

3-11-2008

Faculty Budget Priority Committee Meeting Minutes, March 11, 2008

Faculty Budget Priority Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/
archives_committee_minutes](https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_committee_minutes)

Repository Citation

(2008). Faculty Budget Priority Committee Meeting Minutes, March 11, 2008. .
https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_committee_minutes/227

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Committees at CORE Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Faculty Senate 2007-2014 Committee Minutes and Reports by an authorized administrator of CORE Scholar. For more information, please contact corescholar@www.libraries.wright.edu, library-corescholar@wright.edu.

Minutes
Faculty Budget Priority Committee
Tuesday, March 11, 2008, 1:30 p.m.

Members Present: Tom Sudkamp, Chair; Frank Ciarallo, CECS; Mary Lynd, CONH; Bill Slonaker, RSCOB; Pamela Tsang, COSM

Guests: Steven Angle, Provost; Matt Filipic, VP Business and Fiscal Affairs; Keith Ralston, Associate VP Budget Planning and Resource Analysis

Dr. Filipic distributed the following outline, addressed the issues and responded to the committee's questions.

Overview of Current Financial Situation

Problem Magnitude on the order of \$10 million on a base of \$181 million

- The problem is a base budget problem that can be addressed deliberately over the next 1+ years

Causes of problem:

- State mandated undergraduate tuition freeze for the current biennium
- Not balanced by increases in state support, especially in current year
- Decision to not implement \$2.1 million budget cut this year (as assumed in budget approved in July), preferring instead to be more deliberate
- Need to replenish funds for strategic investments each year
- Recent increases in numbers of tenure line faculty during a period of enrollment stability
- Cost of benefits (to employer) increasing by \$1.5 million per year. We expect larger increase next year.
- Desire to fund at least a modest pay raise this coming year
- Poor investment performance will reduce pool of funds available for investment in future years
- New state programs require Matching funds

Approaches to a solution:

- Discussed problem in December. Expect at least a 1.5% cut, possibly more.
- Provost now meeting with vice presidents, deans, and other unit heads individually
- Examining some more targeted cuts as well in hopes of minimizing across the board cuts or making them easier to manage
 - Temperature setbacks
 - Convenience coping
 - Benefits – increased employee costs/Health Savings Account (HSA)
 - Etc
- Problem is offset somewhat by modest increase in enrollment and resulting tuition over estimates
- **No cuts are planned to this year's budget**
- **Cuts can be made next year with one time dollars (will meet our needs next year)**
- **Base budget reductions will not be required until June 30, 2009**

Keith Ralston provided the committee with the *WSU Efficiency Initiatives FY 2007-08*.

Notes:

- The state's definition of efficiency is broad.
- We need to examine how we spend and be innovative, find efficient ways to work, look at the "non-people" side of the house, purchase for less.
- We need to spend less but more importantly, change the way we spend.
 - Reduce level of waste
 - Eliminate programs
 - Down-size or right-size
- Efficiency is unit focused and centers around what transpires in the units
- We will seek more outside funding from grants and contracts. Examples:
 - CONH/Premier Health Partners
- Re-deployment of computers
- HB 251 requires universities to reduce energy consumption by 20%
- ITN (invitation to negotiate) rather than an RFP – ITN has been used with computer hardware, lab and office supplies.
- Wright Buy has been recognized by the Board of Regents as a "best practice" efficiency
- Ad Astra classroom/space utilization program
- SOPP seeking certification for Medicaid so that previously provided services that were non bill-able could be billed.
- Filling vacancies – does the position adequately describe our needs and could units share staff positions

WSU is currently over the state mandated cost reduction.

Mr. Ralston provided the committee with handouts on the WSU-NCA Self Study Data which are attached.

Wright State University
NCA Self Study Data
Update March 7, 2008

Wright State University (excluding School of
Medicine)

	Tenure Line FTE			Full Time Nontenure-line Faculty FTE			Adjunct (Supplemental) FTE			Student FTE 14th Day Fall Term
	Main	Lake	Total	Main	Lake	Total	Main	Lake	Total	Total
2002-03	437.70	19.00	456.70	93.45	1.00	94.45	194.55	30.13	224.68	12,752
2003-04	445.06	18.00	463.06	98.50	1.00	99.50	203.20	37.13	240.33	13,350
2004-05	452.10	17.00	469.10	119.50	3.00	122.50	226.05	30.96	257.01	13,524
2005-06	469.40	20.00	489.40	116.00	3.00	119.00	220.66	26.96	247.62	13,556
2006-07	483.02	20.00	503.02	134.00	4.00	138.00	194.04	26.38	220.42	13,493

Source for Faculty FTE is 2006-07 Academic Data Series (updated draft 3/7/08) which uses the Delaware Study FTE with FTE added for the departments that are not included in the Delaware Study including:

University College

Honors

ROTC (Army & Airforce)

School of Professional Psychology

Lake Campus

Faculty FTE for Tenure Line and Full Time Nontenure-line is based on actual FTE of faculty available to teach.

Adjunct FTE is based on the Delaware Study Supplemental FTE which includes adjuncts and non-faculty who teach fall term, including Deans, Associate Deans and Assistant Deans with faculty status. Supplemental FTE is calculated according to number of course credit hours (CCH) taught fall term divided by 12 (1 FTE = 12 CCH).

Deans, Associate Deans and Assistant Deans with faculty status have been added to the Academic Data Series (ADS) as 1 FTE per person. If any of these Deans taught during fall term their corresponding Supplemental FTE count was deducted in the ADS.

Budget Planning and Resource Analysis

Wright State University
 NCA Self Study Data
 Update March 7, 2008

Actual Expenditures (Unrestricted) for Tom Sudkamp

YEAR	INSTRUCTION AND DEPT. RESEARCH	ACADEMIC SUPPORT	SCHOLARSHIPS	TOTAL EXPENDITURES
1996	\$67,727,370	\$20,911,455	\$4,546,754	\$132,993,845
2000	\$74,363,201	\$26,185,588	\$10,662,858	\$163,132,417
2001	\$78,254,306	\$28,666,121	\$11,312,074	\$172,026,196
2002	\$81,013,055	\$29,399,550	\$12,957,671	\$175,252,451 *
2003	\$74,917,404	\$31,138,367	\$14,696,531	\$174,872,674 *
2004	\$79,775,249	\$32,047,877	\$15,714,533	\$184,656,453 *
2005	\$78,936,594	\$33,425,705	\$17,432,907	\$191,957,337 *
2006	\$82,168,315	\$33,592,349	\$18,231,918	\$200,212,826 *
2007	\$89,257,163	\$38,162,694	\$18,646,742	\$222,015,787 *

* Unaudited Financial Schedules

Updated: March 7, 2008 MSR

Budget Planning and Resource Analysis