

Budget Model Change Template

What is the change being proposed?

Instead of tracking the SCH by course prefix, track it by instructor. Each instructor would be assigned a “home college.” In the (very) few cases of where instructors are employed by multiple colleges, one could either

- write multiple contracts, with appropriate SCH going to the issuing college or
- create an array for each faculty member with the percentage of their assignment in each college listed. The total SCH generated could be distributed to each college according to these percentages. While not 100% accurate, it would be close.
- Thirdly, multiple position numbers for these faculty could be created – one for each college.

What is the goal of the proposed change?

Participation in interdisciplinary programs is being disincentivized in the current model. This is particularly true now that ABB numbers are being shared at the department level. Consider, for example, the lack of incentive a Biology chair has for letting a faculty teach in DHC or ENST. The department is being charged the full salary but is only being credited for, at best, a fraction of the SCH that person generated. This change would incentivize and reward cross-program collaborations.

Which of the underlying principles of the RCM/ABB principals is the proposed change related to? See principles [here](#)

(<https://www.cwu.edu/budget/overview>)

- It is not clear how this would add authority or accountability to the deans or VPs.
- It would, however, make revenue generation more transparent and RCM/ABB department-level data more accurate and perhaps even useful.
- Many of the growth areas in academics are in interdisciplinary fields. This change encourages participation in these areas.
- Innovations often come from collaborations. This change encourages collaboration between departments.
- Finally, this change would most dramatically affect the silos at the university in ways already mentioned.

What is the deficiency in the current model that the proposed change will correct? How?

Currently, interdisciplinary programs are being disincentivized. This correction will fix that problem in the ways mentioned above.

Outside of the above, what other impacts are foreseen? Specifically mention any negative repercussions anticipated for any units.

The possibility has been raised that someone with ill-intent could use these data to compute how profitable/unprofitable a given individual faculty member was. This is, of course, possible. However:

- This capability already currently exists (albeit not easy) and is not being abused.
- This is not useful information and not the way scheduling works.
- Of minimal risk when compared to the potential reward of incentivizing cross-disciplinary teaching.

There may additionally be some complications in the first year of implementation as a faculty member's "home college" has already been compensated for interdisciplinary teaching – without returning those funds, the home college would, for the first year anyway, receive both buyout money and SCH. Money can easily be moved between colleges, however, so this problem is solvable.