

**FACULTY SENATE
ANNUAL
STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT**

2018-19 ACADEMIC YEAR

Prepared for the Central Washington University Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate Budget and Planning Committee

Committee Co-Chairs: Ken Smith (CB/Accounting) and Kathy Temple (COTS/Math)

Committee Representation:

- **Members:** Roxanne Easley (CAH/History), Kathy Whitcomb (CAH/English/Communications), Paul Knepper (COTS/Law & Justice/Political Science), Lad Holden (CEPS/ETSC), Ian Loverro (CEPS/CESL), Chad Wassell (CB/Economics), Aimée Quinn (LIB), Stephen Stein (Sr Lecturer/Math),
- **Ex Officio Members:** Amy Claridge (Senate Chair/FCS), Cody Stoddard (Senate Past-Chair/Law & Justice), Jim Johnson (ADCO Chair/Biology), Eric Cheney (ADCO Chair-elect/Sociology).
- **Guests:** David Pena-Alfaro and Dannel Fischer from the Financial Planning and Analysis Office attended the March 6 meeting to discuss the data being used to calculate budgets under the RCM model. Walter Szeliga, Senate Chair-elect (Geological Sciences) attended the last two meetings.

Committee Charges:

- BPC18-19.01 Review the budget timeline draft proposed at the President's Budget Advisory Committee (PBAC; Appendices A and B), and provide suggestions for revision.
- BPC18-19.02 In collaboration with the Executive Committee, review and revise the values statement, considering budget implications.
- BPC18-19.03 Coordinate with college budget committees to develop Faculty Code language to clarify their role to empower faculty in financial decision making at the college level.
- BPC18-19.04 Continue monitoring implementation of the budget model at Central by collecting and analyzing data regarding impacts to programs, departments, and colleges. Disseminate results to administrators and faculty as appropriate.
- BPC18-19.05 Provide suggestions to facilitate more effective budget summits, especially focusing on college budget presentations. Work with administrative units to move towards implementation of these suggestions.
- BPC18-19.06 Develop and evaluate alternatives to the current budget model, particularly related to subvention.
- BPC18-19.07 Coordinate with those involved in budgeting on the support side, to work towards a model and system that will benefit CWU as a whole..

BPC18-19.08	Evaluate budget governance structure and suggest changes as needed.
BPC18-19.09	Provide support to the General Education (GE) Committee as they analyze the budgetary impacts of the new GE program and develop strategies to address issues.
BPC18-19.10	Review committee procedures manual and update as required.
BPC18-19.11	Review and provide feedback on the Strategic Enrollment Plan.

Report on the Activities of the Committee:

- **Meeting Dates and Times:** The committee met on the first and third Wednesday of each month during the academic year, from 10-12. There was an extra meeting on Wednesday, Oct. 31.
- **Minutes** are posted on the Faculty Senate webpage.
- **Motions:** Motion no. 18-81, Reaffirmation of the Budget Core Values statement, was approved. This was a slight revision and updating of the Core Values statement that was approved by Faculty Senate in February 2017.

The Committee helped draft Motion 18-57, amending the Faculty Code Section I.B and Appendix A. A further discussion of this is below, under items of interest.

- **Items of Interest:**

At the first meeting, the committee appointed Lad Holden (ETSC) as the committee's representative on the Budget Allocations Subcommittee. The committee also reviewed the proposed budget timeline for FY20 and suggested sending information to the university community in advance of the budget summits.

The committee spent significant time during fall quarter discussing the implementation and funding of the new general education program. At our October 17th meeting, we approved the following motion:

The new general education program will be a benefit to the entire university, increasing student engagement and student success. As such, the Faculty Senate Budget and Planning Committee strongly supports a university-wide solution to funding the start-up costs of the new program. We are very concerned about any funding solution that puts pressure on our existing obligations to students.

At a special meeting on Oct. 31, we approved the following motion. The text of both motions was read to Senate at the Oct. 31 Senate meeting:

The Faculty Senate Budget and Planning Committee feels that an allocation of \$440,000 for general education expenses in 2019-20 from currently unallocated revenue is a workable way to fund the initial estimated costs of the first year of implementation.

We believe that it would be prudent to set aside the remainder of unallocated revenue from 2018-19 for future general education expenses, to provide a cushion for unexpected fluctuations in expenses or overall university revenue. Going forward, we require detailed program-related cost and revenue projections for future years of the program, including assumptions and

spreadsheets or forecast models, with enough time to carefully evaluate assumptions and forecasts.

Guests David Pena-Alfaro and Dannel Fischer from the Financial Planning and Analysis Office attend the March 6 meeting to talk about how they are pulling data and doing the SCH/majors calculation for the college budgets. The committee had many questions about various assumptions and how certain groups were/were not being counted.

A major focus of the committee (both as a subcommittee and then as a committee of the whole) this year was formulating and drafting Faculty Code language around faculty participation in the budget process and college/library budget committees. This was charge 18-19.03 to the committee. A subgroup was formed in fall quarter and, after some initial discussion, the group consulted with members of college budget committees and the library budget committee in early winter quarter. Based on those conversations, the subgroup drafted language that was shared with the full BPC and the Bylaws and Faculty Code Committee. A second draft was then shared in early March with members of the college/library committees, ADCO, the deans, and the provost. The language was presented to the full senate as Motion 18-57 for a first reading at the April meeting. That motion will be up for a third reading and final vote at the May 29 meeting. We believe that the proposed language strengthens shared governance and the faculty role in the budget process, and clarifies what consultation means at the college level.

The committee is currently drafting a statement responding to the budget summit and budget allocations process in the form it took this year. While there were some improvements this year – in particular, the budget summit overview information was much more useful this year, and the college presentations were integrated earlier on – the allocations process remains problematic.

As part of its charge to continue monitoring implementation, the committee is hosting a listening session for faculty on May 21st and will be distributing during the last two weeks of May.

Throughout the year, the committee served an important role as a place for faculty involved in various layers of the new budget governance structure to talk to each other, share information, and coordinate. In particular, issues that arose at the President's Budget Advisory Committee (PBAC) were often discussed at BPC meetings, and suggestions sent back with the faculty representatives on PBAC. With the support of BPC, the faculty representatives on PBAC were able to influence the conversation there around general education, model changes (and the process for making those changes), pushing PBAC to consider values and incentives when discussing changes, and other issues.

- **Successes:**

The Budget Core Values statement was reaffirmed by Faculty Senate at the May 1 meeting.

The committee drafted Faculty Code language regarding faculty participation in the budget governance process, both overall and at the college/library level. That language will be voted on by the full Faculty Senate at the May 29 meeting.

There were several times this year where the committee's strong response to issues was able to shape the conversation happening in other groups, like PBAC and BASC. For example, this committee's strong push for careful consideration of changes to the RCM/ABB

allocation formula and for a designated process and procedure led to BPAC commissioning a working group to develop policies and procedures. Much of our feedback on the first round of budget summits was incorporated in the second version. The committee's insistence on strong language around funding for general education funding helped the EC and Faculty Senate leadership advocate for stronger, more definite statements of funding sources. PBAC is also looking at alternatives to incremental budgeting for the support side of the budget – again, this is an issue that was initially raised by faculty.

The committee served an important role this year as a place for faculty involved in various layers of the budget governance structure to talk to each other, share information, and discuss responses.

- **Concerns:**

While we are gaining transparency at the university-wide level, there is still a lack of transparency in the “academic support” budget (ASL non-college budgets) and in the college budgets. The committee is hopeful that the college budget committees will be empowered to be effective voices for transparency and openness in the college and library budgets, but certainly much work remains to be done.

PBAC and its subcommittees still lack written policies and procedures, and the functions of various groups continues to lack clarity. The committee continues to push for written policies and procedures and greater clarity in how the budget governance process is intended to function.

There is a persistent disconnect in the implementation of RCM (the management model), where both budgetary and management authority seem to have migrated upwards rather than downwards. Empowering college budget committees is a first step in mitigating this, but only a first step.

- **Recommendations for next year's committee:**

Build stronger relationship with college and unit budget committees, and continue to advocate for transparency in the college and library budgets.

Develop and evaluate alternatives to the current budget model, particularly related to subvention and with support unit budgets.

Coordinate with those involved in budgeting on the support side, to work towards a model and system that will benefit CWU as a whole.

Advocate for tuition waiver policies and space allocation processes that benefit the university community as a whole.

Continue to take an active role in the budget governance process, and push for greater clarity in the various roles in that process.

Continue discussions about the budgetary implications of the new general education program, as we move into the first year of the new program.

The committee so far has been fairly effective in a reactive capacity (responding to the actions of others in the budget process). We would like to see it be more proactive in helping shape the budget conversation at CWU.