Faculty Senate Budget Committee

25 March 2024

1.) In attendance:
   a. Ray Lauk
   b. Mercy Cannon
   c. Matthew Howell
   d. Lisa Kay
   e. Sarah Feltus
   f. Vonia Grabeel
   g. Thomas Couvillon
   h. Sara Zeigler
2.) Call to Order
3.) Conversation with the Provost (Part I)
   a. Faculty Hiring Process
      i. Hiring Process used to be rolling -it is now done in two tranches.
         1. This prevents late opening positions from going unfilled because it was too late in the budget year
         2. Also allows reallocation of lines
      ii. Two calls: Summer and Spring
         1. Data is pulled from Institutional Databases
         2. Narratives are built from the data
      iii. Deans access all narratives and data via Google Drive
      iv. Position Requests are compiled in a single pool of money, and allocated by money
         1. So, business retirements mean more faculty in other departments, business hiring means fewer lines everywhere else.
      v. Deans rank candidates and then present their rankings to the other deans.
      vi. Current discussion heavily focuses on student needs and which faculty deal with those needs most heavily
      vii. Deans cut the list down to the size of the pool, then Provost presents list to President.
   b. Additional Comments from Mercy
      i. Criteria often focus on which lines to cut rather than which to maintain. Easier to describe the least important lines than the most important.
      ii. Still took 4 meetings.
   c. Additional Discussion
      i. The data needs are posted on the Academic Affairs website.
         1. Among other things -number of majors, service provision, et cetera
         2. Approvals are for 2 years
   d. Handful of auto-approvals
      i. Non-reappoointment/Denial of Tenure – automatic replacement
      ii. Internal Administrative Hire – automatic replacement
4.) Conversation with the Provost (Part II)

a. In order to conserve expenditure, money approvals are moving up to the VP (Provost) level. Half the money is at VP discretion, the rest is Presidential approval on VP recommendation
   i. There was confusion as to exactly how this worked, but the Deans have sorted it out.
   ii. Money has been redistributed back to the Dean Org Codes (so departments should have money as determined by the Deans)
b. First big chunk of approvals: online marketing, going to approvals with the President.
   i. Budget changes due to end of previous relationship with Pearson.
c. Requests are being reviewed as they come in.
d. Class Fees are separate from the budget rollup.
e. Next year:
   i. There will be less money being pulled from Foundations for scholarships, et cetera. Of the 4 million in spendable scholarships we expected to spend, we actually pulled about $600K.
   ii. Expected expenditures are based on COVID year data, so that needs to be redone.
   iii. We are doing quasi-zero based budget. We are not doing real ZBB. Instead, we're going to a faint tabula rasa process. Not quite a clean sweep, but let's reallocate funds to reflect the current world, not the COVID or Pre-COVID world.
   iv. Deans are working with departments to allocate for the next Budget Build.
   v. We will also be holding back money until we hit revenue targets, and also to fund staff advisors who can handle the growing non-academic advising (housing, mental health, et cetera).
      1. So we will be building the budget on the assumption that there will be less money next year. Mercy calls it a "sequester in reverse." We should know how much less next week.
      2. Also, we can't call it "contingency" because that would trigger the financial health metrics
f. Revenue Estimates
   i. It isn't as nuanced as we'd like -it's based on a best guess of tuition and attendance, but without a good feel for what the funding et cetera will be for the new students.
   ii. We're also looking at several new populations -8k by 28, a prison outreach.
   iii. We are looking at our pool of students and are aware that the population of students we are bringing in is out of balance with our scholarship and student support resources. We're attempting to see where we can find more students within that pool to better balance our expenditure/revenue mismatch.
g. Scholarship Model
   i. Our scholarship model went 6 million over budget.
   ii. Our merit model is old, and needs to be refined.
   iii. On the Foundation side, we're trying to get MOAs to be less stringent
   iv. We're hoping to pull 3-4 million per year (which is what we historically spent the foundation funds on). The goal is that this will be budgeted -not ad hoc.

5.) Conversation with the Provost (Part III)
   a. CFO hire timeline
      i. Posting language has been approved
      ii. We hope to have a replacement by June 30
      iii. If we can't find one we like, there is a network of CFOs we can hire for short terms
6.) Conversations with the Provost (Part IV)
   a. Procard Issues
      i. Procards are a method -is there real overspending?
      ii. There is *some* overspending, but in Academic Affairs its been small amounts here and there.
      iii. Major areas of overspending are places like the scholarship fund
   b. Athletics will not be over budget this year