**Faculty Senate Budget Committee**

Minutes of the February 22th, 2017 Meeting, Gilham Park Room, Administrative Center

**Members Present:** Mark L. Johnson (Chair), Roger Pick,Eduardo Abreu, Paul Cuddy, Leigh Salzsieder, Tony Luppino, Tamera Murdock, Sully Read, Steve Stoner, Ronald Tice, Gerald Wyckoff (Chair, Faculty Senate), Provost Barbara Bichelmeyer.

**rpk GROUP members** attending by phone: Richard Staisloff, Lisa Clarke, Alisa Cunningham and Dawn O’Brien

**Members Excused:** Buddy Pennington, Deep Medhi, Chris Rice

Dr. Johnson called the meeting to order at 3:04 PM.

**Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes:** Dr. Johnson asked if there were any corrections/additions to the minutes of the January 24th, 2017 meeting. Dr. Luppino noted a typo on the spelling of his name in the previous meeting minutes, which was corrected. Ron tice moved to approve and Tony Luppino seconded. The minutes were unanimously approved as amended.

**rpk GROUP presentation:**  Mark Johnson introduced the members of the rpk GROUP who were attending the meeting by conference call. He then asked Richard Staisloff to begin the discussion.

**I. Status of Data Collection:** Richard Staisloff stated that in about 2 weeks (target date is April 6th) their team will be on campus to present the non-financial variables that have been collected. The financial variables should be completed by the first part of May. Several questions were noted and discussed:

1) How are problems being documented so that going forward it will be easier to extract data in the future? Response: An extensive record of problems and fixes is being logged.

2) How will data be parsed (parceled) from the anchor course to promote interdisciplinarity in future data collections? Response: this is being captured through the two approaches being used to view the data (see below).

3) How is research being captured? Response: The Provost noted that we are looking at expenditures, etc., as part of the data collection and research is part of this. Also how research figures into the cost of instruction is being analyzed. Rick Staisloff also noted that the analysis focuses on core operating revenue and expense. Research activity indirectly impacts the efficiency analysis, in that the level of research will presumably affect faculty throughput (SCH per FTE faculty member). The Provost noted that a deeper dive into research could occur as part of future phases of the analysis.

**II. Approaches to Student Credit Hours:** There are two views being taken of the data.

1) Transcript perspective: This will address the question of how do we define what a program is? This takes into account all of the activity that a student is credited to a program as declared by the student. For example, for a declared biology student that takes an English course, the activity, revenue and expense associated with that English course would be credited to Biology.

2) Course perspective (Unit/department delivery approach): this view will split student activity out by SCH offered by each department, as well as the revenue and expense associated with that SCH activity.

**III. Questions and next steps:**

Several questions came up during the ensuing discussions.

How is revenue distributed?

How is scholarship/tuition remission factored into the analysis?

There is a system in place to track non-funded tuition remission/fee waivers already being used, but not at the level of the current analysis, so this will need to be integrated into the analysis.

What %’s have been encountered in revenue sharing between units? The data should inform the actual split rather than a “feeling” or “we can live with that” approach.

Do you use standard or actual costs and how do you add overhead? Data should be based on actual cost from who is teaching the course (TA’s versus faculty being one issue that was noted).

How are expenses calculated in scholarships?

**Responses:** There was extensive discussion. Some of the key points are that we will use actual expenditure data and will reconcile to the audited financials. Overhead will be allocated initially based on SCH activity. It was pointed out that currently we use a metric to calculate overhead in the University’s resource allocation model.

Next Steps: First we want to obtain the Full Data Set, currently we are close to having the non-financial data and are capturing the financials as noted previously. April 6th is the target date for the rpk GROUP to be at UMKC to meet with various groups to unveil the non-financial data findings. This is the first phase of the Academic Portfolio Review.

The Provost emphasized that is **not** about winners and losers, but how we empower units to be the best they can be.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:31 PM.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark L. Johnson, Ph.D.

Chair, FSBC