

Faculty Affairs

Minutes February 7, 2019

Present: renée c. hoogland, Poonam Arya, Daniel Golodner, Marisa Henderson, Ellen Tisdale, Linda Beale, Annmarie Cano, Karin Tarpenning, Hussein Barr (sp.?)

Absent: Ewa Golebiowska, Ekrem Murat, Kypros Markou

Absent with notice: Jocelyn Ang, Patrica McCormick, Jinping Xu

1. **The Meeting was called to order at 12:05pm**
2. **Minutes January 10, 2019 were approved**
3. **rch explains change in Agenda: climate survey discussion is postponed to April meeting**
4. **RCM ctd.**

LB walks us further through the slides provided by Jeff Bolton (forwarded earlier to cttee. members). The mechanism to allocate funds knows three “drivers”: space/square footage, credit hours (UG & Graduate), and general fund expenditures. Of the state appropriation 6-7 million is used for strategic funding (see slide 6). General fund is everything but donor-raised funds (see the budget cttee. website to see how much this is). WSU underperforms on philanthropy—below the benchmark of peer institutions—partly because there is no adequate alumni database and the Deans are not doing their jobs in this respect. Strategic funding in recent has been spent on public safety and the iBio interdisciplinary faculty lines. The Provost usually allocates these funds for strategic hires. The rest goes to the schools and college (direct costs, costs of support units).

AC points out that units can approach the Provost to signal needs (e.g., mental health support, advising).

LB explains that under the new model the RCM steering cttee. proposes allocation of the general fund; the President decides. Direct cost determination will be based on the prior year. If a unit ends up in the negative, it will receive subventions (subsidies) to get in the clear during the first year that the budget model will be cast in RCM terms. Each school will thus be held harmless the first year. The medical school will be forever in subvention, for research is expensive.

ET asks how a unit can end up with a deficit in the first place.

LB explains that the budget group will hold hearings to see if things are being done to make it reasonable to continue the subvention. Deans and schools must take steps to reduce the deficit. F&A Recovery Grant Overhead costs come out of grants (slide 7). The proposed model was to use “credit hours” to allocate funds (slide 8). LB has been objecting to this, insisting that there must be differentiation in the types of credit hours. The current model allocates the state appropriation purely according to credit hours. The question is how to count credit hours that students take outside the major. CLAS, for instance, teaches 84% of the gen./ed. credit hours and needs to hire instructors to teach these classes. Funds do not fully come back to units if

there is a 25%/75% distribution. There are many different models re: credit hours in place where schools have adopted RCM.

Slide 11 explains differential tuition. Slide 14 is the model applied in a hypothetical college. Slide 19 includes the problematic notion of “space”: research space tends to be considerably more expensive than general purpose classrooms. This should be transparent and taken into account.

The three drivers (slide 21 shows a list of how things are paid for) credit hours, general fund, and space are linked to students, direct expenditures, and square footage, respectively.

The role of the OVPR in all this is problematic since it only supports STEM fields. NRP is paid for with taxes imposed on schools and units.

Indirect costs recovery becomes a dean’s decision, not a chair’s (24% goes to the OVPR, 5% to the PI, 7% to the Chair, 12% to the Dean, and the administration gets 48%).

The question looms: where is the accountability for administrative units? For instance, how is the Provost held accountable for hiring an increased number of associates?

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30pm.

Respectfully submitted,

renée c. hoogland, Chair