

A REPORT
of THE UMW 2011-12 BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE
to THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

This report

According to the Faculty Handbook 2.6.2.1, the budget advisory committee (“the committee”) is ascribed two duties that we are herewith discharging: to “indicate the committee’s priorities for the present budgeting year through an annual review process and [to] summarize their priorities on future budgets due to the CFO, CAO, and the UFC.”

Business of 2010-11 Academic Year

In the spring term of 2011, the committee worked with the chief academic and financial officers as well as several members of the administration to review budgets and make recommendations to the president for FY 12. A summary of those recommendations, as well as a summary of the president’s actions, was circulated to the UFC and the governing bodies of the individual colleges in fall 2012.

With limited resources and a process for evaluating budgeting priorities badly in need of revision (for example, budgeting requests numbered in the hundreds with individual requests as low as a few hundred dollars and as much as over \$100-thousand dollars; the individual budgets considered by the committee represent a relatively small percentage of the total amount of the budget assigned to each are; etc.), the committee offered the president a set of guiding principles, which may be found in the minutes of the April 18, 2011, meeting and which are repeated here for convenience:

“Additional guiding principles recommended by the BAC in the development of the 2011-12 budget include the following:

- 1) It is time to increase support for key infrastructure areas, broadly defined. These include:
 - a. Funding increases in marketing, recruitment and retention of a diverse student body.
 - b. Developing an office of external grants and hiring a director.
 - c. Funding critical needs for Admissions and the IT department.

- 2) We also support the creation of new positions that will support the University’s mission, e.g., splitting the two dual sport coaches positions, a new position in HR, a regional gifts officer, as well as facilities and housekeeping positions.

- 3) A philosophical discussion should be undertaken by senior administration about creating new ways of increasing revenues, including differential tuitions and fees.”

A review of the president’s actions shows a broad concurrence with the recommendations of the committee. The only exception was the president’s decision to fund a position in Student Services for a Director of Leadership and Coordinator of Strategic Initiatives. The committee had ranked the request “low” and recommended that the proposal “be more fully developed with input from the provost’s office and deans.” The president, however, chose to fund the position, seeing the position as an important part of a plan to develop new initiatives and to attract new students.

Six-Year Plan

The university was tasked in spring 2011 by Governor McDonnell’s administration with developing a six-year plan for implementing the governor’s educational priorities. The provost and deans met over the summer to develop this plan, and the president asked the committee to review the plan and make recommendations. Given the short turnaround time, the committee was in no position to make any kind of recommendation other than to reiterate its desire to be consulted during the planning process and to repeat their three funding guidelines adduced above. A summary of the six-year plan was circulated to the UFC and the governing bodies of the individual colleges in fall 2012.

Going Forward

Regarding the constitution of the committee, the Staff Advisory Council has no formal representation in budgeting matters; therefore, the committee recommends that UFC takes under consideration exploring the representation of university-wide committees to determine which, if any, warrant the inclusion of a SAC representative and the voting status of that representative.