Notes from the meeting of the budget and priorities committee February 8, 2011

Present: Langmeyer, Said, Bauer, Sen, Taylor, Yap, Vamadeva, Harknett, Zirger (and Plummer and Buttermore)

Agenda: Review material from the December budget summit and come up with recommendations and idea for resource increase, cost reduction from faculty perspective.

Bauer, Vamadeva and Langmeyer had prepared material prior to the meeting. Bauer went through the December summit material and pulled out ideas for immediate consideration, long term and not to be considered. Vamadeva (Ana) focused on savings from freezes on hiring/pay/travel/leaves and revenue enhancements through international students. Langmeyer focused on more general principles for decision making.

Hard to know, what with all that was in front of us, just how to proceed. So,

Peg Alinsworth provided an overview of our membership in the consortium of colleges and universities (EAB) and the University Spending Collaborative (?) and our undertaking an assessment of mostly our non academic practices to see if there are any savings that can be achieved. B&P was generally impressed with what we could gain from this involvement.

IT, another big area for potential savings and perhaps improvements. We already have several IT study committees that are working away. (BJ Zirger)

We then went on to 3 big items and then ran out of time.

1. Retirement.
   * It is recognized that many older faculty ask for medical insurance as part or a main part of retirement “incentive”
   * STRS changes will likely make retirement for 25% of our current faculty attractive before 2015.
   * This requires planning for replacement or placement (since one could either reduce the size of the faculty or replace faculty in different programs from which they retired)
   * Better to have incentives that do not cost current funds. Prefer not paying faculty without work. So phased retirements, offers of part time positions like represented adjunct which would provide medical.
   *”Manpower” planning must be in place.

2. On-line courses.
   * On line programs do not seem to garner state subsidies and that needs to be taken into account
   * On-line will become more integrated into the “regular” pedagogy, course management. More hybrid courses

3. Retention.
   * Subsidies will soon reward graduation rates. Retention and graduation becomes more important so,
   * Better prepared students turn into graduates
   * First year and early interventions turn into retention and graduates
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