

Budget Allocation Subcommittee
Wednesday, February 28, 2018
3:00 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.
SURC 140
MINUTES

Members Present: Gail Mackin, Todd Shiver, Kathryn Martell, Tim Englund, James Johnson, George Drake, Aaron Brown, Kevin Archer, Dennis Francois, Shane Scott, Stuart Thompson, Josh Hibbard, Scott Fendley, Jakob Shewey, Sharon Jonassen, Paul Ballard

Absent: Alex Horning

Agenda

Approval of February 21st Minutes

February 21st minutes approved. Josh Hibbard motioned to approve. Stuart Thompson seconded.

Finalize Recommendations for Budget Allocation Increases to BEC

Members discussed the update that will be given to BEC. In the future, subcommittee suggests that College and Non-College units give budget presentation, and members will ask the public for suggestions on how to improve the process.

Tim Englund handed out the completed scoring summary sheet with all scoring rubrics to members.

Allocation Increase Requests –

- University Advancement
 - Group restates that there is currently a pilot program in CAH, and do not see why the university should hire more before seeing the results. These positions were not discussed with the deans. The deans prefer that they fund these positions, if they decide to hire them. Do not recommend funding.
- Athletics – Head Trainer
 - Based on rubric scores, members do not recommend funding this request. It appears as though there is money available within the unit.
- Finance and Business Auxiliaries
 - Based on rubric scores, members do not recommend funding this request. Request low on student impact and not mission critical. Appears to be low risk for the university if not funded.
- Environmental Health & Safety
 - Based on rubric scores, members do not recommend funding this request. The unit just got two new positions, and there is overlap with the request submitted by Institutional Effectiveness.
- Human Resources – ELM
 - Members wonder if there is someplace else that the unit can find the funding. Seems to be no impact on students, no compliance issues and low risk mitigation. Do not recommend funding.

- Inclusivity and Diversity
 - Too similar to another allocation increase submitted by Human Resources. Members believe that the request was not articulated clear enough. Seems to be an issue that needs to be discussed at a university wide level to avoid competing positions. Do not recommend funding.
- Police and Parking Services – Kittcom 911
 - There is already a funding mechanism in place, members do not see a problem with it. Member notes that the unit has a ten year plan that the reserves will be used for. However, the request did not include that information. Based on the rubric scores and that it already has a funding mechanism in place, the group does not recommend funding this request.
- University Libraries
 - Members would prefer to see a long term project plan over several years. Do not see why it must all happen at once. Suggest looking at other funding sources, one example being Friends of the Library. Do not recommend funding.
- Institutional Effectiveness
 - Goods and Services – It seems as though the software can run on less costly machines. IE as a whole has recently been restructured. Members suggest waiting to let IE manage itself with new VP making decisions. Suggest taking a look at this issue again next year. Also a continuous funding request, and want to see how the unit manages under new VP. Do not recommend funding this request.
 - Operational Requirements – Same issues as with the above request. Do not recommend funding this request.

Highest scoring requests

- Student Success – SMACC
 - Scored high on all aspects of the rubric. Members unanimously state that this request should be fully funded regardless of funds available. Student health is of the utmost importance.
- Student Success – Learning Commons
 - Three parts to this request. The purpose of this request to reduce the fee for these classes by half, eventually removing the fee completely. To make it easier for students to take these required classes. The committee recommends funding two of the three parts, a total of \$212,000. Do not recommend funding the Summer Bridge section at this time. It currently already has funding for this coming summer. Suggest looking at this section again next year.
- Graduate Studies and Research
 - Committee recommends funding this request it in full. It appears as though the university is long overdue in raising the stipend for the graduate assistant. It will make our graduate studies comparable to other institutions, and make our programs more attractive to students that currently have higher funded positions elsewhere.
- Police and Parking – Salary and Equity Increase
 - To make the salaries comparable to local salaries. We are paying for the training, and once completed the officers are leaving to work for other departments with higher salaries. To increase retention of officers.
- Academic and Student Life

- CBA mandated faculty development. Must be funded somehow, committee asks if there is enough in the Provost's reserves to pay for this? Do not recommend funding through this channel.
- Student Success – Disability Services
 - Suggests that funding for this position, which was moved to Human Resources during a reorganization, should be moved back to Student Success. Otherwise, when current position holder leaves, Human Resources would keep the funds with no expense attached to it. Appears to be a structural issue that needs to be discussed at a higher level. Do not recommend funding this request.
- Student Success – Veteran's Center
 - Currently done by the director. Anticipate seeing growth in the number of veterans on campus. Four votes for funding this request. There seem to be other priorities on campus.
- Human Resources – Diversity
 - Committee discussed how the university needs a clear strategic plan for this, a collaborative effort. Overlap with the request from Inclusivity and Diversity, shows how there multiple units want to achieve this goal, but should be discussed at a higher level within the university to identify a clear plan. Do not recommend funding this request.
- Student Success – Advising
 - Eight votes from the committee that say this should request should be fully funded. It will attract more applicants, and improve retention.
- Enrollment Management – Admissions
 - Committee sees the merit in this request, but wants to wait to see the data. Suggests a pilot program with two years of funding to see the ROI. However, there is concern about other funding obligations currently on campus that are for this type of position.
- Student Success – Exploratory Advisor
 - Do not recommend funding this request. There are more important priorities on campus, and within Student Success itself. Committee sees the merit in request, but not do not want to move forward with request at this time.

Next Steps:

- a. Plans for next year – what worked and what didn't
- b. Document process and procedures budget summits and allocation increase requests
- c. Off-cycle allocation requests