Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee Minutes November 6, 2019

Members Present: Arthur Martinez, David Marx, Julie Murphy, Somnath Lahiri, German Blanco Lobo, Kaleb Hefford, Isaac Hollis, and Sandi Cavi

Members absent: Hannah Beer and Zaria Heath

Guest: Dr. Daniel Elkins, Associate Vice President of Academic Fiscal Management

Meeting began: 6:00 pm

Dr. Elkins gave a presentation on the origins, priorities, and guidelines of the Academic Impact Fund (AIF).

Questions from senators in the AABC:

Senator Lahiri asked about the distinction between short- and long-term funding for faculty lines.

Answer from Dr. Elkins (E): AIF covers faculty salary for the entire period the faculty remains active.

Senator Martinez had a question about the sources of funding (appropriations, fees?)

E: Funds come from general revenue. Both appropriations and tuition fees go into a general revenue fund.

Senator Marx made the following questions and/or suggestions for changes in the AIF FY20 report, which members of the AABC got from Dr. Elkins.

* “Educate-Connect-Elevate 2008-2013” needs to be adjusted, years are wrong (page 4).
* Is it true that the majority of current faculty is subject to continue to have payouts upon retirement?

E: maybe not the majority right now. I could get that number later on.

* About the funds used for recruiting new faculty, the average cost is at around $4,500. Why is it not possible to increase the current recruitment fund to that level?

E: the permanent balance on AIF has gone from above 7 million to around to 4 million, so it is difficult to justify an increase. AIF pays salary, provost provides supplemental funding for recruitment.

* Is there a way to plan ahead? We may know in advance that retirements are coming up and there will be a need for new faculty.

E: It is an option. There have been instances that have created a precedent. There is some flexibility, however, we have the commitment to keep the fund healthy.

* Do we have a sense about the numbers related to retirements and/or retaining faculty in the College of Education? Is it a retirements or retention problem? Not a big deal if it is retirements, however, it would be problematic if it is a retention problem.

E: I don’t have an answer.

* College of Education has historically low enrollment, how is the allocation for new faculty positions going to be impacted when demand is going down?

E: My understanding is that they are employing different tools for recruiting non-traditional teachers, these types of efforts are expected to pay off.

Senator Martinez asked about the tenure to non-tenure track proportion changes: I wonder if tenure track faculty can be given more flexibility regarding teaching and research obligations?

E: I don’t know how to specifically address this. I do believe that failed searchers have an impact on the ratio.

Senator Marx continued with the following:

* University College and Honors funds (page 6), why are these things being funded?

E: University College has faculty (NTT), not funded via permanent NTT funding, and they are part of instructional capacity. Honors have 17 honors students, AIF gives funding for courses they take.

* In FY19 and FY20, the recapitalization of faculty computers was funded via AIF-SBC (page 7). This should have been funded by the respective programs not with funds from AIF-SBC.

E: The decision to fund this item may’ve been the result of departments not having enough funding in their budgets, and not funding computers could have a detrimental effect on student instruction.

* What is the College of Business Dean’s Office (page 7)?

E: Not sure. The Office of International Business uses funds to support directors. AIF likely got a proposal from the dean with a strong case for using these funds.

* Some of the items in page 7, seem out of place. Also, there should be a justification about how money was spent.
* What is the dollar difference between additional permanent expenses and permanent funds allocated to NTT? (page 8).

E: Maybe administrators returning to faculty position in conjunction to a counteroffer.

* It seems that too much was spent on instructional support in FY19.

E: Maybe related to hiring new faculty with course releases for the first year. We are studying what is driving up instructional cost.

* Why is it not a source of revenue when faculty move to administration?

E: The unused salary comes back in, but one has to go through the hiring process in order to get a new line.

* Academic Enhancement funds from student fees, how much revenue you are expecting from this source.

E: About $6 million. Of which, $2 million will be allocated for technology and the other $4 million for enhancements that benefit students’ instruction.

Meeting adjourned at 7 pm.