

Appendix B Five-Year Annual Review Budgets and Fiscal Planning Committee

Interviewed Steve Hoelscher, Auxiliary & Activity Business Center, and Carol Babcock, University Administrative Business Center
Reviewed by Louie Bottaro, Member, Committee on Committees

The co-chairs believed the standing rules do not refer to (implicitly or explicitly) reviewing Category I proposals, and that consumes 95% of their time. The broad and appealing BFPC standing rules are perceived as a bait and switch to get members to join, and then members find out reviewing Cat I proposals is the only real task. Student participation in the committee does not reflect what is proposed in the bylaws. This year no members served as liaison on the Curriculum Council.

For this past year, most agendas, minutes, and annual reports dealt with Cat I reviews, but Cat I reviews are not in the standing rules. The co-chairs believe that past annual reports provide a correct and accurate reflection of what has transpired.

Retention of student committee members has been difficult in the past three years. Student committee members tend to be less tolerant of the bait and switch issue noted in above and they quickly burn out from the workload.

The Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee adds value to the university and faculty governance as a check and balance gatekeeper for the institution. The standing rules of our BFPC have a strong link/connection to Oregon State's strategic plan. The work the committee performs (Cat I reviews not mentioned in the standing rules), have a marginal connection to the strategic plan. Like many Faculty Senate committees, additional professorial rank would enhance the committee. With a more diverse group of perspectives to draw from, the committee would have a greater reflection of the university.

The standing rules of the Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee have a strong link/connection to Oregon State University's strategic plan. According to the co-chairs, the actual work has a marginal connection to the strategic plan. In theory, the Cat I reviews help give faculty a voice on all the proposals (both related and unrelated to OSU's ongoing reorganization). If there was sufficient time to do Cat I reviews and the items in the standing rules, then the value to the university and to faculty governance would be much greater.

Financial/budgetary reviews generally do not bear directly on OSU's commitment to diversity, but the committee indirectly enhances (and sometimes directly enhances) OSU's commitment to diversity. It is the co-chairs belief that it is absolutely critical that the proposals come through in a state of completion. Spending countless hours reviewing Cat I proposals is not what the committee members believed was the primary purpose of this committee and this function isn't incorporated into the standing rules. There is a disconnect here, and quite a bit of disillusionment for the committee members.