

Faculty Senate Budget and Planning Committee
Minutes of the meeting 19 January 2006

Present: D. Barlow, L. Gross, S. McMillan, J. Nolt, G. Reed, N. Schrick, J. Whalen, C. White
Absent: G. Kuney, W. Kuo, J. Wansley,

Meeting called to order at 3:30.

- 1) Minutes of the 08 December 2005 meeting were reviewed and approved.
- 2) White led a discussion of the living wage issue. Data from the Living Wage Taskforce as well as data provided by Vice Chancellor Mayhew were reviewed. The primary conclusion to be drawn from current data is that some progress has been made in moving the lowest-paid workers on campus into salary ranges that provide a living wage – but, more work still needs to be done. The committee agreed on a two-pronged approach.
 - a) The committee will draft a resolution to take to the next executive committee and ultimately to the senate that seeks funding for salary increases and flexibility in distribution of those increases so that the issue of low-wage workers can be addressed.
 - b) The committee recommends that next year would be a good time for the Budget and Planning Committee of the Faculty Senate to begin development of a five-year plan for resolution of the Living Wage issue. This should include development of an annual reporting mechanism that should begin next year.
- 3) Reed reported on data that had been provided to deans regarding budgetary comparisons of UT and its peer institutions. Two primary conclusions can be drawn from this data.
 - a) Generally, UT falls a little below the mid-range on most comparisons (ranging from revenue per FTE to administrative expenditures per student FTE).
 - b) UT could rise to at least the 50th percent in funding per student if the THEC formula were fully funded.
- 4) The committee reviewed budget hearing documents. Committee members are all urged to attend the opening session (Monday, February 27 8:30-11) when the chancellor is scheduled to outline institutional priorities. In addition, committee members should send e-mail to McMillan to indicate which sessions they plan to attend. The committee indicated four areas that should be the primary focus of our follow-up with deans and other presenters
 - a) We should hold them to item 1 of the instructions and ask that they provide a progress report. This might be facilitated if the chancellor instructs deans prior to the hearings that they should dedicate at least a few minutes to discussion of what they have done with allocations they received in the past year and what progress they have made on their FY06 goals.
 - b) Similarly, item 5 in the instructions asks units to identify initiatives that could bring substantial returns with relatively small investments. If they do not provide examples, we should push for them to do so.
 - c) Under item 3 of the context for planning, units are asked to identify their top and bottom units in terms of performance. We should ask that they do so and push for the reallocation strategy that is requested in that item.

- d) Item 7 in the context for planning section focuses on development. We should ask that they provide us with some sense of priorities for development money – particularly in the area of scholarships and endowments.
- 5) Following the hearings, the committee will use its March 16 meeting to synthesize what was learned in the hearings and to prepare a response for Chancellor Crabtree. McMillan will work with Barlow to schedule such a meeting.
- 6) McMillan will work with FS President Kennedy to determine what role the Budget and Planning Committee should have in system-wide hearings. Those may be attended by members of the system-wide faculty council. If the B&P committee needs to attend, McMillan will get scheduling information from Vice President Davis and distribute to the committee.
- 7) The committee reviewed options for how to respond to the fact that the athletics department has not fulfilled its promise to change the name of the VASF so that the word “scholarship” is not used inappropriately. While there was not uniform agreement, the general sentiment is that a letter should be sent to Hamilton expressing our concern and telling him that if the change is not made by January 31, the committee will take further action. Depending on his response, the committee will need to develop an action plan.
- 8) No problems were identified with the data from the faculty salary survey. Gross will work with Hinde to make sure that the report is organized and formatted as in past years (with a minor change to include summaries) so that it can be posted to the faculty senate Web site.
- 9) Gross briefly discussed e-mail messages that he had sent previously regarding OIT and development/scholarships. The key concern is the system/campus relationship and the need for campus autonomy. Barlow noted that these are ongoing problems that the committee should continue to monitor.
- 10) The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.