

## Academic Senate Advisory Budget Committee Report

2016-17

Members: Andrea Rorrer, Howard Horwitz, Steve Bartlett

Excused: Bob Allen, Chris Maloney, Joan Marcotte Gregory, Prescott Muir

Chair: Gage Williams

The Academic Senate Advisory Budget Committee (ASABC) met five times this academic year. The minutes from those meetings are included with this report. At our December 16th meeting, Senior VP for Academic Affairs Ruth Watkins and Associate Vice President of Budget & Planning Cathy Anderson met with the committee. Overall, ASABC meetings this academic year focused on defining the charge and goals of this committee, understanding the ongoing changeover from the soft funding SCH model to the new Incentive Funding Model (IFM) model, and this report.

Overall, the committee agrees that the ASABC is an important committee and should continue. We did learn that there is a second budget committee, the Budget Planning Committee (BPC), that works directly with VP's Watkins and Anderson throughout the year. It was agreed in the meeting with VP's Watkins and Anderson that a member of this committee could join the BPC. ASABC member Andrea Rorrer has agreed to join the committee and her name has been forwarded to Ruth Watkins. The ASABC believes that communication between the two committees is a missing link and can allow for the ASABC year-end report to have more content and knowledge of the University's overall budget processes and challenges. Currently, the membership of the ASABC is motivated to have more specific knowledge of the budget decision process and what and how this committee can be reporting to the academic senate on the universities overall budget process.

It is clear to the ASABC that the university is extremely proactive in structuring the university budget to efficiently support the four strategic goals to serve the mission of the university. Those four goals are: promote student success to transform lives, develop and transfer new knowledge, engage communities in improving health and quality of life, and ensure the long-term viability of the university. At our meeting with VP's Watkins and Anderson, they shared with the ASABC how the university appealed to the State Senate to increase funding this year for employee performance-based compensation, student growth and market demand, performance funding, and a request to increase Regent Scholarships. Next year, when a member of the ASABC joins

the BPC, this committee might be able to provide a more in-depth report on how the university is prioritizing budget request, establishing amounts of increases in those areas, and how other budget initiative ideas might be considered to support the University's strategic goals.

An important topic discussed this year by the ASABC membership was the recently implemented IFM. Two of the ASABC committee members attended the fall leadership lunch where VP's Watkins and Anderson gave details about the new incentive funding model. The committee agrees with VP's Watkins and Anderson that funding strategy is only one year into its implementation and it's too soon to truly know its positives and negatives. One or two more years should be completed and then possibly this committee could conduct a review and prepare a report on the overall impact of the new incentive model. It is clear that this model now shifts the distribution of soft funding to the Dean of each college. Previously, chairs could count on funding amounts that were arrived at through total SCH. The new model still considers SCH but also includes total number of majors and now total graduates. Deans are awarded funding, and then have the exclusive responsibility on how they wish to distribute. The ASABC has spoken with a small sample of Deans, and from that informal survey, it appears that each Dean has their own method and system for how much of their college's IFM award is distributed to individual departments and schools. Unofficially, it is understood that Dean's will not allow amounts of IFM awards to departments and schools be so low that it will harm the unit. Unfortunately, for many chairs and directors, it's not clear how the department can increase their allotment of funding. The new formula does not include graduate students, and unofficially it is assumed that this funding will not go towards adjunct salaries. The adjunct salary issue is a bit confusing because many departments and schools rely on this funding for adjunct salaries. For now, it is clear that Chairs and Directors need to address these questions directly with their deans for clarification. The ASABC believes more clarification and transparency is needed about how Deans will decide how to distribute funding.

Overall, the ASABC committee membership agrees that this committee has an opportunity to provide the faculty senate with valuable and informative information concerning the budget.

The ASABC has agreed upon the following seven bulleted action items for the committee to address next year. These action items were vetted at the last ASABC meeting on March 31st. This list contains items that next year's committee can continue to vet and then decide on the best course of action to see them realized or advanced:

- The committee recommends that the ASABC work on ways to advance university transparency on how funding needs are decided and funding is distributed. Specifically, funding sources other than the IFM.

- The committee recommends that the ASABC work on ways to advance the creation of a document that specifies the ways in which Deans distribute their IFM funding to the academic units in their college.
  - The committee recommends that the ASABC work on ways to advance that each year the Deans provide an accounting of the amounts and recipients of their college's IFM funding.
  - The committee recommends that the ASABC work on ways to advance a study on how programs with large graduate programs function with the loss of SCH funding.
  - The committee recommends that the ASABC work on ways to advance further discussion with Deans on how to fund adjunct part-time faculty without using IFM funding. What is the impact of the IFM on faculty and staff that are .49 FTE or below?
  - The committee recommends that the ASABC work on ways to further advance discussion on what the financial impact is for the IFM model so far in smaller departments.
- 

The Academic Senate Advisory Budget Committee (ASABC) met five times this academic year. The minutes from those meetings are included with this report. At our December 16th meeting Senior VP for Academic Affairs Ruth Watkins and Associate Vice President of Budget & Planning Cathy Anderson met with the committee. Overall ASABC meetings this academic year focused on defining the charge and goals of this committee, understanding the ongoing changeover from the soft funding SCH model to the new Incentive Funding Model (IFM) model, and this report.

Overall the committee agrees that the ASABC is an important committee and should continue. We did learn that there is a second budget committee the Budget Planning Committee (BPC) that works directly with VP's Watkins and Anderson throughout the year. It was agreed in the meeting with Ruth and Kathy that a member of this committee could join the BPC. ASABC member ??????? has agreed to join the committee and her name has been forwarded to Ruth. The ASABC believes that communication between the two committees is a missing link and can allow for the ASABC year-end report to have more content and knowledge of the universities overall budget process and challenges. Currently, the ASABC is motivated to learn have specific knowledge of the budget decision process and what and how this committee can be reporting to the academic senate on the universities overall budget process.

It is clear to the ASABC that the university is extremely proactive in structuring the university budget to efficiently support the four strategic goals to serve the mission of the university. Those four goals are; promote student success to transform lives, develop and transfer new knowledge, engage communities in improving health and quality of life, and ensure the long-term viability of the university. At our meeting with Ruth and Cathy, they shared with ASABC how they appealed to the State Senate to increase funding this year for employee performance based compensation, student growth and market demand, performance funding, and a request to increase Regent

Scholarships. Next year when a member of the ASABC joins the BPC, this committee might be able to provide a more in-depth report on how the university is prioritising budget request, establishing amounts of increases in those areas, and how other budget ideas that could support the universities strategic goals.

An important topic discussed this year by the ASABC was the IFM. Two of the ASABC committee attended the fall leadership lunch where Ruth and Cathy gave details about the new incentive funding model. The committee agrees with Ruth and Cathy that this change is only one year into its implementation and it's too soon to truly know its positives and negatives. One or two more years should be completed and then possibly this committee could conduct a review and prepare a report on the overall impact on the new incentive model. It is clear that this model now shifts the distribution of soft funding to the Dean of each college. Previously chairs could count on funding amounts that were arrived at through total SCH. The new model still considers SCH but also includes total majors and how graduates. Deans are awarded funding and then have the exclusive responsibility on how they wish to distribute. The ASABC has spoken with a small sample of Deans, and from that informal survey, it appears that each Dean has their method and system for how much of their college's IFM award is distributed to individual departments and schools. Unofficially it is understood that Dean's will not allow amounts of IFM awards to departments and schools be so low that it will harm the units. Unfortunately for many chairs and directors, it's not clear how the department can increase their allotment of funding. The new formula does not include graduate students, and unofficially it is assumed that this funding will not go towards adjunct salaries. The adjunct salary issue is a bit confusing because many departments and schools rely on this funding for adjunct salaries. For now, it is clear that Chairs and Directors need to address these questions directly with their deans for clarification. The ASABC believes more clarification and transparency is needed on how Deans will decide how to distribute funding.

The ASABC has agreed upon the following bulleted action items for the committee to address next year. These action items were vetted at the last ASABC meeting on March 31st. The list is items that next years committee can continue to vet and then decide on the best course of action to see them realised or advanced?

- The committee recommends that the ASABC work on ways to advance university transparency on how funding needs are decided and distributed. Specifically funding sources other than the IFM.
- The committee recommends that the ASABC work on ways to advance the creation of a document that specifies the ways in which Deans distribute their IFM funding to the academic units in their college.

- The committee recommends that the ASABC work on ways to advance that each year Deans provide an accounting of the amounts and recipients of the college's IFM funding.
- The committee recommends that the ASABC work on ways to advance a study on how programs with large graduate programs function with the loss of SCH funding.
- The committee recommends that the ASABC work on ways to advance further discussion with Deans on how to fund adjunct part-time faculty without using IFM funding. What is the impact of the IFM on faculty and staff that are .49 FTE or below?
- The committee recommends that the ASABC work on ways to advance the further discussion on what The Academic Senate Advisory Budget Committee (ASABC) met five times this academic year. The minutes from those meetings are included with this report. At our December 16th meeting Senior VP for Academic Affairs Ruth Watkins and Associate Vice President of Budget & Planning Cathy Anderson met with the committee. Overall ASABC meetings this academic year focused on defining the charge and goals of this committee, understanding the ongoing changeover from the soft funding SCH model to the new Incentive Funding Model (IFM) model, and this report.

Overall the committee agrees that the ASABC is an important committee and should continue. We did learn that there is a second budget committee the Budget Planning Committee (BPC) that works directly with VP's Watkins and Anderson throughout the year. It was agreed in the meeting with Ruth and Kathy that a member of this committee could join the BPC. ASABC member ??????? has agreed to join the committee and her name has been forwarded to Ruth. The ASABC believes that communication between the two committees is a missing link and can allow for the ASABC year-end report to have more content and knowledge of the universities overall budget process and challenges. Currently, the ASABC is motivated to learn have specific knowledge of the budget decision process and what and how this committee can be reporting to the academic senate on the universities overall budget process.

It is clear to the ASABC that the university is extremely proactive in structuring the university budget to efficiently support the four strategic goals to serve the mission of the university. Those four goals are; promote student success to transform lives, develop and transfer new knowledge, engage communities in improving health and quality of life, and ensure the long-term viability of the university. At our meeting with Ruth and Cathy, they shared with ASABC how they appealed to the State Senate to increase funding this year for employee performance based compensation, student growth and market demand, performance funding, and a request to increase Regent Scholarships. Next year when a member of the ASABC joins the BPC, this committee might be able to provide a more in-depth report on how the university is prioritising budget request, establishing amounts of increases in those areas, and how other budget ideas that could support the universities strategic goals.

An important topic discussed this year by the ASABC was the IFM. Two of the ASABC committee attended the fall leadership lunch where Ruth and Cathy gave details about the new incentive funding model. The committee agrees with Ruth and Cathy that this change is only one year into its implementation and it's too soon to truly know its positives and negatives. One or two more years should be completed and then possibly this committee could conduct a review and prepare a report on the overall impact on the new incentive model. It is clear that this model now shifts the distribution of soft funding to the Dean of each college. Previously chairs could count on funding amounts that were arrived at through total SCH. The new model still considers SCH but also includes total majors and how graduates. Deans are awarded funding and then have the exclusive responsibility on how they wish to distribute. The ASABC has spoken with a small sample of Deans, and from that informal survey, it appears that each Dean has their method and system for how much of their college's IFM award is distributed to individual departments and schools. Unofficially it is understood that Dean's will not allow amounts of IFM awards to departments and schools be so low that it will harm the units. Unfortunately for many chairs and directors, it's not clear how the department can increase their allotment of funding. The new formula does not include graduate students, and unofficially it is assumed that this funding will not go towards adjunct salaries. The adjunct salary issue is a bit confusing because many departments and schools rely on this funding for adjunct salaries. For now, it is clear that Chairs and Directors need to address these questions directly with their deans for clarification. The ASABC believes more clarification and transparency is needed on how Deans will decide how to distribute funding.

The ASABC has agreed upon the following seven bulleted action items for the committee to address next year. These action items were vetted at the last ASABC meeting on March 31st. The list is items that next years committee can continue to vet and then decide on the best course of action to see them realised or advanced?

- The committee recommends that the ASABC work on ways to advance university transparency on how funding needs are decided and distributed. Specifically funding sources other than the IFM.
- The committee recommends that the ASABC work on ways to advance the creation of a document that specifies the ways in which Deans distribute their IFM funding to the academic units in their college.
- The committee recommends that the ASABC work on ways to advance that each year Deans provide an accounting of the amounts and recipients of the college's IFM funding.
- The committee recommends that the ASABC work on ways to advance a study on how programs with large graduate programs function with the loss of SCH funding.
- The committee recommends that the ASABC work on ways to advance further discussion with Deans on how to fund adjunct part-time faculty without using IFM funding. What is the impact of the IFM on faculty and staff that are .49 FTE or below?

- The committee recommends that the ASABC work on ways to advance the further discussion on what is the financial impact of the IFM model so far in smaller departments?
- The committee recommends that the ASABC work on ways to advance the further discussion between Deans and chairs/directors on how IFM funding is distributed with each college.