

Minutes for CNAS Budget meeting on 3/21/2013.

There were handouts from Tammy which should be paired with these minutes.

Tammy asked for a list of guiding principles for implementing student fees. These could be sent via email later.

Insurance to come for claim for flooding in Kemper Hall. We have a \$25k deductible., but \$200k in repair fund, so there is no issue about not getting repairs done. However, the insurance will be used.

Summer school allocation: CNAS' amount is currently \$242.5k which is somewhat smaller than previous years.

Per course faculty; budget is \$335,574 and includes two half-time faculty, so real per course is more like \$250k. Current balance is \$36k.

This budget line could be used for GAs. Could make 21 GAs, but that's not necessarily where it would go, but it is a possibility. Tammy has asked departments to consider GAs instead of per course.

Space; described the on the handout. HRA move in January or summer 2015. Classrooms in plaster stadium are being renovated and some assigned to math.
Some cnas fundraising goals are listed on the handouts too.

Budget handout.

Salary savings \$637k last year. Pays for startup, misc GAs.

Expense carryforwards currently go back to departments.

It is possible to increase funds via summer enrollment and summer ch production. Summer enrollment is down except for chpa who do on-line, which we can't do much of because of labs. Tammy welcomes ideas for increasing summer enrollment as it results in an increase of revenue to the college.

Tammy gave a computer presentation: Everyone has access via blackboard. Access via "cnas program assessment". Then Instructions/checklist, file folder: budget data for 2013.

Also MSU public scorecard link is a good source for info.

Also enrollment data. Also has publications by department for past 5 yrs.

Bear intelligence is another place for resources. Need a login. If you don't have one, let Tammy's office know and it will be done. The Aim dashboard also lives here.

Committee should look this over these sources as related to budget allocations; for new hires, filling retirements. Wants guiding principles related to the budget. Tammy asked Frank about new money, other than just enrollment, in the context of, "Do we need to change our budget strategy?" Will budget increases be strictly tied to enrollments? I'm not sure there was a clear-cut answer here.

Charge to us, write 2 sentences in guiding principles and send to me. Within a week and meet in 2 weeks. Results are below. Next meeting set for April 11.

Results:

Doug Gouzie: 1) Total # of UNDERGRAD SCH produced (Undergrad as not all have Grad programs and many that do use TA money to pay tuition waivers)

Comparison Indicators for Undergrad SCH

a) 5-year trend

b) % of Delaware Averages for Department (discipline) (% MSU compared to benchmark averages)

c) $\$/SCH$ for MSU-Dept versus MSU $\$204/\text{credit hr}$ in-state tuition rate (we know many sciences will not look great against this, but the $\$204/\text{hr}$ IS what we take in as funding, so how efficiently we are delivering SCH for this income should be considered. I envision this as overall Dept $\$\$$ budget divided by overall undergrad SCH for that department, by year)

d) IF desired 2013 research $\$$ could be factored into these comparisons by using 1 SCH for every $\$1000$ of external funding on an overhead-paying grant (in other words, even though some grants pay Grad Students and some are for instrumentation, etc. if we simply estimated that 20% of the 38% standard overhead would come back into the university, then each $\$1000$ of external funds would generate about $\$200$ of overhead, comparable to one SCH of in-state tuition)

2) Total # of majors

a) 5 year trend

b) factor for external national trends ("hot new job fields" or "oversupply" as someone mentioned in one of our meetings)

Janice Greene: 1. Trends in enrollment in undergraduate and graduate programs;

2. Productivity in # of grants/faculty and in publications/presentations

3. Graduation rate

Jamil Saquer: 1) Decisions should be based on a consistent set of data such as performance indicators and Delaware comparisons

2) Decisions taken should protect current faculty and staff as much as possible

Stephanie Hein: 1) #of Majors and SCH production so that we can gauge the number of students that would be impacted by a decision

2) Retention of students (KPI)

3) Graduation rates (KPI)

John Havel: Missouri State University has as its primary mission to develop educated persons and is currently growing in both undergraduate numbers and graduate programs. To evaluate performance of departments, I believe we need to include quantitative measures of both course "output (SCH production) and various measures of research and graduate student performance. Such measures should include, but not be limited to, publications in peer-reviewed literature, external funding of research grants, completed graduate theses, and presentations of graduate students in national meetings.

Mike Reed: Firstly I think that a minimum budget should be set which satisfies the students' needs within that department, whether it be service or for majors. A substantial amount of funding comes from tuition and so departments should receive sufficient money to serve their student population, since that's a substantial source of revenue.

1) SCH production/faculty member

2) Research productivity as measured via grants, papers, and presentations.

3) Student service: research interaction, graduate programs, and field-related service.

Damon Bassett: 1) Undergraduate student credit hour production, which should be evaluated using a 5-year trend, Delaware averages, and cost/SCH.

2) Total number of majors, with consideration given to the 5-year trend and potentially national trends (though this will be harder to quantify).