

Draft Minutes Faculty Council Budgetary Affairs Committee Thursday, March 26, 2009

Present: Simon Atkinson, Trudy Banta, Ed Berbari, Ben Boukai, Randall Halverson, Camy Harrison, John Hassell, Keith Morran, Jacquelynn O’Palka, Fred Rees, Reed Smith, Jack Windsor, Marianne Wokeck

Approval of Minutes of the January 21, 2009 meeting

Update of the Campus Budget

Document Provided

IUPUI 2009-11 Operating Appropriation Request

The final appropriation budget is not likely until mid-May. The budget will go to the Board on June 11-12. The governor proposed a reduction in research funding for higher education, but his funding level was tripled by the Indiana Commission for Higher Education. The Chancellor carries out the internal distribution of campus research funding.

Campus Resource and Planning Committee-Report

Documents provided

- Resource Planning Committee ~ Purpose ~
- IUPUI Proposed Guiding Principles for 2010 & 2011; Biennial Budget Planning, March 24, 2009
- Memo to Dean’s Council From Charles R. Bantz, Chancellor Re: Student Technology Fees, February 23, 2009
- UITS Fiscal Health Actual 2004-05 through Budget 2008-09

Over the last several years, several campus groups have been created in order to increase accountability and efficacy in use of campus financial resources.

- The Financial Planning and Advisory Committee (FPAC) was created in 2002-03 to provide a fiscal analysis of the campus, and help ensure that resource allocations are directed toward “strategic/long-range” university and campus goals. FPAC received input from the chair of the BAC.
- The Fiscal Futures Team, made up of five deans and five faculty members, was created in Fall 2005 to establish internal priorities for investments.
- A new “quasi-permanent” campus committee, the IUPUI Resource Planning Committee was established providing input at a strategic level to the Chancellor. Seeking to “synthesize input from major campus stakeholders”, the committee includes faculty, administration, student, and staff representation. The committee includes the chairs of the Faculty Council Planning Committee and Budgetary Affairs committee, and deans from the Schools of Medicine, Science and Liberal Arts. Deans from other Schools share three rotating memberships. As of July 1, the committee will have a new makeup; more deans may want to be involved.

This academic year, the campus deans have developed a set of guiding principles which affirm the value of RCM as the “foundation for planning and budgeting” for the campus. See document: IUPUI Proposed Guiding Principles for 2010 & 2011. In the past, failures in RCM have occurred. It’s been difficult for deans to promote the overall wellbeing of the campus, undermining the ability of the campus to plan strategically. Problems may also occur in service units which do not operate in accord with RCM and are less transparent. RCM can help to contain problems. How can the Committee and campus more effectively support units and deans to focus the limited resources of the campus upon its core priorities, and not try to do everything?

Ten major campus goals haven’t changed since 2002. These are reflected in Uday’s action goals. The campus community needs to recognize and support the value of Enrollment Shaping in order to meet Teaching and Learning goals, and the Signature Centers to meet Research & Scholarship goals.

Garland Elmore is meeting with the deans regarding the transition to the new Student Technology Fee (STF). Committee members made a number of points related to the new STF.

- Allocation of income from the Student Technology Fee (STF) was split long ago between UITS and the Schools. Several academic units have created their own networks and computer laboratories because they haven’t been able to get their needs met. IUPUI has a distinct identity as a non-residential campus. UITS seems to emphasize hardware purchases, but meaningful conversation with the Schools and campus to determine needs and priorities has not been taking place.
- In addition to student fees, UITS costs \$11 million in campus assessments. How much of the campus funding for UITS is retained here? It is not reasonable to split salary costs evenly between the campuses if there is little responsiveness to the needs of IUPUI.
- Transparency is surface level only. Faculty learn of major new investments by UITS only at the time of a press announcement. Budget hearings give the appearance but not the reality that faculty have input in setting priorities.

The committee plans to invite Garland Elmore for a discussion of the Student Technology Fee (STF) at its next meeting. Committee members should consult their dean prior to the meeting.

Wrap-Up Reports of the Planning and Budget Hearings

- Medicine: because of the enmeshment of financial data for medicine and other campus academic units, it’s very difficult to compare salaries between medicine and the rest of the campus, or with other medical schools.
- University College: does not have a secure revenue stream. Will ask again for an advising fee. The School states that is vital not to cut programs for retention.
- E&T: it’s difficult to make new faculty hires. When they plan new hires, E&T and Science need to be able to include costs for start-up labs.

Upcoming Meeting:

Thursday, April 23, 12:30 – 2:00PM, UL 1116

Respectfully submitted,
Randall Halverson, BAC Secretary