

November 25, 2013, CE 409, 1 -2:30 p.m.

Joint Meeting of Campus Planning and Budgetary Affairs Committee with Chancellor Bantz and EVC Paydar

Attendees:

Charles Bantz, Nasser Paydar, Amy Warner, Ed Berbari, Zeb Davenport,

BAC: Andrea Copeland, Debby Cullen, Camy Broecker, Dawn Rhodes, Andrew Winship, Joyce Mac Kinnon, Ann Holmes, Sherry Gass, Marianne Wokeck, Jacqueline Blackwell, Jere Odell, Jack Schaaf, Stephen Randall, Brian Krohn, Thomas Fisher, Chair

Campus Planning: Trudy Banta, William Weare, Gary Pike, Brian Woodahl, Cynthia Adams, Joan Kowolik, Miriam Murphy, Chair,

CB: Strategic Planning Process – Feedback welcome. Two contextual themes for the strategic plan: 1) Public perceptions about higher ed – now they think we are important to the future of the nation, President emphasizing college education. Our budget increased based on performance measures related to graduation rates. 2) The attention of our performance and cost beneficial analysis, tuition especially. Recession – Americans are deeply concerned about money. The cost of education has gone up relevant to minimum wage. Starting to implement – feedback on priorities important. We will have to figure out how to fund new allocations. For example, the 1.4 million we got from graduating Pell recipients – will go to need based scholarships.

Concerns about feedback from last year's budget hearings - two summary documents were provided to the BAC committee. Follow-up meetings will be held with schools that have fiduciary concerns -invited – new schools and schools in trouble financial and the school of medicine (most volatile budget on campus). Mentioned the concerned that members of BAC were not included in last year's budget hearings.

DR: Will the committees still submit questions to be answered by the deans?

Members: Educate the members about types of questions are appropriate. Questions should be faculty generated.

CB: Thirty days to submit questions? Coordinate meeting schedules

DR: Hearings begin January 29, 2014

NP: Appreciative of the input on the strategic plan that the committees provided.

Member: This meeting was called to raise concern about the lack of involvement of and communication with the faculty about campus budgeting. What is the best way to get faculty input into the process?

DR: Because we are an RCM – BAC agrees it is not appropriate to tell a Dean how to spend their money.

Members: Focus is more about communicating information about budgets. Two years ago, we were not part of the hearings – no need for us to be there, although we were there.

Member: Our questions about the budget were not addressed two years ago at the hearings – we were told not ask them.

DR: In RPC – we asked people what they were getting out of the meetings. Deans had 7 minutes to talk about their units – more of a commercial than an in depth conversation. I got more out of the meetings last year than any prior.

Member: What did you get out of the meetings?

DR: The deans felt freer to talk about specific issues without all these people sitting around.

Members: While, I understand that some topics are not for open forum. There needs to a better way to communicate with faculty – where the money is going – the recent campaign faculty gave considerably. Need transparency with the budget.

DR: We gave the copies to BAC.

Member: We have to think about how to better disseminate this info back to the faculty.

CB: Make sure we provide feedback to the faculty about their gifts. It is import to understand the flow of the budget in your own unit as that is where most decisions are made. Macro issues for the university and the campus – this venue here is good for these issues. A chart detailing where our money comes from would be helpful. Most of our budget comes from tuition – about one sixth of our budget comes from the state. Our biggest threat is tuition. We need to keep students in college to make money and it's the right thing to do. And research funding. Those of you who depend on indirect cost to recover salary expenses. The state money is not guaranteed but we appear to okay for now.

Member: The planning committee also wrote questions and their questions were not asked.

Member: Deans were asked to about marketing. Budgets aren't pretty. I tried to highlight consistencies in the reports – assessment, enrollment fluctuation, please don't cut our budgets. I think we need to have an open and honest discussions with the deans and not have them put on a show.

Member: When you don't acknowledge the input from faculty – we feel our contribution of meaningless

Member: People need to know where the various portions of each school's budgets comes from – what's from the state, what from giving, etc. – it's a good way to learn from one another. If we had these figures before the meeting our questions will be more relevant.

CB: It's in the data – we could do this in a graphic in order to make it more accessible. The fundamental difference in the budgets is who does not depend on tuition.

DR: Need to share budgetary documents with faculty council. You made mention of several schools asking for money, but that's not how a RCM works.

CB: We are engaged in some of the commitments we made in signature centers – they were only supposed to be start-ups no expectation of continued funding. They were not successful in generating donations. The amount of discretionary funds is quite small – I can reallocate 1% of the funds received from the statue (amount only – the funds come from tuition). One year we needed police. The other chunks-- big things like philanthropy and school of public health. We have a trust – that I put 1 million in for matching funds.

Member: People don't know this. It would be helpful to include this information in the budget reports.

CB: We will also have to coordinate amongst ourselves. The biggest complaint that I have – I can't call up the Lily endowment and ask for money –they want one office to call them for all of IU. Except for religion – the head of religion can call. Occasionally, the endowment calls us, for example the 40+million was not initiated by the Philanthropy school. The McKinney donation was not solicited for the law school. We need to be more systematic about seeking endowments. Marilyn Glick is passionate about sight and hence her donation. Listen to people who surround you – especially people who don't usually have a voice. The Cox scholars donor– he called us.

Member: Most people don't know what the rules are and they feel like they aren't getting any support from the Foundation. The school needs help in figuring out how to go about it properly.

CB: have a meeting to strategize communicating how to better provide access to this type of information.

PN: It seems like we have three goals in the hearings 1)current condition of each school 2)what are their future plans –what are the potential opportunities we are going to take advantage of 3)faculty governance wants to know – motivating faculty to become leaders – it's the right of the faculty to know – to consult not make decisions. We can come up with a template – to interpret the budgets of the schools so that it would be easy to compare. We could also give them the heavy duty excel sheet. We already have put together 9 questions from McRobbie – for example, how do you couple academic and career advising. We could ask each group to come up with 4 questions. If we ask deans 25 questions – we might just get minimal answers. We could build the education part into the picture.

DR: when we get things prepared – who do you give it to so that we know it gets to the people it needs to?

Member: Send them to Karen Lee.

Member: There are some enrollment shaping fund initiatives coming from the schools – the schools had to match funds in order to use them. It was paying twice. What is the fairest way of increasing discretionary funds?

Member: The chancellor's reallocation fund was being added to the base – the schools pushed back – because it was increasing.

Member: Nothing from an allocation fund should be added the base. Move around administrations funds.

CB: most of the reallocations go back to the schools. For example, supporting new PHD programs for a start up period. The reallocation fund is a percentage of tuition – it used to grow rapidly – now that it is only 2% - and now people are not happy about it. Trying to find the right model will take more discussions. This job lacks the financial resources – need more investment capital.

Member: Assessment – what about the presidential tax – what percent comes back?

Member: Is it the expectation of this group that Planning and BAC will participate in the hearings?

DR: When Jan spoke about the model that would be beneficial – we might have to group the deans.

CB: We have tried several models over the years. Now we are talking about a hybrid. Do we schedule with one dean or more than one dean. Should we put people together so that they could collaborate and reduce costs? Do you think the value of having some of your deans is valuable enough to hear less from them?

Member: Keep it to one dean at a time.

Member: Leave it open to the deans if they want to attend and hear what other deans are doing.

Member: Recommends having them in pairs.

Member: I liked PN's idea of 4 questions from each committee. Would be helpful to know the nine questions are you are already asking.

NP: If we want to be more educative – then pairing would not be good. I'm not sure it's a good idea to put two people in the same room. The deans have significant time together. Questions have to be tied to planning.

Member: One representative from each committee to meet with the deans. The one member could then report back to their committee.

CB: In the interest of transparency, better to have more committee members than less. There have been times when we've not received timely feedback. It was not helpful. Instead of compiling for one report – provide feedback after the meetings all along. They need to know they are missing out on an opportunity or if they headed for trouble. We have a long term nursing crisis but a short term crisis because people are being laid off right now. How do we get the school through this?

Member: We have mainly provided summaries – how do you think that feedback should look?

CB: let us give it some thought. It's going to be a tricky 5 to 10 years –medical changes are going to affect all of us.

Member: Propose to BAC members – 1) identify dates 2) receive questions already on the table 3) create our 4 questions 5) and then you will get back to us on how we should provide feedback.

Member: 1) Primer on the foundation and 2) one on budgets in higher education. If we were more educated about the rules we could identify opportunities more easily. 3) Take healthy look at the timeline for decision making.

Member: Timeline should include orientation for new deans which turn around every six years.

DR: POC – when the schools make their budget decisions.

Member: There are lots of decisions making at various levels – it would be helpful to have all this in a decision making map.

DR: That is part of what the Resources Planning committee is for. One school's timetable will change from one school to the next. Therefore you should get involved in your unit's budget decision timeline.

Member: I suspect that not every school is passing down all the information.

C Brocker - The new deans and new chairs have that information.

CB: over-communicate and encourage sharing downwards. Space is a big issue for universities. Buildings used to be free as the state paid for them. The funds we've received from the state has varied on new structures – most unfunded. We have not received any money for building operations from the state for 8 years. I would look at additional costs that appear to be additional costs – space is a good example. I'm not convinced that everyone understands the many ways you pay for space.

Meeting adjourned 2:33