

## Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee

October 2, 2019

Minutes

*Voting members present:* Amy Bourne, Frank Chaplen, Gloria Crisp, Jessica DuPont, Drew Ibarra, Corina Rampola

*Voting members absent:* No voting members absent

*Ex-Officio members present:* Sherm Bloomer – Associate Vice President of Budget & Resource Planning

### Welcome and Introductions

#### Review of the 2018-2019 [Annual Report](#)

- How should the committee implement the new budget model and does the committee need to have a discussion on how effective the current budget forms are?
- Drew is a member of the University Budget Committee (UBC). He will attend the meetings and bring back information for the committee and will also take questions the committee has to the UBC.
- Recommendations by committee members:
  - The committee needs to establish better communication with the UBC.
  - Can the chair send a representative to the UBC if he is not able to attend?
    - Sherm confirmed that he may send a proxy.
  - Student members – how does the committee get more students involved?

### Discussion

- Purpose of the committee and review procedures
  - The committee typically reviews departmental use of resources (primarily through Category I proposals).
  - The committee would like to have more input on the University Budget as a whole and is making plans to work more closely with the UBC.
    - Tuition setting and policy
    - Building the next annual Budget
  - The committee would like to fill the student positions.
  - Would like to do more work with the larger University Budget/working with the UBC more and having more of an influence on budget discussions
    - Engagement with the UBC – tuition setting and policy
    - Building next annual budget – the committee could engage more with this process
  - The chair provided a copy of the Category I review [checklist](#).
    - Includes criteria that the committee looks for during review.
  - The chair provided a copy of the Budget [form](#).
    - The committee uses this form to determine if it the proposed budget is accurate and that it has been signed off by the business center, the submitter and the department chair/unit head.
      - The business center needs to be clear that their signature means that the projections are accurate and that they have looked over the form and agree that it is an accurate assessment.
      - Reviewers should confirm that the budget narrative matches what's put on the form.
      - Library costs needs to be assessed.
      - Projected enrollment – is it considered a resource that the committee has the purview to accept or deny based on that information?
        - The committee is happy to make the recommendation but feels they do not have the experience or knowledge to reject a proposal based off the enrollment projections.
- Standing Rules:

The Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee assists the Faculty Senate in development of recommendations to the President regarding the University's budget and fiscal priorities. The Committee reviews the adequacy of resources allocated to existing programs and the fiscal implications of proposed changes in

programs, enrollment, and budgetary priorities and procedures. The Committee consults with administrative officers of the University and is empowered to make recommendations to them during the preparation of the Institution's budget.

The Committee consists of six Faculty and up to two Student members, with preference given to having one graduate student and one undergraduate student, and the Associate Vice President of Budget and Resource Planning, ex-officio, non-voting.

The Chair of the Budgets & Fiscal Planning Committee shall serve as a voting member on the University Budget Committee.

### **Review**

- Engineering Science, BS #102102 – New Degree Program
  - [Web](#)
    - The budget narrative is under year 2 in the proposal.
      - The number for Cascades seems rather low – does it match the need of the student body?
        - It was confirmed that Cascades has a different budget model than the Corvallis campus.
    - It seems to rely heavily on existing programs.
      - New equipment could be steep – does the department already have all the equipment they need in existing programs?
    - It's an on-campus course, but lists Ecampus tuition as a resource and makes a reference to differentials.
    - Numbers for student FTE feel off. The average credit load seems to be 60% of their headcount and could be affecting the numbers.
    - Student workers are listed under supplied and services.
      - The committee will recommend they move this to 'personnel'
    - Questions from the committee:
      - Does the supplies cost match the need? It seems on the low side.
      - Are there additional marketing outreach costs? What are they?
      - Would .33 support staff meet student needs?

### **Information**

- Please review the below proposal for the October 16 meeting.
  - Molecular and Cellular Biology – MS, PhD #107612 – Suspension of an Academic Program
    - [Web](#)