

Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee

April 23, 2019

Minutes

Voting members present: Gloria Crisp, Dave Feeney, Drew Ibarra, Denise Lach, David Pham, Corina Rampola, John Talbott (remote)

Voting members absent: No absences

Organic Farming Systems #105032 – New Certificate Program

- [Web Proposal](#)
 - Budget looks sound and there is a high potential of student interest. It is a unique program in the state. The department may be underestimating the amount of students they will get. Will they need additional faculty if there are more students?
 - The industry has a high need for programs like this.
 - Based on their current numbers and figures, the math looks correct.
 - Drew Ibarra moves to approve; seconded. No abstentions. Motion carries.

Biological Data Sciences #106498 – New Degree Program

- [Web Proposal](#)
 - Update: Responses sent to questions (refer to email)
 - Salary and OPE rates were based on actuals for three tenured track faculty members. Looking for two more with OPE rates estimated to be 87,000 and 51% based on standards for similar positions.
 - Is this pay based on term or year? Looking further into the budget, it appears to be by term.
 - There are still some concerns that the salary is not sufficient for tenured track employees.
 - What is the .15 based on? Based on math by the BFP, there is still concern that the salary is not enough. How much of their Position Description is devoted to teaching? Is the FTE based on this teaching percentage?
 - The committee is concerned that the department has underestimated the pay of instructors, based on the figures provided.
 - The budget has been signed off by the business center.
 - The graduate student fee remissions rates are based on current rates (\$4,769) and escalated by 4% each year.
 - Two of the courses will not be taught in the first couple of years. BDS 311 is being offered in second year and requires one Teaching Assistant (TA) and by year three, there will be two TAs.
 - Is it represented by term or by year? If by, per term, that's fine, but they should double it to determine the yearly salary. The layout is somewhat confusing.
 - Other Personnel Expense (OPE) rates are based on actuals and industry standards for similar positions.
 - The committee suggests that the OPE be lined out categorically and that the starting salary should be included in the proposal.
 - Is the \$87,000 the standard for everyone? Does it account for pay differences?
 - Resources covered by existing funds.
 - Drew will send a message to the business center for clarification on some items and make notes in the Curriculum Proposal System (CPS) about the follow-up.

Budget Committee – Discussion of Purpose, Expand Scope of Discussion Beyond Proposals

- Does the Committee feel the need to review a proposal at all?
- Should the Committee focus more on contributions to larger budget discussions that support the University?
 - Currently, the committee feels like all it does is review the curriculum proposals. The Standing Rules allows for greater scope and responsibilities, but how far does the authority of the committee go?
 - Should the committee reach out to deans and department heads to see how they are dealing with changes in the budget model?
 - Does the committee have a voice in University budget discussions?

- The Chair of the committee is an observer, but can only attend so many meetings due to time conflicts.
- Does the University budget committee allow for proxies? Vickie Nunnemaker will ask Sherm Bloomer.
- Why are there two budget committees?
 - State law requires one that is set up by HECC and it has certain rules in place. This committee makes recommendations to the board on the University's overall budget.
 - The Budgets and Fiscal Planning Committee (BFP) of the Faculty Senate focuses more on individual budgets for programs but is empowered to consult with administrative officers and make recommendations during the preparation of the University's overall budget.
 - The BFP has not had much, if any, input on the new University budget model and the Faculty Senate has not had any input on it, either.
- Historically, what has the committee done?
 - Curricular proposals and talked about how they have not been able to have more influence in budget discussions.
 - Past committee members have not been willing to make changes to the Standing Rules to either allow for the authority to do so, have a broader scope of responsibilities, or to even just simplify the rules to focus on Curricular proposals.
- How does the committee change the Standing Rules?
 - Suggestions for revisions go the Committee on Committees, then the Executive Committee and then to the Faculty Senate for a vote.
- The BFP would like a closer relationship with the Faculty Senate. They would like to work the Executive Committee to occasionally come and deliver reports or have discussions.
- Is there a way to save some time on the review process
 - Academic Programs used to review the proposals and have in-person discussions with the originators before the proposals went out to the committees. A lot of problems were caught at this point and resolved before they went further.
 - Academic Programs no longer has the time to do these meetings.
- Can the committee invite proposers to the meetings to get questions answered there, rather than emailing and waiting for a response?
 - The committee is welcome to invite anyone they like to the meetings.
 - The committee will work out a schedule where they determine, first, if a meeting will be needed and then invite the proposer to the next session.

Future Business

- Discussion topics on BFP's future as a committee – Standing Rules revisions, process changes, and what can the committee add to budget discussions?
- Invite Mina Carson, Faculty Senate President, to discuss what she feels the BFP should work on?
- Discuss how much of a voice the faculty have in University budget discussions and decisions.