

Minutes of the University Budget Committee Meeting

3/1/2018, Gilham Park Room, Administrative Center

Members Present: Barbara Bichelmeyer, Kelli Cox, Sheri Gormley, Carol Hintz, Mark L. Johnson, Ali Korkmaz, Sharon Lindenbaum, Dea Marx, Linda Mitchell, Tamara Murdock, Roger Pick, Bonnie Postlethwaite, Cameron Roark, Nancy Stancel, Kevin Truman, Karen Wilkerson, Ted White.

Members Absent (excused): Curt Crespino, Gerald Wyckoff

UBC Secretary Mark Johnson called the meeting to order at 10:03 AM.

Agenda Items (see attached Agenda)

Approval of Minutes of December meeting: No edits to the February Meeting minutes were made. Kevin Truman moved approval of the Minutes of the February meeting submitted by Secretary Mark Johnson. Several members seconded. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Current Budget Updates: Sharon Lindenbaum reported that there was no recent news with regard to our budget allocation. There was some discussion that we might get the cap lifted on tuition, which would give us some wiggle room hopefully, but nothing definite.

State Updates: Provost / Interim Chancellor Bichelmeyer noted that she was in Jefferson City yesterday. The mood in Jefferson City is different than before. She is hopeful that the Legislature will propose a different (better) higher education budget that what the Governor has proposed. Barb noted that the Legislative cycle to override a potential veto by the Governor is longer than our budget cycle. As such, we are working on a worst-case scenario (aka the Governor's proposed budget) in terms of FY19 budget planning.

Barb noted a new SB912 proposal has been introduced and is being circulated that would allow an increase in tuition above the cap when the State budget is cut. Conversations are also being held about incorporating current line items in our State funding into our core Funding.

Sharon noted that Fees might be included in the caps under SB912, however, it is not clear yet if this will be part of the final bill. If included this would be a negative for us as fees are relatively small and so capping fees would result in only incremental increases.

Provost / Interim Chancellor Report: Barb informed the UBC that the problems with Oak Place Apartments were more extensive than originally thought and that all students will be moved out by the end of March. Moving these 252 students brings the total to 512 students who will move from OPA and be relocated to alternative housing. The University is working with several community individuals to find places for these students to live. At present, it is not clear what our financial liability will be with regard to these problems. She will keep the committee informed as things develop.

Dea asked if this posed a health issue for the students. Barb replied that this is a preemptive move, to get the students relocated before it becomes a health problem for the remaining

students. Linda asked if Barb was aware of the status of HB 1474 that deals with the status of tenure? Barb indicated that there does not appear to be much traction in the legislature for this at present.

Resource Investment Model Update:

Barb summarized the outcomes of the FY19 Budget retreat with the Deans. The Deans were tasked with presenting their core needs, things that were dispensable and activities that were “in-between”. Several themes emerged from these discussions. Several areas of cost management that can/will generate savings were discussed:

- Impact of New Budget Rules (nearly finalized)
- The RIM model is being tested to see how the numbers look
- Potential shared services

Barb will be holding individual meetings with each Dean to examine the impact of these options on their Unit. This is still a work in progress and Karen and Sharon are working hard to build a final budget. Barb commented that one clear top priority from the Dean’s retreat right now is to replace faculty lost by Units that need to be replaced.

Ted White asked about how SCH is being calculated for anchor courses and who is doing this? Karen and Sharon indicated that the data warehouse would make these determinations and the SCH would be distributed appropriately.

Kevin expressed the need to get Shared Services figured out quickly, so we do not lose key people.

Administrative Services Review (ASR):

Sharon summarized the activity ongoing with the ASR. The rpk GROUP has finished their cost management recommendations. A priorities matrix is being developed based on these recommendations. Currently changes in utilities are being implemented that can be made easily without effecting delivery of service at a cost-savings. Also, a single commencement across campus is being considered.

Barb asked how our ASR fits into the System review? Sharon indicated that ours needs to be aligned with System. Barb indicated that one tie with System is in the area of travel management. System is looking at creating a Travel Office to manage costs across all four campuses. Sharon indicated that this has been tried before (unsuccessfully) and needs to be handled better this time.

Barb stated that all of this ties into the Strategic Plan being developed and that system is looking for better alignment of our Strategic Plan with System goals and plans. It is clear that the current Board of Curators will be redefining how System works and the autonomy of the various Campuses vs. System will be changing.

Ted White asked about cross-campus teaching of courses and noted that it will require a large investment of resources to be successful. Barb replied that there is a lot of discussion currently ongoing about having faculty at one campus having courtesy appointments at all campuses with a common email address (e.g. @missouri.edu), etc. There are lots of issues and some concerns about how UM-Columbia is being branded, for example, and maintaining the uniqueness of

UMKC as well as its autonomy. Linda noted that at the IFC level there are good strides being made with respect to course sharing, but there are personnel issues that need to be resolved. Issues being discussed include: how do we have a faculty at one campus manage a course and students at another campus? How do we deal with library access for students between different campuses (which affects subscription costs for libraries, for example)?

Barb commented that in talking about the desire to have 4 strong campuses that work together; this will require having a strong System that has councils or other structures in place to enable these processes and these bodies should have real authority. Linda indicated that IFC is doing a lot of vetting/discussions, but that the Curators don't always understand what is possible.

Barb concluded the discussion by noting that the plan is to have 10 Service Experience Teams/Task Forces in place by the end of this semester. These will be formed in the upcoming days so that when the new Chancellor starts, we will be ready to move forward.

Academic Portfolio Review: Databases are being updated with feedback from the Units.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:55 AM.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark L. Johnson, Ph.D.

Secretary

University Budget Committee