**Faculty Senate Budget Committee**

Minutes of the March 21st, 2018 Meeting, Gilham Park Room, Administrative Center

**Members Present:** Mark L. Johnson (Chair), Eduardo Abreu, Kelli Cox (ex officio), Paul Cuddy, Tony Luppino, Sharon Lindenbaum (ex officio), Erik Olsen, Buddy Pennington, Leigh Salzsieder, Sully Read, Chris Rice (for Melanie Simmer-Beck), Ronald Tice, Linda Mitchell (Chair, Faculty Senate), Gerald Wyckoff (Past-Chair, Faculty Senate), Jennifer Waddell

**Guests:** Kim McNeley and Amy Watson

**Members Excused:** Deep Medhi, Roger Pick, Steve Stoner, Provost Barbara Bichelmeyer (ex officio).

Dr. Johnson called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM.

1. **Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes:** Dr. Johnson asked if there were any corrections/additions to the minutes of the December 11th, 2017 meeting. None were made. Sully Read moved to accept as submitted, Leigh Salzsieder seconded. The minutes were unanimously approved.

The Agenda order was altered to accommodate Sharon who had another meeting to attend.

**2. Undergraduate persistence patterns**

Kim McNeley presented to the FSBC that a new Faculty Team was being formed to monitor and advise on undergraduate persistence patterns. The committee will meet on Mondays or Fridays at 8 am, twice a month. The CIVITAS software package would provide 3 basic tools:

* Monitoring of undergraduate student persistence.
* Identifying courses that enhance or diminish student persistence, which has budget implications as resources may need to be applied to boost courses that are strong performers, etc.
* Supplemental instruction tools that measure impact/effectiveness student persistence, again this could have budget implications.

Buddy asked what company provided the software. Kim replied CIVITAS Learning.

Sully asked about the cost of this software? Kim and Amy were not entirely certain. Linda stated the based on the exposure she had to the program it was worth every penny, Jerry indicated that the return on investment will be very high. Kim indicated that this had been vetted carefully and fully before the decision was made to purchase.

Buddy asked what databases this would be linked to? Kim replied it would be UMKC Pathway and our Blackboard Learning Management Systems primarily. The impact tool can include other data sources where there are student IDs.

Buddy then asked if this is something that the other campuses might be interested in using and sharing costs. Jerry indicated that as far as he knew, this was not currently planned and that as early adopters we are likely getting more bang for our buck in many respects.

Mark asked the committee members to let him know if they are interested in serving on this Faculty Team to represent the FSBC.

1. **Budget and RIM Issues**

Mark began by mentioning that Carol Hintz told him that she was going to meet with a couple of State Legislators who were interested in understanding the basis for our claims that our Faculty salaries are not in line with our competitor institutions. Mark then provided Carol with the salary analysis that Chris Rice had done with the help of Ali Korkmaz, which had been presented to the FSBC last year. Carol intended to take that analysis with her to this meeting.

Mark stated that this Thursday afternoon (March 27) there was a meeting called by Provost / Interim Chancellor Bichelmeyer with the Deans and Unit Fiscal Officers to begin the rollout of the RIM. Tony asked if anyone knew the purpose of this meeting; it seemed there was some perception that the Deans would be given their budget numbers. Mark indicated that he wasn’t certain this was the case, but that Sharon Lindenbaum would be attending in the FSBC meeting a little later and perhaps she would know more.

Tony next asked what (if any) feedback had been received from all the discussions with Nikki Krawitz and various individuals and groups regarding the RIM? Leigh responded that he was just now reviewing a written response document summarizing the conversations and feedback that had been drafted in this regard, and this would be disseminated in the near future.

Jerry asked if we know what the budget numbers for FY19 will be. Linda indicated that she did not think so at this point in time; there is a lot of craziness right now with different legislation that is being considered and other things that contribute to a very unclear situation.

Jerry asked shouldn’t the RIM proposed allocation of money be presented and distributed to faculty before the Deans get their budget numbers, as this is a shared governance issue? Sully asked that given all of the discussions about possible reorganization of Units/Departments; will the RIM follow this reorganization? This needs to be stated upfront with the rollout of the RIM. Buddy asked if other responsibility centers would be getting a similar presentation to the ones the Deans are getting. Linda noted that the Faculty Senate will be asking for / getting a presentation at an upcoming meeting. Jerry expressed concern that none of us have a clue at this point how the numbers are going to be calculated and that there needs to be a back-and-forth process to allow the FSBC to review and fact check as necessary to ensure that opportunity for faculty input was provided.

Tony mentioned that previously there had been a UBC subcommittee that was formed to review the budget model and make recommendations for modifications, but this never really resulted in adjustments to the extent that were needed. This needs to happen as we go forward.

Leigh noted that one of the issues is how do we solve for a ~$20 million dollar deficit in the budgeting. To the question raised by Buddy, Leigh noted that the RIM is currently focused on the Academic Units, it is not clear when/how the Support Units will be brought under the RIM.

Tony reiterated his concerns that the off-the-top numbers are not clear and when do faculty get to have input on the budget process.

Kelli indicated that all Administrative Units were asked to make budget projections following the same exercise that the Deans used this year.

Erik agreed with Tony and wanted to make certain that the FSBC was represented in the process. He asked do we know what the final budget numbers were for the last fiscal year? Consensus was we do not yet know those numbers.

Tony stated that we should be given an accounting (variance analysis) of budgets as was done was las starting from 2009 that incorporates the last few years budgets as well.

Linda indicated that the IFC has been comparing notes and we are the only campus doing 10, 15 and 20% cut scenarios.

Sully asked if any final decision has been made with regard to the recommendations of the CIE Task Force on Athletics? Linda thought the final decision was being deferred until the new Chancellor assumed office. She also noted that the conversations amongst the student athletes she teaches is that the female athletes are very upset with the cuts to women’s sports that were not also shared equally by the men’s basketball program, for example. One thing that needs to be done is to assess the level of UMKC student support for Athletics (if there is none or little, then that should guide further decisions) and if potential changes in facility usage might generate financial savings.

Leigh noted that all of these talking points have been discussed by the RIM team, but not resolved.

Sharon Lindenbaum joined the meeting and several of the above questions where then discussed with her.

The meeting on Thursday is by no means a full or final reveal of the budget numbers. It is intended to be an introduction to the process. Tony suggested that this might come as a surprise to many of the Deans and she should send out an email as to the purpose of the meeting so as to reduce surprise and give the Deans a heads-up as to what the meeting is really intended to do.

Tony next asked if the current RIM is using projections or actual numbers for FY19. Sharon indicated that this simulation would be based on FY17-FY18 (partial) data to show how the RIM would divide up the SCH dollars.

Mark asked if it the intention to have follow-up meeting with FSBC, UBC and other constituencies. Sharon sated that yes, this was what was planned.

Tony stated that the FSBC would like to see the GRA split for the past several years (see comment above). Sharon: we can provide these numbers.

Buddy asked if the RIM was being fully applied to FY19. Sharon indicated the intention was to do a gradual rollout. Jerry asked if we know the projected budget for FY19?

Sully asked about the reorganization of the Units and how this will be accommodated? Sharon indicated that yes there may need to be alterations to the allocations under the RIM if/when programs are moved from one Unit to another. This is currently in the works; for example, they are still trying to figure out how to allocate SCH associated with Interdisciplinary courses. The UBC will be ultimately charged with reviewing what worked and didn’t work and making recommendations for modification of the RIM from one year to the next. Tony noted that with respect to the Interdisciplinary Courses he (prior budget model team) has previously provided 3 different ways to handle this. Sharon indicated that they have looked at these suggestions, the main issue is the logistics of how they capture this information in the financial system.

Tony stated that with a phase-in approach, it will be critical to make sure this actually happens, which was not entirely the case with the previous budget model.

Jerry stated that in dealing with the ~$20 million dollar deficit there needs to be real transparency to keep the faculty and Deans’ in the loop as they work through this process. Tony agreed and stated that the process needs to by carefully planned and executed. Jerry expressed his concerns (and those of many faculty) about how the deficit would be handled.

Buddy asked about non-Academic Units and how they fit into the current process. Sharon indicated that right now the focus is on the Academic Units, but eventually all responsibility centers will be captured under the RIM.

Sharon then gave a brief update on the Administrative Services Review. The rpk GROUP analysis is essentially completed and they made a number of recommendations. With regard to the spans and layers the decision has been made to let the organization “settle” a bit before moving forward with some of those recommendations and so this part of the analysis is being set aside for the time being. One area for savings relates to travel and a Travel Desk to coordinate all UMKC travel is being considered. Another area relates to Student Health Service were savings can be realized. Technology improvements is a third area that can have immediate impact. She noted that System hired PWC to do a study and so we will have to carefully align our findings with those of that study. We don’t want to make changes and then have to re-align if system makes different changes.

Tony asked with regard to shared services why it was necessary to have PWC do this for our campus when rpk GROUP had already done this? Jerry commented that the PWC study was initially focused on the MU campus in 4 areas and morphed into a more System-wide study. The UM System cost, especially for the recent Admin survey, was relatively low as faculty and administrative resources were used- not just PWC. Sharon indicated that in many areas PWC used data for UMKC we had already generated.

1. **Merit Raise discussion**

Mark indicated that he wanted some thoughts from the committee about the Merit Raise pool and how raises could best be distributed. Mark pointed out that a flat across the board 2% raise disproportionately favored the higher income earners and further exacerbated income disparities. Given the morale issues with staff on campus currently, it seemed to him that a positive message could be sent, if some other means of figuring raises was developed.

Jennifer asked why are we considering raises at all given the budget deficits? Linda indicated that this was a mandate from president Choi to include a 2% merit raise pool in the budget of each campus. Sharon noted that not all campuses have given raises at the same time. Linda indicated that the IFC has held discussions about the problems of salary compression, etc., and they favor a different approach, but President Choi feels a Merit raise it is necessary to retain and attract the best faculty.

Tony asked if Units have been asked to include this 2% Merit raise pool in their FY19 budget planning. Sharon stated yes.

Jerry indicated that he was under the impression that Deans have been told they have to include a raise pool in their budgets. He asked the question of what if the faculty agreed they did not want the money to be used for their salary increases but to meet other (higher) priorities with their Unit? Sharon replied that in the past there has been real angst across campus when some Units did not give raises. Jerry felt strongly that this should be a discussion amongst faculty as part of share governance and this needs to take place.

More discussion will be held at the next FSBC meeting.

1. **Academic Portfolio Review Feedback**

Mark asked the members to solicit feedback from their Units as to what type of information and tools they would like to have in terms of future data from the APR. The Data Team is having discussions about the process for data distribution going forward and developing a dashboard that would provide this information for the Units to make decisions about class offerings and teaching.

1. **Other Business**

No other business. The meeting was adjourned at 12:10

Respectfully submitted,



Mark L. Johnson, Ph.D.

Chair, FSBC