

Minutes, Budget Committee of Academic Senate

Meeting of March 31, 2000 (As approved, May 1, 2000)

Present: Charles Parrish (chair), Marc Cogan (late), Charles Elder, Michael McIntyre*, Hiroshi Mizukami, Vanessa Rose*(late), Shirley Walkowski*, James Woodyard.

Absent with Notice: Richard Beltramini, Domenico Gatti, Nancy Greger, Marlyne Kilbey*, John Ofenstein, William Slater,

Absent w/o Notice: Alex Agius,* Linea Rydstedt,

*Liaison

1. The meeting convened at 2:14 p.m. The minutes of the meeting of March 5, 2000, were approved.

2. The meeting began with a discussion of the form of consultation that the Budget Committee would be providing for the FY 2001 budget. It was noted that consultation with the Budget Committee is scheduled for 3 days before the budget goes to the printer. Many members noted that this schedule was unacceptable. Ms. Rose, who arrived late, subsequently explained that the scheduled meeting is to give a general report on the budget decisions to the committee. She contemplates substantial consultation in April and May.

3. Mr. Elder initiated discussion of the possibility of the Budget Committee preparing an annual report, near the start of each year, that would set forth the budget priorities of the Budget Committee. That report would be forwarded to the Policy Committee and then the Academic Senate for discussion, modification, and approval. Through the Policy Committee, the Budget Committee would seek input from other standing committees of the Academic Senate as to important items for consideration. The Budget Committee would take responsibility for doing a cost estimate of various proposals and indicating its views as to priorities. It was suggested that the report, to have credibility, must be more than a wish list — it must indicate priorities and revenue sources, at least in general terms. The report would indicate long-term goals and suggest a strategy of incremental changes to work toward those goals. The report might indicate, for example, that reducing the university's heavy dependence on part-time faculty is a long-term goal of the Academic Senate. In addition, the report might suggest current changes in allocations that might move the university toward that goal.

Several members noted that this proposed report, although independent of the administration's budget process, is not intended to be in conflict with that process. The idea is for the Budget Committee and the Academic Senate to get its voice heard at a time when the budget was sufficiently in flux that input would be useful. With respect to the "capital budget," it was expected that there would be a lot of harmony with the administration, although there might be timing differences. Some members suggested, for example, that they

support the administration's initiative to increase dormitory space at the university and might want to accelerate that initiative. At an early stage, the president of the Academic Senate might bring the Budget Committee's report to the full Senate for discussion and might raise the issues presented in the report in other appropriate forums.

To get the process started, the following motion was made and seconded:

That the Policy Committee request the standing committees of the Academic Senate to prepare a list of up to five budget priorities in their area of competence and to sent the list to the Budget Committee to make cost estimates and to consider for inclusion in the Budget Committee's proposed annual report on budget priorities for FY 2002.

The motion passed by voice vote without opposition.

4. Mr. Cogan, in preparation for the meeting, had written a memo on budget priorities that he shared with the committee. The memo called for a shift in budget resources from the non-academic side of the budget to the academic side in order to address the problems created by the heavy use of part-time faculty at this university. The memo provided benchmark data tending to show that, adjusted for enrollment, Wayne State had between 247 and 316 fewer full-time faculty positions than its peer institutions. Based on language in the memo, the following motion was made and seconded:

That the Budget Committee of the Academic Senate recommends that the following steps be taken to bring the number of full-time faculty at Wayne State University into line with peer institutions:

- (1) That the share of the FY 2001 Budget allocated to the schools and colleges be increased by 1% over the FY 2000 allocation — to 41.40% of the Budget;
- (2) That the amount of the increased allocation be earmarked for the hiring of full-time faculty members and of support staff and instructional supplies for those new faculty members.
- (3) That it is further recommended that share of the fiscal year budgets allocated to the schools and colleges be increased by a further 1% each of the following four years: to 42.4% of the FY2001 Budget, 43.4% of the FY 2002 Budget, 44.4% of the FY 2003, and 45.4% of the FY 2004 Budget, with the new allocations in each budget cycle earmarked for new full-time faculty, support staff, and instructional equipment.

The motion passed by voice vote without opposition.

5. Some general discussion of budget priorities took place. One member indicated that increasing the number of students beginning their college career at Wayne should be an important priority. Others noted that adding new faculty would help with that goal and also would help bring in additional research money, in that part-time faculty generally do not get research grants. It was noted that the faculty has a major interest in the success of the admissions office. That operation appears to be understaffed and not up to the standards of competing institutions. It was agreed that a future meeting might address this issue but that the current budget issues must get the top priority of the committee.

6. Ms. Rose discussed with the committee the coming budget process. She offered to come to a meeting of the committee in early May and to invite the faculty representative on the Budget Review Committee to also come, for the purpose of discussing budget priorities in the coming budget. She indicated that she intended to send to the committee a list of the major budget initiatives that the Budget Review Committee was considering as the lists were formulated. She indicated the submissions would be piecemeal to maximize opportunities for timely input from the committee. She was particularly interested in early feedback from the committee with respect to unfunded priorities from last year.

7. The meeting adjourned at 3:38 p.m.

By Michael J. McIntyre