**Faculty Senate Budget Committee**

Minutes of the December 11th, 2017 Meeting, Brookside Room, Administrative Center

**Members Present:** Mark L. Johnson (Chair), Eduardo Abreu, Kelli Cox (ex officio), Paul Cuddy, Ceki Halmen (for Deep Medhi), Tony Luppino, Sharon Lindenbaum (ex officio), Erik Olsen, Jen Salvo-Eaton (for Buddy Pennington), Leigh Salzsieder, Steve Stoner, Roger Pick, Chris Rice, Ronald Tice, Linda Mitchell (Cahir, Faculty Senate), Gerald Wyckoff (Past-Chair, Faculty Senate)

**Members Excused:** Deep Medhi, Sully Read, Provost Barbara Bichelmeyer (ex officio), Buddy Pennington, Jennifer Waddell.

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 October 10th, 2017 meeting. None were made. Linda Mitchell moved to accept as submitted, Steve Stoner seconded. The minutes were unanimously approved with Jerry Wyckoff abstaining.

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

**2. Resource Investment Model**

Leigh Salzsieder made a brief presentation. He indicated that the committee was meeting regularly and the meetings were very long, but the discussion was focused and productive. Several key outcomes have resulted:

* The committee has developed a set of guiding principles for the budget process and allocation of funds
* The RIM is designed to take into account all “colors of money” and established 3 categories of responsibilities centers: Academic, Support and Auxiliary.
	+ A question was asked about how the Library/Librarians were categorized? Leigh responded that he was not certain, but would report back. *He raised this issue with the RIM committee and the decision was made to classify the library as a Support Unit Responsibility Center.*
* The intention in the new RIM is to create a Strategic Investment Fund (Provost controlled fund) and a Chancellor’s fund to support growth opportunities not originally budgeted.
	+ Tony asked if there was a means by which we could clip off some of the Auxiliary or State $ every year to fund these two funds? Sharon and Leigh indicated that this was the intention.
	+ Tony then asked how is the challenge of predictability (or lack thereof) going to be dealt with given the unknowns from year-to-year? The reply was that the Deans would be provided Management tools for Scenario Planning to budget for changes in State Allocations, Administrative Service Charges, etc.
* The Next Steps for the RIM committee include:
	+ Run the model to test assumptions
	+ Align budget rules
	+ Develop budget process flow
	+ Communicate broadly
	+ Make recommendations
1. **Academic Portfolio Review and Budget Update Discussion**

Mark made a brief presentation demonstrating the information that each Unit will be receiving in the next week or so. This includes the rpk GROUP Slides for each Unit, course data and financial data sets.

Mark gave a brief update on the status of the budget based on discussions from the UBC. Started current fiscal year with a projected $4.5 million deficit. Due to decreased enrollment and over-scholarshipping the deficit is now ~$7.5 million. Given the potential cuts in State funding the deficit projection could be $15-20 million.

Jerry asked about the number of students per class? Mark indicated that this is in the Course Data tab of the Excel Workbook being sent out. The separate Financial Data that is forth coming can be merged as the Units see fit with their own data. The data is being sent out is an information tool for guiding decisions. There is a need to clean up the Instructor – Class information and Mark asked the Units to focus o the 2016 data as that will be the basis for correcting data going forward. Units were asked to return any corrections (highlighting changes preferably) by February 15th. Once all the corrections have been received the Data Team will meet to discuss next steps.

Erik noted the issue of how overhead is determined has come up in the CAS discussions. Tony agreed that we need to know how overhead is calculated and charged. Jerry stated that since the data will drive the budget model to a large degree, the FSBC should weigh in on how the overhead is split out and charged. There was consensus that this needed to occur.

A question was asked about the status of the Administrative Services Review and who from the FSBC is on the committee? Mark indicated that the FSBC representative is Steve Stoner on the Data Team and that Mark is on the Leadership Oversight Team. Mark will try to arrange for a report at the next meeting if Sharon is available.

Linda noted that there is a lot of anxiety relating to how the Dean’s will use the APR data and that the Admin Services Review will result in a number of lower level staff positions will be eliminated instead of potentially duplicated positions at the higher levels.

Erik agreed and noted concerns that increasing class sizes and NTT as are being discussed is not going to solve problems.

Jerry stated that each Unit needs to know what they are getting from Admin Services.

Linda commented that we need a disaster budget for UMKC because of new tax plans and if Missouri does not do something the State could lose $1billion in revenue and this means more cuts for higher education. Linda further suggested that adding more endowed professorships are needed and this would reduce “green” dollars cost of instruction.

**4. Other Business**

Mark indicated that the next FSBC meeting would not likely be until March 2018, after the APR data had been returned and the Data Team could meet to discuss next steps, unless something urgent developed.

There be no other business the meeting was adjourned at 11:10 AM.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark L. Johnson, Ph.D.

Chair, FSBC