

**University Budget Advisory Committee Meeting  
March 19, 2013**

**In attendance:** Nabil Al-Tikriti (chair), Paul Messplay, Les Johnson, Dan Hubbard, Dana Hall, Mukesh Srivastava, Colin Rafferty (secretary), Rick Pearce, Patricia Reynolds, Joe Romero

Meeting called to order at 4:03 pm.

Minutes of the last meeting were distributed. Reynolds moved to accept as submitted, Srivastava seconded. Motion passed.

Discussion began with a discussion of the procedure for the next two meetings. Reynolds asked if there has ever been a central pool of student workers regarded separately. Messplay stated that there had not been a centralized fund for student workers. Pearce clarified: each department/program funds their own students workers, but year to year, they do not know how many workers they'll need.

## **DISCUSSION OF ITEMS**

### Provost's Items

Reynolds: Provost has done a good job of prioritizing. #1 & #2 are immutable.

**ITEM #1:** State support for program suggests importance of funding this as top priority of provost. Committee suggests full support of Item #1 as high priority.

**ITEM #2:** Hubbard: question about contradictory language ("one-time costs" vs "periodically recurring"). Committee's general understanding of this language is that the \$50K would spend for the first year for MS in Geospatial Analysis software; in subsequent years, this fund would be available for other programs, at the discretion of the Provost.

The recommendation of this committee is that this item should be converted to a single-year funding of the software for the MS in Geospatial Analysis. With that conversion, the committee suggests full support of Item #2 as high priority. Without that conversion, the committee suggests that the proposed innovation expenditures be brought to the committee annually.

**ITEMS #3-7:** Reynolds: Provost has made four requests regarding the ITCC; the impending opening of this building has made this a necessity. Pearce asked if having the building staff is a high priority or not. Al-Tikriti pointed out that the division of the requests raises the question of the prioritization of each request. Reynolds brought up the example of the Maker Bot bringing in community; the ITCC will bring in both students and community.

The recommendation of this committee is for funding the staff of the ITCC.

**ITEM 3:** The committee suggests funding as a High Priority (1).

**ITEM 4:** The committee recommends awareness of this need for competitive salaries across campus. The committee suggests funding as a High Priority (1).

**ITEM 5:** The committee suggests funding as a High Priority (1).

**ITEM 6:** As the ITCC expands and grows, the committee will return to this subject. The committee suggests funding as a High Priority (1).

**ITEM 7:** The committee suggests funding as a High Priority (1).

**ITEM 8:** The committee notes that this *is* a new money request. This is a request to increase admissions marketing funds by \$91K. The over-usage of outside consultants causes the committee concern over the return on investment.

The 46K request is not specific; it simply requests a restoration of a recently removed fund. There is a rationale for the request, but no clear sense of what the funds are for. The committee suggests this request be a Low priority (5).

The 35K request: the committee suggests this request be a Medium-High Priority (2).

The 10K request: With rise of social media, the committee is concerned about the reliance on print media. The committee suggests this request be a Medium-Low Priority (4).

**ITEM 9:** Committee supports assisting incoming students in determining the actual cost of college. The committee suggests this request be a Medium-High Priority (2).

**ITEM 10:** The committee expresses concern over the need to modernize the admissions/recruitment process. The committee suggests this request be a High Priority (1), and would like to emphasize their urging for support.

**ITEM 11:** Three different comments: Reynolds spoke for the need for an assessment tool for the university's accreditation purposes. Hall and Hubbard suggest returning this for another year to await the recommendation of the task force. Al-Tikriti suggests avoiding quantification of assessment. The committee suggests this request be a Low Priority (5).

**ITEM 12:** The committee recognizes this proposal as an opportunity to be slightly less exploitative of the staff. This office is overworked; the committee supports any effort to reduce their workload. The committee suggests this request be a Medium-High Priority (2).

**ITEM 13:** The committee is wholeheartedly in favor of Item #13, and suggests this request be a High Priority (1) with the addition of the phrase "tenure-track" to "full-time faculty positions." Upon funding of this item, the committee suggests promoting it vigorously.

**ITEM 14:** The logic of the statement regarding anticipated savings is unclear to the committee because of requested security funds elsewhere in the budget. The committee suggests this request be a Medium Priority (3).

**ITEMS 15 & 18:**

The committee expresses a desire for a way to systematize orderly increases such as these into the departmental budgets. The committee recommends considering implementing a lab and

breakage fee for programs for which it would appropriate. The committee suggests these requests be a High Priority (1).

**ITEM 16:** The committee would like to see the return of Faculty Academy, and would appreciate a clarification in the request. The committee suggests this request be a Medium Priority (3).

**ITEMS 17 & 19:** The committee expresses concern over potential overlaps in funding as the ITCC comes online (no pun intended). The committee suggests this request be a Medium Priority (3-).

**ITEM 18:** See entry for Item 15.

**ITEM 19:** See entry for Item 17. The committee suggests this request be a Medium Priority (3+).

**ITEM 20:** In keeping with the University's commitment to the College of Education's emerging national prominence and the lack of any kind of funding the Dean might have for moving towards national accreditation, the committee suggests this request be a Medium-High Priority (2).

**ITEMS 21 & 22:** The committee notes that there is already a recurring operating budget for AACSB. The committee suggests this request be a Low Priority (5-).

Meeting adjourned at 5:52 PM.