



Budget Allocation Subcommittee
February 19th, 2019
10:30am – 12pm | SURC 209

Minutes

Paul moved to approve minutes from 1/16/19, 1/31/19 and 2/1/19. Jeff seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously with four abstentions.

Review of Proposals

Paul asked for clarification on how this committee's recommendations will be submitted to PBAC. Gail confirmed that the recommendation from this committee will be split in to three tiers; the first will be the tier of requests that this committee recommends to fund, the second will be those that aren't necessarily unanimously agreed upon by the group but there is sufficient support to recommend funding if it is available, and the third tier will be requests that the committee does not recommend to fund.

Paul then asked where the funding for these requests are coming from; Gail confirmed that the funding is coming through the RCM model and agreed with Paul that this did mean the funding was essentially coming from the four colleges. Paul suggested that this structure puts the committee in an awkward position because there are members of the committee who are not members of the four colleges voting to remove funding from the colleges; he also suggested that the funding of these requests would result in an increase in overhead for the four colleges, and overall he disagrees with the model.

The group discussed how the allocation of funds works in the RCM model, and it was clarified that 100% of university revenue is distributed to the four colleges, but then the university costs are removed from that revenue and reallocated to other departments for overhead and such. Therefore, it could incur an additional cost/decrease in revenue to the colleges if these allocation requests are approved for funding. Paul explained that with this model, they were unable to fund pay increases in CEPS and are likely to take a cut again next year; he felt that it would be very difficult for him to approve any of the allocation requests knowing the colleges were already potentially underfunded. The group discussed how the support departments need funding to ensure the colleges can do their jobs, but that there needs to be a balance with that and funding the colleges to provide education to the students; this is difficult to achieve with the current model and trends in public education.

Scott raised the question of what the ultimate goal for CWU would be in terms of enrollment; what is the number of students we are trying to reach that would put us at critical mass and create an effective system of revenue and cost? It was noted that the Strategic Management Enrollment Plan has not yet completed the capacity analysis, but that should be completed within the next 4-6 months. In the meantime, many of the costs are passed down to the students in the form of increases in tuition and fees.

Gail stated that this group is a representation of both sides of the university; the colleges, and the support departments. It is important to have everyone at this table to consider the allocation requests because the requests are potentially associated with the university can increase revenue which will benefit everyone. Sharon gave a brief overview of the RCM model so that the whole group was on the same page with how the process works, and how the funds are distributed within the university.

Tim arrived to the meeting with the allocation request rankings; the BASC committee members were to submit their rankings for each allocation request individually by last Friday, and then Tim collected and compiled them so that there are totals and one mean overall score for each request. Two members of the BASC committee did not submit their rankings by Friday, but Tim confirmed that based on the data he had, he felt that there was sufficient information received to accurately rank the requests.

The group discussed the scoring; it was noted that even though there were requests in the top tier because they had the highest scores, they aren't necessarily recommended for funding because they still didn't technically score "high." For example, the top request scored a 14, but that is out of 20 total points. Paul suggested that if the top tier was the tier for recommended funding, he still would not vote for any of the requests that scored in that category. The group agreed that the scores cannot be the sole decision-maker in the process, but the scale does matter. It was determined to start at the top tier proposals and work their way down.

The Group began a discussion of the Financial Aid Counselor request. Aaron noted that this proposal meets many of the priorities for students that the university recognizes, including retention. The data from last year supports this proposal, and Josh agreed that he has gotten feedback from students that would also support the proposal. Tim countered that while this is important, he is not convinced that there aren't other resources that can be reallocated in that department to meet the need suggested by the proposal. Jeff agreed, and believes there are some process and structural improvements that could be made in the department. Todd suggested that if this proposal was approved for funding, it could be one that pays for itself through increasing student retention and student enrollment by providing better customer service in the financial aid department. Josh made the point that in thinking back to last year and thinking about Tim's suggestion that there might be other resources, the top tiered requests from last year were mandated by the President to be funded by the departments; so, if this group recommends this proposal for funding, it does not necessarily mean that the funding will come from outside of that department. Paul and Tim countered that this committee is not recommending funding that comes from the departments internally, we are recommending funding in the form of additional allocations and they argue that that should be used as a criteria for determining whether or not to recommend; if we see that it can be funded internally then we move the request to the bottom of the tiers and don't recommend it for additional allocations. Gail disagreed and suggested that a recommendation for funding is a recommendation for funding; if this group believes that a request is important to the university and merits funding, then it should be moved forward with our recommendation. A side note can be added stating that we believe options other than additional allocations should be looked in to. Paul countered that yes, it is a recommendation for funding, but the point is where is that money coming from and he referenced the earlier conversation about the RCM model. Tim agreed and added the suggestion that this committee's job is not to determine whether something is simply worthy of funding (because there are 16 worthy allocation requests here), but rather that it is worth taking money away from the four colleges to fund, and that is the way he will approach his consideration of the recommendations. Tim continued with the point that the Deans were

instructed to consider funding for their colleges in a way that is counterintuitive to the allocation process; the allocation request amounts represent money that could be used in the colleges to meet the educational needs of the students, such as adding more faculty to support the growing student population and demand. Aaron agreed, but countered that if those students cannot receive proper financial aid services to fund their education, they won't be able to enroll or attend classes anyway; Tim countered that those same students won't stay enrolled if they can't get in to a class they want/need because there aren't enough instructors to teach it. Lidia agreed that everyone's concerns are valid; however, she noted that watching students have to wait for financial aid services for the lengths of time that they do and the amount of time that the counselors spend with those students ensuring they have the funding that they need every quarter will help with retention of the students. When considering the needs of students, the need in financial aid services is high; the recommendation could be for one counselor instead of three, but the students need to be able to understand their financial aid and receive the help and guidance they deserve without the wait time they are currently experiencing. Gail agreed and added that based on our student demographics (38% Pell-eligible, 40% first gen, 90% file a FAFSA), the majority of our students are interacting with financial aid in some way. Jeff noted that this request and others that include positions are items that are permanently funded if approved; there is no way in our current system to follow up a year from now and determine how the allocation improved services and/or increased revenue. If it didn't, the funding can't be undone. Gail asked for the final recommendations from the group on this particular proposal; Aaron made the recommendation that this proposal goes in the top tier as-is, with further discussion. Stuart seconded the recommendation. Kevin asked for a discussion to define the tiers. Gail referenced the minutes from January 16th where the discussion by the BASC concluded that the top tier was a recommendation for funding, the second tier was a recommendation with reservations, and the third tier was for proposals that are not recommended for funding. Tim suggested that rather than discuss the merit of the *details* of the proposals that are submitted, it might be more beneficial to discuss the *idea* behind the proposals and determine if that is worthwhile. Gail suggested that we could move forward with a statement such as "we recommend this proposal for funding, but for one or two counselors initially, pending data that supports the need for the full request of three positions." Josh suggested that since we do not know how much funding is available for these requests overall, that we provide a recommendation stating that we like the idea of this proposal, but not identifying particulars in regards to the number of positions to fund or the dollar amounts tied to them. Tim supported that suggestion; he suggested that the motion be amended to state that "we recognize the necessity and support the potential need for more financial aid counselors." Aaron asked for clarification, and the group confirmed that it would still be moved forward as a Tier 1 allocation. It was agreed unanimously to maintain this statement; Gail asked for a vote to move this allocation forward in Tier 1, with the agreed-upon statement. Lad suggested that this is a never-ending request if the university is attempting to reach the 15,000 student threshold; this committee cannot fix/recreate the structure of the division to make it better able to support the student population increase – that needs to be done at a higher level. Josh noted that he is looking at these proposals from a point of ROI. The meeting had to be adjourned at this point due to time constraints, so the final motion was not voted on, and will be readdressed at tomorrow's meeting.