

Minutes of the University Budget Committee Meeting

3/20/2017, Gilham Park Room, Administrative Center

Members Present: Barbara Bichelmeyer, Curt Crespino, Diane Fillion, Sheri Gormley, Carol Hintz, Mark L. Johnson, Ali Korkmaz, Sharon Lindenbaum, Roger Pick, Bonnie Postlethwaite, Kevin Sansberry, Susan Sykes Berry, Ted White, Karen Wilkerson, Gerald Wyckoff.

Members Absent (excused): Karen Wilkerson, Leo Morton

The meeting was called to order at 4:01 PM by Provost Bichelmeyer. She introduced Sheri Gormley who is a new member of the Provost's Office and will have the responsibility of Quality Assurance with respect to the Higher Education Commission regulations and also work in Process Improvement.

Agenda Items (see attachment)

Approval of Minutes of January meeting: No edits to the February Meeting minutes were brought forward. Susan Sykes Berry moved approval of the Minutes of the February meeting submitted by Secretary Mark Johnson. Gerald Wyckoff seconded. The minutes were unanimously approved.

State Updates: Curt Crespino provided an update on activities ongoing at the State of Missouri level. 56 Alumni, Faculty Staff, Students and Community Advocates visited Jefferson City to meet with Legislators on Lobby Day. He stated that there is a robust engagement strategy being developed at several levels. The target priorities are Core Funding, the Downtown Arts Campus, Pharmacy and Dental School Satellites and the Center for Neighborhoods. The delegation shared a community letter with over 100 signatures as the Economic Impact Brochure. Partnering with the city and the Chamber, we hosted Freshman Legislators for a special orientation session on campus. Small group meetings continue to be held with Legislators to advocate for UMKC needs. A new House Bill (HR19) authorizing issuance of bonds to support the building of the Downtown Arts Campus was passed with over 100 sponsors. This Bill now moves on to the Senate.

Budget process at State is on hold as the Legislature is currently in recess. The initial House budget does not include the Center for Neighborhoods funding that was cut. The House Budget has a core cut to the UM system allocation of 9.2% or ~\$323,000 higher cut than the Governor's recommendation. However, the new appropriations legislation that restores \$1M for SoP satellite in Springfield and \$1.5 M SoD satellite in Joplin are being included in next year's budget. Next goes to the Senate for their budget recommendations.

Sharon Lindenbaum next discussed the challenges we face with undergraduate programs and our options:

- Tuition is tied to CPI, which is about 2.1 % currently. Even an increase of 2.1% will not cover the impact of State cuts to our Core funding.
- One strategy would be to ask for a waiver to increase tuition higher for undergrad programs.
- The risk is to what extent an increase in tuition would impact our competitiveness.

Curt commented that we are still trying to learn how the new Governor operates. He also noted that State revenue is trending upwards (4.9% growth) in-line with revenue projections. Not anticipating any additional cuts this year.

Barb commented that we need to learn how the new UM President Choi will operate. One thing he is pushing is a common application that would be used by multiple Universities and Colleges in Missouri.

Additional discussion pointed out that Undergraduate enrollment projections for next year are not good, especially with respect to International Students. We need to seek ways to be more competitive and flexible, especially with respect to services we offer our students.

A recent comparison study creates the perception that we are not as engaging compared to our peers as a research campus and not as student-centric as a comprehensive teaching campus.

Resource Allocation Model and Academic Portfolio Review; Data Team Update:

The Provost commented that we have had a number of challenges in collecting all of the data and spent a lot of time developing definitions that can be used from one year to the next. Marrying the data from the System, HR, Registrar and Data Warehouse proved more difficult than anticipated. The rpkGROUP will present its initial analysis of the academic data on April 6 (hope to let FSBC see the data a few days earlier if possible). Jerry Wyckoff suggested that we put the definitions matrix on the Senate or IR website used for the Academic Portfolio Review. Mark Johnson indicated he would make them available for posting on the Faculty Senate website.

The Provost raised the question about how we deal with all of the Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) that exist throughout the University and create a “shadow system” that may work contrary to the current budget model. Sharon Lindenbaum suggested that we create an archive of all MOUs, but how we build them into the model is an open question at this point. Importantly we need to insure that \$ move as detailed in the MOUs.

Ted White pointed out that teaching in courses across units needs to be captured in the model and MOUs would go away.

The Provost agreed with Ted and noted that this touches upon our need to have a “Center” for Interdisciplinarity (need a structure to organize this under the budget model and not a Center as defined by the CRRs) that promotes interdisciplinary

teaching/courses. One barrier has been differences in tenure/tenure-track faculty and NTT faculty between units that are involved in teaching in interdisciplinary courses and this complicates resource allocation. Diane Filion pointed out that P&T issues often get handled by MOUs that handle teaching across units. The Provost indicated that every aspect of interdisciplinarity should be factored into P&T decisions. Russ Melchert noted that MOUs can provide incentives for many aspects of collaborations between academic units and administrative service units. Ted white suggested that collaboration on teaching levels could be tracked through MyVita / Pathways to track %effort of teaching in different courses. It was also noted that TAs are a problem in MyVita and how they are given %effort is the system. The Provost stated that we need to get established definitions to cover these issues that are vetted and approved by the Deans and Faculty Senate and then get them coded into the system so they can be tracked properly.

Planning for Response for State Withholding:

The Provost summarized efforts by stating that a lot of planning for immediate and long-range (Tier 2) projects is ongoing. Amongst the Tier 2 projects are policies around academic hiring, the student experience and process improvements. As a starting point for process improvement moving forward, the Provost will be identifying key people to serve on a project Team for these Tier 2 target areas. There will be regular meetings of the Chairs of these Teams to inform the other Chairs/Teams of what they are each individually working on. Process improvement for research will be handled separately and tied into the CIE Task Force (and its report) on the Office of Research Services.

Mark Johnson noted that some of the decisions that were universally applied across campus may have cost UMKC money because they restricted use of extramural grant funds (a.k.a. salary freezes for staff supported by grants that had salary increases built into them annually) and we need to make sure policies take into consideration these differences in the future. Several UBC members agreed that this is an important consideration that needs to be accommodated in the new policies.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 5:01 PM.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark L. Johnson, Ph.D.
Secretary
University Budget Committee