Law, CALS, CNR, CAA, etc). .
Sweep unrestricted fund balances and/or freeze some accounts	↓	NR	Reduce costs on internal spending.	The committee felt that this idea lacked specifics and that each individual type of account would need to be considered given the wide variety of different accounts and purposes.
Moratorium on University software purchases and upgrades	-	NR	Program closure.	Although several of the committee shared frustrations on the ever changing software landscape, many of these products are already paid for, making this idea not overly practical.
Eliminate or reduce some regional operations (e.g. extension)	-	NR	Reduce costs on internal spending.	This idea seemed counter to the land grant mission and was not ranked.

B Programs and Positions

Ideas Ranked as highly preferable to acceptable (0 to 1.67)

Idea	\$	Rank	Type of Idea	More Information
Early retirement for faculty and staff	↓	0.00	Reduction in workforce.	Already implemented via ORIP
Voluntary separation initiatives for faculty/staff	↓	0.00	Reduction in workforce.	Already implemented via VSIP
Reduce filling vacant faculty positions	↓	0.00	Reduction in workforce.	Refill mission critical positions. Especially those needed to retain accreditation.
Strictly follow faculty strategic hiring plans	↓	0.00	Reduction in workforce.	Already implemented.
Encourage all department chairs and associate deans with at least a MS degree to teach at least 3 credits		0.25		To place this in context, the committee is aware of some chairs/associate deans that do not teach (although many do). This would enable faculty to do more with the same resources.
Adopt staff strategic hiring plans	↓	0.29	Reduction in workforce.	
Enforce minimum course sizes	-	0.67		May lead to efficiencies, but not teaching small courses that faculty have capacity to do, will reduce revenue.
Freeze all forms of 'out of cycle' pay increases, including retention offers	-	1.00	Reduce costs on internal spending	The committee felt this should only be a temporary measure. There is concern that retention may still be needed for some critical position.
Voluntary 'short-term' adjustments to faculty PDs to teach more (3/3)	-	1.14		The committee expressed concerns on (a) what short term means and (b) the longer-term impacts that this has on position.
Reduce filing vacant staff positions	↓	1.14	Reduction in workforce.	At the college and department level, staff levels are already very low.
Voluntary reductions in FTE (0.875 FTE, 0.9 FTE etc.) for faculty within 10 years of retirement	↓	1.17	Reduction in workforce (effort)	To provide context for this idea, a large number of faculty who are not eligible for VSIP or ORIP have indicated that such a long-term voluntary step down to retirement (say 10 years instead of the typical 2 years) would be met favorably. The committee understands that UI General Counsel is weighing in on this idea, as there are complex considerations associated with benefits and various federal protections.
Reduce all temporary help hiring from general education budgets	↓	1.29	Reduction in workforce.	Except for key positions.
Reduce reserve at Central University level for strategic hires	↓	1.50	Reduction in workforce.	2020 General Education budget book contains \$1,580,093 set aside for Faculty Strategic Hiring Process (p207). These are reserved to ensure that critical accreditation needs are met due to unexpected losses in faculty and instructors. https://www.uidaho.edu/finance/budget-office/budget-books/fy2020-budget-books Overall, although the committee agrees that this fund is necessary, they feel it could be reduced as it's hard to reconcile the potential of laying off faculty with potential concurrent hiring. The committee also recommends oversight of the use of these funds, especially when hiring decisions are being made.

B Programs and Positions

Ideas Ranked as acceptable (1.68 to 3.33)

Idea	\$	Rank	Type of Idea	More Information
Cap number of sabbaticals per college per year based on faculty size	-	1.86	Policy Change (Senate).	Not likely to result in significant savings and undermines incentives for research. Colleges realize small savings for 1 year sabbaticals. i.e. pay 50% of faculty salary, but have to hire instructors etc. to cover key courses.
Explore ways to allow Emeritus faculty and other retirees to volunteer time (teaching etc.)	-	1.83	Policy Change (HR).	Although the committee respects the spirit of this idea, they are concerned that this may not be legal due to federal work protections.
Shift all teaching to a 4 day week (M-Thurs) with meetings/events etc. left for Friday	↓	1.86	Reduce costs on internal spending.	This idea may provide some savings by not having classrooms serviced one day a week.
Limit the duration for administrative leave to 3 months (instead of >year in some cases)	-	2.00		Further clarification is recommended regarding this idea. It is unclear what legal issues that may cause.
Allow staff to volunteer to work a 35-39 hour work week year round (not just summer) while still on full benefits	↓	2.00	Policy Change (HR).	Although the committee respects the spirit of this idea, they are concerned that this may not be legal due to federal work protections.
Explore ways to allow current employee to volunteer time	-	2.00	Policy Change (HR).	Although the committee respects the spirit of this idea, they are concerned that this may not be legal due to federal work protections.
Reduction in force of faculty due to low enrollment in programs	↓	2.14	Reduction in workforce.	Board Policy II.G.6.aprovides that tenured faculty can be terminated “in situations where extreme shifts of enrollment have eliminated the justification for a position.” https://boardofed.idaho.gov/board-policies-rules/board-policies/human-resources-policies-section-ii/policies-regarding-faculty-institutional-faculty-only-ii-g/
Expand # NTT instructors and Clinical for teaching	-	2.43	Reduction in workforce (less tenured faculty)	
Allow staff to have lower than 0.875 FTE but still retain full benefits	↓	2.43	Policy Change (HR).	
Expand # NTT research faculty	-	2.57	Reduction in workforce (less tenured faculty)	
Eliminate half year sabbaticals	-	2.86	Change in Policy (State Board).	The idea is that this would force faculty to only take 1 year sabbaticals leading to marginal savings that are not realized via 6 month sabbaticals. There is a concern that this discriminates against non-STEM faculty that can't afford full year sabbaticals.

				<p>Board Policy II.G.3.c.ii..states that “[t]he term of a sabbatical leave is either one (1) academic semester at full pay or two (2) semesters at half pay.”</p> <p>https://boardofed.idaho.gov/board-policies-rules/board-policies/human-resources-policies-section-ii/policies-regarding-faculty-institutional-faculty-only-ii-g/</p>
Academic Program Elimination	↓	3.00	Reduction in workforce.	<p>Program discontinuance not under financial exigency is governed by Board Policies III.G. and III.Z. All categories of employees, including tenured faculty, may be terminated as a result of program discontinuance.</p> <p>https://boardofed.idaho.gov/board-policies-rules/board-policies/higher-education-affairs-section-iii/iii-g-program-approval-and-discontinuance/</p> <p>https://boardofed.idaho.gov/board-policies-rules/board-policies/higher-education-affairs-section-iii/iii-z-planning-and-delivery-of-postsecondary-programs-and-courses/</p> <p>-</p>
Encourage staff/admin on 12 months contracts to move to 11, 10, or 9 months like most faculty	-	3.00		Further clarification is recommended regarding this idea. The question was raised of whether the overall pay would remain the same, similar to a faculty 9 mo appointment?
Formalize 'Staybatticals' - faculty get a mental break by doing a service sabbatical in a different unit for a semester	-	3.29		Cost neutral. Could provide a way for 'better off units' to help units maintain programs during 'lean times'.
Lay off Tenured faculty (other than as a result of program discontinuance or financial exigency, which are addressed elsewhere).		3.60	Reduction in workforce.	<p>Board Policy II.G. and FSH 3520 provide that tenured faculty may be terminated in situations where extreme shift of enrollment have eliminated the justification for a position.</p> <p>https://boardofed.idaho.gov/board-policies-rules/board-policies/human-resources-policies-section-ii/policies-regarding-faculty-institutional-faculty-only-ii-g/</p> <p>https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/3520.html</p> <p>Two additional mechanisms that are not related to budgets are (included for completeness):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Following an unsatisfactory post-tenure review (generally to be conducted every 5 years following tenure). II.G.6.g. Periodic Performance Review of Tenured Faculty Members - Dismissal for adequate cause. II.L.3. This can include one or more instances of sexual harassment or other form of harassment prohibited by law; immorality; criminality; dishonesty; unprofessional conduct; actions in violation of policies, directives, or orders of the Board, an institution or agency; unsatisfactory or inadequate performance of duties, or failure to perform duties.

B Programs and Positions

Ideas Ranked as least preferable to not acceptable (3.34 to 5.0)

Idea	\$	Rank	Type of Idea	More Information
Reduce spousal accommodation hires	↓	3.40		Would prevent effective hiring process.
Layoffs (untenured and non-tenure track)	↓	3.50	Reduction in workforce.	<p>Layoffs as a result of program closure are governed by Board Policy III.G.7.b.i. Layoffs during a contract term require a declaration of financial exigency and are governed by Board Policy II.N. and FSH 3970.</p> <p>https://boardofed.idaho.gov/board-policies-rules/board-policies/higher-education-affairs-section-iii/iii-g-program-approval-and-discontinuance/</p> <p>https://boardofed.idaho.gov/board-policies-rules/board-policies/human-resources-policies-section-ii/staff-reduction-procedures-all-employees-ii-n/</p> <p>https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/3970.html</p>
Contract non-renewals	↓	3.50	Reduction in workforce.	<p>Non-renewals of non-tenured faculty and exempt staff are governed by Board Policy II.G. and FSH 3900.</p> <p>https://boardofed.idaho.gov/board-policies-rules/board-policies/human-resources-policies-section-ii/policies-regarding-faculty-institutional-faculty-only-ii-g/</p> <p>https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/3900.html</p>

C Salaries

Ideas Ranked as highly preferable to acceptable (0 to 1.67)

Idea	\$	Rank	Type of Idea	More Information
Voluntary Furlough	-	1.00		Temporary reductions in cost. Does not help with reducing structural deficit.
Moratorium on all overtime work	↓	0.29	Reduce costs on internal spending.	
Explore faculty incentive buyouts program	↑	0.59	Generate revenue.	Faculty buyout General Education time on grants. University nets the buyout plus the F/A. faculty provided incentive of some fixed % of the salary savings as a bonus. At South Dakota State University the bonus was 50% of the general education savings. Some faculty here suggests 20% would be an adequate motivation.
Voluntary vacation time give back	↓	1.00		Most faculty don't get vacation time, so this only impacts administration and staff.

C Salaries

Ideas Ranked as acceptable (1.68 to 3.33)

Idea	\$	Rank	Type of Idea	More Information
Temporary adjustment in salary that steps up with income bracket (e.g. 5% for >150K, 2% for 75-150K, and 1% for < 75K)	↓	3.00	Reduce costs on internal spending.	<p>Board Policy II.B.2.c delegates to the president "reductions in force and all similar and related work place decisions" "except or unless as limited by other Board or institutional policy." Our institutional policy, FSH 3450 C, limits employment actions under this section to "temporary wage adjustments such as furloughs or similar short-term employment actions."</p> <p>Board Policy II.B.2.c delegates to the president "reductions in force and all similar and related work place decisions" "except or unless as limited by other Board or institutional policy." Our institutional policy, FSH 3450 C, limits employment actions under this section to "temporary wage adjustments such as furloughs or similar short-term employment actions."</p> <p>https://boardofed.idaho.gov/board-policies-rules/board-policies/human-resources-policies-section-ii/appointment-authority-and-procedures-ii-b/</p> <p>https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/3450.htm</p> <p>Comment raised: Given contractual agreements are done yearly, short-term* reductions in salary that are allowed outside of financial exigency would seem to be limited to a sub-contract time period. At the end of that time period, the salary would return to pre-adjustment levels.</p> <p>*At the time of writing this report, President Green has been asked directly what 'short term' means and is checking with General Counsel for clarification.</p>

Mandatory furlough (1-7 days)	-	3.29	Reduce costs on internal spending.	<p>Temporary reductions in cost.</p> <p>Board Policy II.B.2.c delegates to the president “reductions in force and all similar and related work place decisions” “except or unless as limited by other Board or institutional policy.” Our institutional policy, FSH 3450 C, limits employment actions under this section to “temporary wage adjustments such as furloughs or similar short-term employment actions.”</p> <p>Board Policy II.B.2.c delegates to the president “reductions in force and all similar and related work place decisions” “except or unless as limited by other Board or institutional policy.” Our institutional policy, FSH 3450 C, limits employment actions under this section to “temporary wage adjustments such as furloughs or similar short-term employment actions.”</p> <p>https://boardofed.idaho.gov/board-policies-rules/board-policies/human-resources-policies-section-ii/appointment-authority-and-procedures-ii-b/</p> <p>https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/3450.htm</p>
-------------------------------	---	-------------	------------------------------------	--

C Salaries

Ideas Ranked as least preferable to not acceptable (3.34 to 5.0)

Idea	\$	Rank	Type of Idea	More Information
Temporary adjustment in salary done as an equal %.	↓	3.57	Reduce costs on internal spending	<p>An equal % would undo market-based compensation. Unfairly hits lower income faculty and staff.</p> <p>Board Policy II.B.2.c delegates to the president “reductions in force and all similar and related work place decisions” “except or unless as limited by other Board or institutional policy.” Our institutional policy, FSH 3450 C, limits employment actions under this section to “temporary wage adjustments such as furloughs or similar short-term employment actions.”</p> <p>https://boardofed.idaho.gov/board-policies-rules/board-policies/human-resources-policies-section-ii/appointment-authority-and-procedures-ii-b/</p> <p>https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/3450.htm</p>
Temporary adjustment in salary that steps up with academic rank.	↓	3.71	Reduce costs on internal spending	<p>Comment raised: Given contractual agreements are done yearly, short-term* reductions in salary that are allowed outside of financial exigency would seem to be limited to a sub-contract time period. At the end of that time period, the salary would return to pre-adjustment levels.</p> <p>*At the time of writing this report, President Green has been asked directly what ‘short term’ means and is checking with General Counsel for clarification.</p>
Mandatory Furlough over Winter break holiday closure (except for employees making < \$30K)	-	4.29		<p>Temporary reductions in cost. Does not help with reducing structural deficit.</p> <p>Board Policy II.B.2.c delegates to the president “reductions in force and all similar and related work place decisions” “except or unless as limited by other Board or institutional policy.” Our institutional policy, FSH 3450 C, limits employment actions under this section to “temporary wage adjustments such as furloughs or similar short-term employment actions.”</p> <p>https://boardofed.idaho.gov/board-policies-rules/board-policies/human-resources-policies-section-ii/appointment-authority-and-procedures-ii-b/</p> <p>https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/3450.htm</p>

D Benefits

Ideas Ranked as highly preferable to acceptable (0 to 1.67)

Idea	\$	Rank	Type of Idea	More Information
Redesign health insurance plan to match industry norms	-	1.4		Would want the university to be very careful in reducing benefits--salaries are already low in comparison to other peer institutions; a reduction in benefits could be detrimental in recruiting new faculty and staff or in keeping those already here.

D Benefits

Ideas Ranked as acceptable (1.68 to 3.33)

Idea	\$	Rank	Type of Idea	More Information
Incentivize faculty to move dependents to non-UI partners insurance	-	1.71		
Increase employee and retiree contributions to health insurance plan	-	2.57		
Reduce the HSA employer match (max \$1000 from UI)	↓	2.83	Reduce costs on internal spending.	

D Benefits

Ideas Ranked as least preferable to not acceptable (3.34 to 5.0)

Idea	\$	Rank	Type of Idea	More Information
Eliminate or reduce tuition benefits for faculty and/or staff and their dependents	↓	3.43	Policy Change (Senate).	Not clear how much this would save. Also, would be negative for morale given staff most likely benefit from the tuition benefit. The content for this idea is FSH 3780: https://webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/3780.htm

E Student Affairs

Ideas Ranked as highly preferable to acceptable (0 to 1.67)

Idea	\$	Rank	Type of Idea	More Information
SEM should interact with alumni	-	0.57		<p>The context of these statements arises from a general dissatisfaction with the effectiveness of SEM.</p> <p>2020 General Education budget book contains \$5,761,261 for Strategic Enrollment Management (p59). https://www.uidaho.edu/finance/budget-office/budget-books/fy2020-budget-books</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Military Programs: \$68,161 - Registrar's Office: \$997,316 - UG Admissions Recruitment: \$1,154,691 - International Programs Office: \$252,322 - Student Financial aid (incl. BEAMS): \$1,030,411 - UG Admissions Processing: \$337,209 - Career Services: \$594,339 - Enrollment Management: \$624,457 [what most people likely consider 'SEM'] - Academic Support Programs: \$432,044
SEM should send out recruitment materials to Idaho high schools (e.g. Moscow!)	-	0.86		
Explore 4-year fixed tuition program	-	1.14	Adjust budget model.	A lot of universities have had trouble with the accounting; we'd need to confer with those who've done this such as CO, Texas A&M

E Student Affairs

Ideas Ranked as acceptable (1.68 to 3.33)

Idea	\$	Rank	Type of Idea	More Information
Return Vandal Friday to Fridays to eliminate need for Saturday overtime	↓	1.71	Reduce costs on internal spending.	
Reduce the extra Engineering Outreach online Fee (\$300) to make these online courses more competitive to both on campus and online students	-	1.71		Need more information on this idea. Why is fee \$300 and where does that fee go?
Put \$\$ back on the VandalCard so students spend more \$\$ internally	-	1.86		
Offer more evening classes	↑	2.00	Generate revenue by expanding product options.	
Enforce campus live-on requirement	-	2.20		Need more info. Seems reasonable (with room for exceptions), but what do students want to do? Is there a big push to not live on campus?
Summer pre-freshman program that uses previous year financial aid to create cohorts of students specially catered to Pell eligible and/or out of state students.	-	2.25		Need more information on this idea.
Increase campus live-on requirement to 2 years in dorms	-	2.29		
Reduce cost of summer credits to encourage more enrollment	-	2.29	Adjust budget model.	Need to assess regional competition and price points.
More focus on investing in college recruiters versus development staff	-	2.33		Apparent critique of SEM.
Involve alumni in teaching and recruitment - explore volunteering	-	2.50		Need more information on this idea.

Increase efforts to run summer courses using PhD students as co-instructors	↑	2.67	Generate revenue by expanding product options.	Faculty need support in online courses/program offerings which means CETL needs to be supported. If we want quality online classes (including summer courses, which most students want, for flexibility, in the summer) we need to invest in instructional design resources and faculty development around teaching and learning.
Renegotiate WSU/UI Coop agreement (the comment alleges that 2 WSU students for every UI student makes the exchange)	↑	2.80	Adjust budget model.	
Increase undergraduate tuition (+5-10%) as we are one of the lowest tuition institutions in the region	↑	3.00	Adjust budget model.	

F Physical Plant - Facilities

Ideas Ranked as highly preferable to acceptable (0 to 1.67)

Idea	\$	Rank	Type of Idea	More Information
Explore partial shutdowns to reduce facility costs (e.g. winter break/thanksgiving).	↓	0.50	Reduce costs on internal spending.	The committee felt that cost savings could be made by reducing partially shutting down classrooms and other non-critical function spaces during breaks.
Consolidate location of courses in the summer to 1-2 buildings to reduce costs associated with classroom use	↓	0.75	Reduce costs on internal spending.	The committee felt that cost savings could be made by limiting all summer courses to 1-2 buildings.
Reduce energy use by setting thermostats to not heat on hot days or cool on cold days	↓	0.86	Reduce costs on internal spending.	
Reduce use of air conditioning in summer (as some buildings are really cold!) and very few students are present	↓	1.14	Reduce costs on internal spending.	How is the power bill broken down at the University? Does UI generate our own power (wood chip burning plant)? Or, is utilities coming from Avista? What is the cost per kilowatt hour? Power efficiency is a good thing overall for environmental reasons, of course, but how much would we save with these measures if we are generating our own power? If Avista is involved, how is the University being charged? Does UI operate the generator, or do they contract this out?
Rather than one trash can per office - promote central rubbish bins per section/floor to reduce cleaning time	↓	1.67	Reduce costs on internal spending.	

F Physical Plant - Facilities

Ideas Ranked as acceptable (1.68 to 3.33)

Idea	\$	Rank	Type of Idea	More Information
Reduce energy by having lights come on only when natural light levels drop too low	↓	1.83	Reduce costs on internal spending.	How is the power bill broken down at the University? Does UI generate our own power (wood chip burning plant)? Or, is utilities coming from Avista? What is the cost per kilowatt hour? Power efficiency is a good thing overall for environmental reasons, of course, but how much would we save with these measures if we are generating our own power? If Avista is involved, how is the University being charged? Does UI operate the generator, or do they contract this out?
Reduce energy in research laboratories	↓	2.00	Reduce costs on internal spending.	
Reduce the frequency that concrete floors are polished (currently 1-2 times a week)	↓	2.17	Reduce costs on internal spending.	
Reduce custodial services frequency and effort	↓	2.33	Reduce costs on internal spending.	
Centralizing services across the university	↓	2.50	Public Private Partnership.	These all require a reduction in staff, some of whom are likely in the lower end of the pay scale. This should be concerning. Of course, efficiency is not a bad thing, but this will likely mean reducing work force. What would be the cost savings? The cost in morale would be severe as would the impact to the larger Moscow Community. The UI is one of the largest employers in the Palouse region. Cutting our labor force, especially of those at the lower end of the pay scale, seems very "un-neighborly"-- it could potentially deepen the divide between Town & Gown.
Reduce grounds keeping / landscaping frequency and effort (stop mowing leaves!)	↓	2.67	Public Private Partnership.	
Reduce nightshift employees and overtime	↓	2.67	Reduce costs on internal spending.	
Outsourcing/contracting services	↓	2.83	Public Private Partnership.	
Reduce Morrill Hall admin building to 4 10hr work days so that expensive HVAC can be turned off 3 days a week	↓	3.20	Reduce costs on internal spending.	Should be considered across all campus.
Eliminate most faculty phones (except essential)	↓	3.33	Reduce costs on internal spending.	

G Institutional Support - Administration

Ideas Ranked as highly preferable to acceptable (0 to 1.67)

Idea	\$	Rank	Type of Idea	More Information
Reducing number of executives (associate VP, VPs, etc.)	↓	0.00	Reduction in workforce.	<p>The context for this and related ideas (see ** below) is a perception that the administration growth has outpaced the growth of faculty and staff. The summary pages (p1) from the General Education budget books from 2010 to 2020 provide the context for these comments.</p> <p>https://www.uidaho.edu/finance/budget-office/budget-books</p> <p>From FY2010 to FY2020, the General Education budget for all administrative categories (02 to 07: Research, Academic, Institutional, Student Services, Library) increased from \$49.8M to \$80.4M (+\$30.6M). In contrast, Instruction over the same period has increased from \$64.9M to \$82.0M (+\$17.1M), with a large increase between FY2019 and FY2020.</p> <p>On average, Instruction experienced an annual increase of 2.67%, whereas administration has increased by 5.66%. In FY2010, \$0.76 was spent on administration for each \$1.00 spent on instruction. In FY2020, \$0.98 was spent on administration for each \$1.00 spent on instruction.</p>
Explore reducing support for research institutes	↓	0.00	Reduce costs on internal spending.	<p>2020 General Education budget book contains \$930,560 (p192) under Research for Research Centers and Institutes (given many of these faculty PCNs are shared with units, just the central component is included in this rationale).</p> <p>https://www.uidaho.edu/finance/budget-office/budget-books/fy2020-budget-books</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aquaculture: \$310,617 - Water/Energy Resources: \$262,444 - IBEST: \$349,028
Explore reducing support for Directors (Director of Honors, Director of General Education, etc.)	↓	0.00	Reduce costs on internal spending.	
Reduce sending out glossy calendars such as the ones with the ITS contacts on the back	↓	0.00	Reduce costs on internal spending.	
Reduce glossy materials sent out by HR and other units to explain things that an email could cover (benefit changes etc.)	↓	0.14	Reduce costs on internal spending.	
Require all Senate and University committees to 'Go Paperless' - use only digital media - cut down on printing costs	-	0.14	Reduce costs on internal spending.	

Hiring freeze on all associate Vice Presidents/Vice Provosts	-	0.86		** (see above context)
Conduct an Administrative Prioritization Process (like PP) and cut programs.	↓	1.00	Reduction in workforce.	** (see above context)
Standardize administrative stipends (fixed amount or %)	-	1.29		
Freeze salary of executives	-	1.43		
Right-size by fixing a ratio of administration to faculty	↓	1.43	Reduce costs on internal spending.	** (see above context)
Conduct an audit of spending of the upper administration (audit conducted by Senate/staff council reps)	-	1.67	Program closure.	** (see above context)

G Institutional Support - Administration

Ideas Ranked as acceptable (1.68 to 3.33)

Idea	\$	Rank	Type of Idea	More Information
Moratorium on all external consulting agreements	-	1.71	Public Private Partnerships.	Are existing or pending agreements going to benefit the university?
Conduct an internal search for the VP Research	↓	2.00	Reduce costs on internal spending.	Potential to save costs on national search.
Merge colleges and consolidate deans, associate deans, and dean level staff	-	2.67	Program closure.	Would take a considerable amount of time for minimal benefit.
Reducing Strategic Enrollment Management	-	2.83		<p>The context of these statements arises from a general dissatisfaction with the effectiveness of SEM.</p> <p>2020 General Education budget book contains \$5,761,261 for Strategic Enrollment Management (p59). https://www.uidaho.edu/finance/budget-office/budget-books/fy2020-budget-books</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Military Programs: \$68,161 - Registrar's Office: \$997,316 - UG Admissions Recruitment: \$1,154,691 - International Programs Office: \$252,322 - Student Financial aid (incl. BEAMS): \$1,030,411 - UG Admissions Processing: \$337,209 - Career Services: \$594,339 - Enrollment Management: \$624,457 [what most people likely consider 'SEM'] - Academic Support Programs: \$432,044

H Research – Grants and Contracts

Ideas Ranked as highly preferable to acceptable (0 to 1.67)

Idea	\$	Rank	Type of Idea	More Information
Increase the incentive for research entrepreneurs to acquire extramural grants/contracts by waiving the F&A charges on grants/contracts that are small or have little marginal requirement for F&A support services.	-	1.5		<p>Need more information on this idea.</p> <p>Seems that this would reduce revenue as even a low amount of F/A is better than zero and a minimum amount of needed for the university to ‘break even’ (i.e. cost of lights, heating, lab facilities, security, etc.)</p>

H Research – Grants and Contracts

Ideas Ranked as least preferable to not acceptable (3.34 to 5.0)

Idea	\$	Rank	Type of Idea	More Information
Limit approval of grants and contracts that have low F/A rates	-	3.75		Need more information on this idea.
Reconsider past agreements on F/A disbursement/sharing	-	3.75	Policy Change (federal).	Need more information on this idea. This would require the University to renegotiate with the Department of Health and Human Services.

I Misc. / Other

Ideas Ranked as highly preferable to acceptable (0 to 1.67)

Idea	\$	Rank	Type of Idea	More Information
Rent out student residence halls in the summer for summer schools and conferences	↑	1.29	Generate revenue.	Do we have staff to cover the logistics/maintenance/security, etc.?
Concessions / vending space in the new Arena	↑	1.43	Generate revenue.	
Reduce the scope and budget of SEM to only aspects where they meet expectations		1.67		<p>The context of these statements arises from a general dissatisfaction with the effectiveness of SEM.</p> <p>2020 General Education budget book contains \$5,761,261 for Strategic Enrollment Management (p59). https://www.uidaho.edu/finance/budget-office/budget-books/fy2020-budget-books</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Military Programs: \$68,161 - Registrar's Office: \$997,316 - UG Admissions Recruitment: \$1,154,691 - International Programs Office: \$252,322 - Student Financial aid (incl. BEAMS): \$1,030,411 - UG Admissions Processing: \$337,209 - Career Services: \$594,339 - Enrollment Management: \$624,457 [what most people likely consider 'SEM'] - Academic Support Programs: \$432,044

I Misc. / Other

Ideas Ranked as acceptable (1.68 to 3.33)

Idea	\$	Rank	Type of Idea	More Information
Eliminate the BEAMS program	↓	1.83	Program closure.	BEAMS program is part of Student Financial aid and as per the 2020 budget Book has currently has 2 staff of total salary: \$92,000.
Freeze CEC across the board	-	2.20		May not be feasible. Depends on State Law. Does not cut costs.
Bring back special events for generating revenue (e.g. RV show, rodeos, weddings, conferences, etc.)	↑	2.14		
Encourage more faculty and staff to pay \$13 to use the rec center by adding the option to the Open Enrollment options	↑	2.17	Generate Revenue.	
Encourage cross-department college sharing of supplies, desks, pcs etc. to reduce purchases	-	2.33		
Reduce the scope and budget of CETL	↓	2.40	Reduce costs on internal spending.	2020 General Education budget book contains \$365,777 for CETL and DEE (p67). https://www.uidaho.edu/finance/budget-office/budget-books/fy2020-budget-books The committee expressed concern at the potential reduction of the small program given many of the revenue generation ideas focus on expanding online learning activities, which CETL and DEE each play a central role in.
Create student parking lot	↑	2.57		
Eliminate Chrome River and revert back to vandalweb as the system does nothing better than the old system but causes tremendous amount of extra work to the financial staff of the entire university. Note: A typical example is that a reimbursement for \$20 per day for 25-day field work has to be entered 25 times using 9 pages in Chrome		2.57		Although the committee understands the frustration that these new systems have caused, they have already been paid for.

River System, while in Vandalweb, it only took one line.				
Eliminate the Confucius Institute		2.67	Program closure.	Given The Confucius Institute does not appear in the 2020 General Education Budget Book, the committee is unsure what the impact of this idea is.
Use and sell biodiesel fuel	↑	2.80		
Involve the Moscow community more		2.83		
Expand the Confucius Institute		2.83		Given The Confucius Institute does not appear in the 2020 General Education Budget Book, the committee is unsure what the impact of this idea is.
Don't have winter graduation	↓	2.83	Reduce costs on internal spending.	
Have the College of Natural Resources harvest more trees, like they did for the Arena		3.17		The context for this idea is that ~\$1M of wood was harvested from the UI Experimental Forest for use in the Arena. However, there is only a limit number of trees and clear-cutting the UI experimental Forest would not be an example of sustainable land management practices. In addition the UI Experimental Forest is widely used for research and experiential activities for undergraduate and graduate students, so harvesting the trees (outside the forest management plan) would impact student success.
Bake sales - every college and department with "I" cookies and themed baked goods	↑	3.17	Generate Revenue.	Not practical.

J Measures that fall under financial exigency

Ideas Ranked as acceptable (1.68 to 3.33)

Idea	\$	Rank	Type of Idea	More Information
Permanent salary reductions. Proportional by income bracket (e.g. 5% for >150K, 2% for 75-150K, and 1% for < 75K)	↓	2.40	Reduce costs on internal spending.	<p>Board Policy II.N. governs actions taken pursuant to a declaration of financial exigency: https://boardofed.idaho.gov/board-policies-rules/board-policies/human-resources-policies-section-ii/staff-reduction-procedures-all-employees-ii-n/</p>
Permanent salary reductions. Staggered by Rank (e.g. 5% for Full profs, 2% for associate profs, and 1% for assistant profs)	↓	3.00	Reduce costs on internal spending.	<p>II.N. 2d. Employment Actions Other than Layoffs. In any situation where a layoff may be made pursuant to subsection N, an employment action other than a layoff may also be instituted, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a salary reduction - a work hour reduction - a demotion, and/or - administrative leave without pay <p>Such employment actions need not be uniformly applied.</p> <p>https://boardofed.idaho.gov/board-policies-rules/board-policies/human-resources-policies-section-ii/staff-reduction-procedures-all-employees-ii-n/</p>
Permanent salary reductions. Equal %	↓	3.00	Reduce costs on internal spending.	

Appendix A: Summary of University of Idaho General Education Budget Books from 2010 to 2020

<https://www.uidaho.edu/finance/budget-office/budget-books>

	\$	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
01	Instruction	\$ 64,969,396.00	\$ 61,367,671.00	\$ 62,546,042.00	\$ 65,267,548.00	\$ 66,395,244.00	\$ 68,871,955.00	\$ 66,825,148.00	\$ 71,285,663.00	\$ 72,034,153.00	\$ 73,577,902.00	\$ 82,003,730.00
02	Research	\$ 6,520,820.00	\$ 6,170,296.00	\$ 6,253,166.00	\$ 6,048,935.00	\$ 5,712,749.00	\$ 5,505,125.00	\$ 6,020,288.00	\$ 6,260,298.00	\$ 9,216,196.00	\$ 9,626,555.00	\$ 5,030,578.00
03	Public Service	\$ 642.00	\$ 642.00	\$ 642.00	\$ 642.00	\$ 642.00	\$ 654.00	\$ 644.00	\$ 642.00	\$ 181,626.00	\$ 159,688.00	\$ -
04	Academic Support	\$ 7,988,549.00	\$ 8,283,164.00	\$ 9,300,081.00	\$ 9,539,704.00	\$ 10,939,065.00	\$ 11,516,193.00	\$ 12,089,400.00	\$ 12,456,552.00	\$ 12,061,513.00	\$ 12,175,818.00	\$ 15,671,479.00
05	Library	\$ 7,784,880.00	\$ 7,480,234.00	\$ 7,805,688.00	\$ 8,477,823.00	\$ 8,777,624.00	\$ 9,344,682.00	\$ 9,742,835.00	\$ 10,163,922.00	\$ 10,208,012.00	\$ 10,312,580.00	\$ 10,017,294.00
06	Student Services	\$ 10,147,801.00	\$ 12,679,411.00	\$ 13,282,244.00	\$ 14,694,040.00	\$ 14,596,466.00	\$ 14,634,990.00	\$ 16,381,956.00	\$ 18,292,953.00	\$ 10,530,140.00	\$ 11,025,900.00	\$ 17,440,356.00
07	Institutional Support	\$ 17,405,662.00	\$ 17,779,963.00	\$ 19,030,254.00	\$ 21,812,101.00	\$ 20,320,796.00	\$ 20,904,367.00	\$ 21,198,428.00	\$ 24,105,198.00	\$ 32,345,602.00	\$ 31,902,160.00	\$ 32,322,612.00
08	Physical Plant	\$ 22,099,819.00	\$ 22,141,034.00	\$ 23,130,223.00	\$ 23,808,147.00	\$ 26,364,014.00	\$ 29,643,834.00	\$ 27,248,901.00	\$ 24,978,922.00	\$ 24,235,758.00	\$ 24,616,597.00	\$ 24,926,287.00
10	Auxiliary Enterprises	\$ 3,136,331.00	\$ 3,847,585.00	\$ 3,061,260.00	\$ 3,351,060.00	\$ 3,477,100.00	\$ 3,693,200.00	\$ 3,924,200.00	\$ 4,162,350.00	\$ 4,352,000.00	\$ 4,476,600.00	\$ 4,587,664.00
	Unexpended /One Tir	\$ 10,000,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,013,200.00	\$ 2,793,500.00	\$ 735,000.00	\$ 2,326,200.00	\$ -
		\$ 150,053,900.00	\$ 139,750,000.00	\$ 144,409,600.00	\$ 153,000,000.00	\$ 156,583,700.00	\$ 164,115,000.00	\$ 164,445,000.00	\$ 174,500,000.00	\$ 175,900,000.00	\$ 180,200,000.00	\$ 192,000,000.00
	%	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
01	Instruction	43.30%	43.91%	43.31%	42.66%	42.40%	41.97%	40.64%	40.85%	40.95%	40.83%	42.71%
02	Research	4.35%	4.42%	4.33%	3.95%	3.65%	3.35%	3.66%	3.59%	5.24%	5.34%	2.62%
03	Public Service	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.10%	0.09%	0.00%
04	Academic Support	5.32%	5.93%	6.44%	6.24%	6.99%	7.02%	7.35%	7.14%	6.86%	6.76%	8.16%
05	Library	5.19%	5.35%	5.41%	5.54%	5.61%	5.69%	5.92%	5.82%	5.80%	5.72%	5.22%
06	Student Services	6.76%	9.07%	9.20%	9.60%	9.32%	8.92%	9.96%	10.48%	5.99%	6.12%	9.08%
07	Institutional Support	11.60%	12.72%	13.18%	14.26%	12.98%	12.74%	12.89%	13.81%	18.39%	17.70%	16.83%
08	Physical Plant	14.73%	15.84%	16.02%	15.56%	16.84%	18.06%	16.57%	14.31%	13.78%	13.66%	12.98%
10	Auxiliary Enterprises	2.09%	2.75%	2.12%	2.19%	2.22%	2.25%	2.39%	2.39%	2.47%	2.48%	2.39%
	Unexpended /One Tir	6.66%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.62%	1.60%	0.42%	1.29%	0.00%

\$	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
Instruction	\$ 64,969,396.00	\$ 61,367,671.00	\$ 62,546,042.00	\$ 65,267,548.00	\$ 66,395,244.00	\$ 68,871,955.00	\$ 66,825,148.00	\$ 71,285,663.00	\$ 72,034,153.00	\$ 73,577,902.00	\$ 82,003,730.00
Support (Research, Academic, Institutional, Student Services, Library)	\$ 49,847,712.00	\$ 52,393,068.00	\$ 55,671,433.00	\$ 60,572,603.00	\$ 60,346,700.00	\$ 61,905,357.00	\$ 65,432,907.00	\$ 71,278,923.00	\$ 74,361,463.00	\$ 75,043,013.00	\$ 80,482,319.00
Physical Plant	\$ 22,099,819.00	\$ 22,141,034.00	\$ 23,130,223.00	\$ 23,808,147.00	\$ 26,364,014.00	\$ 29,643,834.00	\$ 27,248,901.00	\$ 24,978,922.00	\$ 24,235,758.00	\$ 24,616,597.00	\$ 24,926,287.00
Other	\$ 13,136,973.00	\$ 3,848,227.00	\$ 3,061,902.00	\$ 3,351,702.00	\$ 3,477,742.00	\$ 3,693,854.00	\$ 4,938,044.00	\$ 6,956,492.00	\$ 5,268,626.00	\$ 6,962,488.00	\$ 4,587,664.00
Total	\$ 150,053,900.00	\$ 139,750,000.00	\$ 144,409,600.00	\$ 153,000,000.00	\$ 156,583,700.00	\$ 164,115,000.00	\$ 164,445,000.00	\$ 174,500,000.00	\$ 175,900,000.00	\$ 180,200,000.00	\$ 192,000,000.00
%	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
Instruction	43.30%	43.91%	43.31%	42.66%	42.40%	41.97%	40.64%	40.85%	40.95%	40.83%	42.71%
Support (Research, Academic, Institutional, Student Services, Library)	33.22%	37.49%	38.55%	39.59%	38.54%	37.72%	39.79%	40.85%	42.27%	41.64%	41.92%
Physical Plant	14.73%	15.84%	16.02%	15.56%	16.84%	18.06%	16.57%	14.31%	13.78%	13.66%	12.98%
Other	8.75%	2.75%	2.12%	2.19%	2.22%	2.25%	3.00%	3.99%	3.00%	3.86%	2.39%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* This is the original data acquired from each year's budget book. It is not inflation adjusted and beyond the grouping of administration is not modified in any way.

Appendix B: Links to Relevant Policies

A. General Principles

RGP III.I.2-3 Role and Mission Statements

<https://boardofed.idaho.gov/board-policies-rules/board-policies/higher-education-affairs-section-iii/roles-and-missions/>

RGP III.I.4 Institutional Long-Range Plans

<https://boardofed.idaho.gov/board-policies-rules/board-policies/higher-education-affairs-section-iii/roles-and-missions/>

FSH 1340 Academic Priorities

<https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/1340.html>

FSH 1520 Constitution of the University Faculty

<https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/1520.html>

FSH 1640.34 Provost Council

<https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/1640.html#1640.34>

FSH 1640.20 University Budget and Finance Committee

<https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/1640.html#1640.12>

FSH 6560 Rights Retained by the University

<https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/6560.html>

A. Ordinary Actions

RGP II.F Policies Regarding Non-classified Employees

<https://boardofed.idaho.gov/board-policies-rules/board-policies/human-resources-policies-section-ii/policies-regarding-nonclassified-employees-ii-f/>

RGP II.G Policies Regarding Faculty

<https://boardofed.idaho.gov/board-policies-rules/board-policies/human-resources-policies-section-ii/policies-regarding-faculty-institutional-faculty-only-ii-g/>

RGP III.G. Postsecondary Program Approval and Discontinuance

<https://boardofed.idaho.gov/board-policies-rules/board-policies/higher-education-affairs-section-iii/iii-g-program-approval-and-discontinuance/>

RGP III.H Program Review

<https://boardofed.idaho.gov/board-policies-rules/board-policies/higher-education-affairs-section-iii/iii-h-program-review/>

RGP III.Z. Planning and Delivery of Postsecondary Programs and Courses

<https://boardofed.idaho.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/IIZ-Delivery-of-Post-Secondary-Education-0818.pdf>

RGP III.Z.b.vii. Discontinuance of Programs

<https://boardofed.idaho.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/IIZ-Delivery-of-Post-Secondary-Education-0818.pdf>

FSH 3080 Classification and Appointment of University Positions

<https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/3080.html>

FSH 3090 Temporary Hourly Employment

<https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/3090.html>

FSH 3370 Promotion or Reassignment of Exempt Employees

<https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/3370.html>

FSH 3520 Faculty Tenure

<https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/3520.html>

FSH 3730 Retirement Privileges and Programs

<https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/3730.html>

FSH 3840 Procedures for Faculty Appeals

<https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/3840.html>

FSH 3860 Grievance Procedures for Classified Employees

<https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/3860.html>

FSH 3890 Grievance Procedures for Exempt Employees

<https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/3890.html>

FSH 3900 Non-Reappointment at End of Contract of Non-Tenured Faculty and Exempt Staff

<https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/3900.html>

FSH 3930 Separation of Classified Employees

<https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/3930.html>

FSH 3950 Notice to Human Resources of Employee Separations

<https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/3950.html>

B. Short-Term Actions**RGP II.B. Appointment Authority and Procedures**

<https://boardofed.idaho.gov/board-policies-rules/board-policies/human-resources-policies-section-ii/appointment-authority-and-procedures-ii-b/>

FSH 3450 Presidential Actions to Manage Expenditures to Respond to Financial Challenges

<https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/3450.htm>

C. Actions Taken under Financial Exigency**RGP II.N. Staff Reduction Procedures. [AKA Financial Exigency]**

<https://boardofed.idaho.gov/board-policies-rules/board-policies/human-resources-policies-section-ii/staff-reduction-procedures-all-employees-ii-n/>

FSH 3970 Financial Exigency Policy and Staff Reduction Procedures

<https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/3970.html>