MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING
October 6, 2011 UNION Stateroom #3, 3:30 pm

Present: Burenheide, Carlin, Condia, Flaming, Jackson, Honey, Reed, Smith, Soldan, Suh
Absent: Cates, Cauble, Graham, Lynn-Sherow, Spriggs, Watts
Guests: Bruce Shubert

1. Bob Condia, chair, called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm

2. The September 1, 2011 minutes were approved as submitted.

3. Visitor – Dr. Bruce Shubert PhD, VP for Administration and Finance
   Discussion: University Budget (45-47 minutes)

   Condia thanked Shubert for attending the FSCOUP meeting. Shubert briefly discussed the highlights of
   the university financial summary that was sent out a few days ago to K-State Today (http://www.k-
   state.edu/today/announcement.php?id=1495&category=from_the_administration&referredBy=today
   Archive). He commented this year KU announced a scholarship program that is similar to what K-State
   has been using already, however KU’s has a renewable opportunity to some students and we would like
   to look forward to more opportunities for students here at K-State such as that. Discussion will begin
   with student leadership about tuition strategies for future years. Shubert opened the floor for
   questions. Condia asked whether legislature is aware that there is no more “fat” in the budget, etc.
   Shubert reported that K-State does a good job keeping them informed. What about research funds that
   come to K-State, how does that apply to the general good? The grant itself can pay for someone’s salary
   etc, which allows funds to open up for other uses for a time, so that is beneficial to the unit. How is it a
   good thing to the campus overall? It brings in outside money which is a direct benefit. Then there are
   benefits to the private sector... intellectual property, etc. Shubert also commented that the VP for
   Research position in universities is now coming regularly to the Board of Regents to improve visibility
   and support of these areas. Graham thanked Shubert and his office for distributing this financial
   summary; he feels it is very helpful and clear to put this information out to the university community.
   Smith asked if there are areas FSCOUP can assist. Shubert asked that if there are questions or concerns
   that come up, bring them to his attention, as well as sharing with constituents our story and keeping
   them informed of the situation.

   Shubert commented briefly on a letter he received regarding suggested initiatives from the city for uses
   of funding this year - as he noticed it was on FSCOUP’s agenda to make an appointment to the
   city/university fund committee.

   Another topic of discussion with Shubert was the merit system on campus currently. Should this be
   reviewed? It doesn’t appear monies will change dramatically in the next year, but there is the question
   too of whether or not to institute the targeted excellence initiative when monies return.

   Condia thanked Shubert for his openness with the committee.

4. Marketing and Communication report (10-13 minutes) – No report
   • Jeffery Morris, Vice President for Marketing and Communication
     This item will be removed as a standing item, but FSCOUP will be happy to place this item on the
     agenda when there are

5. Old Business (20 minutes)
   • Suggestions of FSCOUP’s on priorities of K-State’s 2025 logic models
     Review Logic Models
     Condia would like to send forward to FS President Vontz three priorities of FSCOUP for 2025:
     • Logic model III Graduate Scholarly Experience (1-5 years)
       o Competitive compensation and support available for GRAs, GTAs, and GAs.
• Logic model V Faculty and Staff (1-5 years):
  • Total compensation – to be competitive
  • Successful recruitment and retention (faculty and GRAs, GTAs, and GAs)

• Logic model VI Facilities and Infrastructure (6-10 years)
  • Enhanced campus community and collaborative learning working

Committee members reviewed logic models and a handout Lynn Carlin brought to the committee. Members discussed what they felt were priorities that should be noted by FSCOUP. Suh also brought out what concerns he has about reaching top 50, just at a college level. It seems it would be important to choose and focus on priorities that would be reachable as a university. Or choose a matrix to focus on for your area, but not all. This sparked good conversation among committee members.

Condia reminded committee members we want to focus on areas that we can get behind, not just what seems to be reachable. Carlin also commented that the outcomes are important, but it appears they have been lost a little bit in the conversations.

Conversation turned towards that fact that the basics have to be in place in order to facilitate the deeper things getting done. Graham noted that it’s kind of like getting the launching pad done.

Condia thanked everyone for the discussion and will work on sending the priorities above from FSCOUP to president Vontz.

The following is more detailed information submitted from Lynn Carlin regarding the committee’s conversation surrounding 2025 priorities, as requested:

I think the general philosophy was that we needed an early emphasis on faculty and staff as well as infrastructure related to the campus experience, because without those issues addressed early on, we won’t get to the longer-term outcomes.

1. Theme 5: Faculty and Staff - short/intermediate term outcomes and activities related to total compensation, university HR processes, and successful recruitment and retention
   a. Total compensation competitive with aspirant university and regional employers for faculty and staff in high priority areas
   b. Total compensation competitive with aspirant university and regional employers for all employees
   c. Efficient, effective, and integrated university HR processes and services that place employees in the right positions with the right skill sets at the right time
   d. Successful recruitment and retention of a talented and high performing, diverse workforce

2. Theme 3: Graduate Scholarly Experience - short term outcomes and activities related to compensation and successful recruitment and retention of GRAs, GAs, and GTAs
   a. Competitive compensation and support available for GRAs, GTAs, and GAs
   b. Tuition waivers for all GRAs

3. Theme 6: Facilities and Infrastructure - short/intermediate term outcomes and activities related to facility services, temporary housing space, and enhanced campus community experience and collaborative working and learning environments
   a. Responsive, timely, and strategic facilities services aligned with campus operational needs as well as future planning and implementation
   b. Adequate temporary space to house programs and staff impacted by renovations of existing facilities
   c. Enhanced campus community experience and collaborative learning and working environments promoted by facilities that support multi-disciplinary work and integrated interaction between students, faculty, researchers, staff, and administrators

• Nominations for “City/University Special Projects Fund Committee”
After discussion it was agreed these three names will be put forward as nominations to the city/university fund committee.

6. Meeting adjourned at 4:50 pm.

Next meeting: Thursday, November 3, 2011, **union room 205, 3:30 pm**

**Guest:**
Sue Peterson, Director of Governmental Relations and Assistant to the President