

Minutes, Budget Committee of Academic Senate

Meeting of March 22, 2010 (as approved, May 3, 2010)

Present: Michael McIntyre (chair), Judy Field, Rob Kohrman*, Winston Koo, Charles Parrish, Aleksandar Popadic, Louis Romano, Linea Rydstedt, William Volz.

Absent with Notice: Donald DeGracia, , Thomas Killion, Richard Needleman*, Assia Shisheva, James Woodyard.

Absence without Notice: George Alchammas*, Charles Elder, Rita Kumar.

Invited guest: Nancy Barrett, Provost; John L. Davis, Vice President for Finance & Facilities Management.

*Liaison

1. The meeting began at 11:01 a.m. The minutes of the meetings of March 8, 2010, were approved.
2. *Tribute to Provost Nancy Barrett.* The chair noted that Provost Nancy Barrett would be making her final appearance at a meeting of the committee. He thanked her for her support of the committee and for her active participation in its work over the past seven years. He said that he spoke for the committee in thanking her for her determined efforts at making consultation with the faculty on budget matters a reality. He then opened the floor for comments by members. Many members took the occasion to express their affection and admiration for the provost.
3. *Discussion of Chair's Budget Proposal.* The committee discussed at length the chair's budget proposal presented at the last meeting and attached to the minutes of that meeting. The proposal called for tuition restraint and for a shift of resources to the schools and colleges. The committee generally was supportive of the basic plan, but with some reservations. A few members felt that the University should seek higher tuition in order to provide greater funding for research. The chair suggested that the bottleneck for research was the University's inadequate research facilities, and that problem of inadequate facilities was not going to be addressed in the FY 2011 budget. He noted that the School of Medicine was not even attempting to fill its open slots and that a number of searches for research faculty had been unsuccessful this year. One member suggested that holding the tuition increase to 3 percent would likely result in budget cuts to the schools and colleges. The provost and the budget director suggested that the 3 percent tuition increase would be sufficient to cover contractual commitments and cost increases for essential services if state funding is not cut significantly, but they agreed that they could not guarantee no budget cuts.

Much of the discussion of the chair's proposal focused on tactics. Several members felt that the proposal to increase the percentage of the budget going to the

schools and colleges by two percentage points would lead to an unproductive debate about the numbers. They suggested that the focus should be on an increase in tenured/tenure-track faculty. The chair noted that his proposal also called for an increase in graduate teaching assistants, partly to promote research and partly to reduce the University's over dependence on part-time faculty. He suggested that he was reluctant to tie a tuition increase solely to faculty slots because, in the past, the Administration has promised the slots to get support for a tuition increase but then did not provide funding for them.

The discussion made clear that any increase in faculty positions would have to be funded by (1) cuts in non-academic programs, (2) use of the President's strategic fund, or (3) an increase in tuition. Budget Director Kohrman estimated that a 1% increase in tuition would provide funding, net of additional financial aid, of around \$2.5 million.

4. *School of Medicine Tuition.* The committee reviewed the proposal for raising tuition in the School of Medicine by 3 percent. It was noted that this increase, although appearing to be modest, actually amounted to an increase of around \$900 for in-state students and almost \$1,800 for out-of-state students.

5. *Multi-purpose Building at Matthaei Complex.* The committee reviewed the Administration's proposal to spend \$1.4 million for what it characterizes as a multi-purpose athletic building. The claim is that the building is needed to deal with an increase in intramural activities of students. The chair suggested that the need may be due to the extensive use of the existing facilities by non-students living in the neighborhoods. One member noted that the Administration has provided no data on actual usage by Wayne students.

6. *Other BOG Matters.* The committee quickly reviewed the proposals to the Board of Governors for laboratory renovation in the College of Nursing, a building addition at the Law School, and an increase in housing fees for the dormitories.

7. The committee adjourned at 12:22 p.m.

Michael J. McIntyre